OREGON EDUCATION INVESTMENT BOARD

Dec. 7, 2011
Hearing Room F, Oregon State Capitol
Salem, OR

OEIB Members Present
Gov. John Kitzhaber, Chair; Nancy Golden, Chair Designee; Richard Alexander; Yvonne Curtis; Julia Brim Edwards; Matt Donegan; Samuel Henry; Nicole Maher; Mark Mulvihill; David Rives; Mary Spilde; Kay Toran; Hanna Vaandering

Advisors Present
George Pernsteiner, Chancellor, OUS; Susan Castillo, Supt of Public Instruction; Camille Preus, Commissioner of Community Colleges; Josette Green, Director, Oregon Student Assistance Commission

Members/Advisors Excused
Ron Saxton

Staff/Other Participants

Tim Nesbitt	Mgr, Education Investment Proj	Sarah Ames	Communications, Ed Inv. Proj.
Ben Cannon	Office of the Governor	Jan McComb	OEIB Staff Support
Seth Allen	OEIB Staff Support	Gary Cordy	Dept. of Justice

Welcome and Introductions
Governor John Kitzhaber called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm. He welcomed board members and audience members and briefly reviewed the agenda. Sign-in sheets are available for those who wish to comment on the job description or other matters. The meeting is being streamed live and will also be archived for later viewing.

He thanked members for all their hard work. He noted that there were some big issues scheduled to be discussed at the meeting, including the Chief Education Officer job description and legislative recommendations. Adoption of last week's meeting minutes will be postponed until January.

Presentation: "The Eastern Promise"
Director Mark Mulvihill, Intermountain ESD and OEIB Board Member
Bob Davies, President, Eastern Oregon University
John Turner, President, Blue Mountain Comm. College
Dana Young, President, Treasure Valley Comm. College

Director Mulvihill stated that the goal of the Eastern Promise is to embed the college-going experience into the senior year of high school and build capacity for this program across eastern Oregon. He introduced the panel who described their locally-developed dual credit program, Eastern Promise. The program began last January.

Davies talked about the immense challenge in reaching the 40-40-20 goal. Individual sectors cannot reach the goal by themselves; they have to work together to create a seamless pipeline to postsecondary education. He stated that there were eight key elements to promote college readiness in high school. It starts in the fifth grade—talking to students and their family about what it will take to get to college. It is also about creating mentorships for students and opening students' eyes about the world and opportunities that await them. Dual credit leads to a successful college experience. There must be adequate rigor so students know they can be successful at the college

level. They are focusing on removing barriers for students to access postsecondary education. Advanced Placement is wonderful, but tends to exclude lower income students or Spanish speaking populations. We do not want to leave behind students that earn "B" and "C" grades. Institutional collaborations are important. This isn't new, but rarely do you have all sectors involved working together toward a common goal. This year, 2,102 students graduated from eastern Oregon high schools; 301 elected to attend one of Oregon's public universities (over half chose Eastern Oregon University). This is 14 percent of the total graduates. The Eastern Promise goal is to increase that to 30 percent. While some students went out of state, Oregon is still well below the "40s" in the 40-40-20 Goal. Eastern Promise has short term and long term strategies to increase the college-going rate.

Turner stated that they can't qualify enough teachers to teach dual credit. Under current rule, dual credit teachers need a masters degree in their *subject* area; most high school teachers have a master's degree in education. This dual credit teaching requirement could be changed to just a master's degree in education or another field. Students would have to show that they have mastered identified learning outcomes developed by colleges and universities. This would ensure quality. Our accreditation will not allow lower teacher standards, so Eastern Promise would create Professional Learning Communities to educate teachers about the outcomes and increase communication between the sectors. Biology, math, communications are the subjects with which Eastern Promise is beginning. They are now working on the assessment/learning outcomes. Under this system, college faculty would have confidence that students were prepared. They are looking at expanding the program to more high schools and plan to run a pilot program in fall of 2012. The provosts are already talking about expanding to more subjects. This could be scaled up statewide. They are also looking at "reverse transfer." When community college students transfer to OUS a few credits short of an associate's degree, the community colleges don't get to count them as a success. With reverse credit, the credits earned at university could be used to grant an associate's degree, thus allowing community colleges to count them as successful students.

Young stated that many factors influence a student's decision to attend college. They want to create an early intervention program with 5th graders, and talk to them about college and the value of advanced education. Many students make their decision by middle school regarding college. Students from poor and diverse backgrounds are at great risk at not completing high school. We must do better and show them the way. Eastern Promise's goal is to provide early intervention programs at the elementary and secondary levels and promote the value of education. We forge new relationships among the sectors. Also being discussed is granting students who earn the Oregon diploma automatic admission to Eastern Oregon University and developing scholarship programs. Eastern Promise will develop local solutions such as the ASPIRE program, Upward Bound, and Gear Up programs—that will be key in being successful. She stated that she was excited about next phase and the difference it will make in eastern Oregon

Davies concluded by stating that they have learned a lot about the different sectors; it hasn't always been easy. As institutional leaders, they have reallocated priorities to make this work; they are not asking for additional funding. It is human-intensive; it takes a lot of hours to make this work. Hermiston High School is looking at having one-third of their curriculum online. Community support has been tremendous in terms of volunteers and scholarships. This will also help the area economically. Elements of this kind of program align with the idea of achievement compacts.

Discussion:

- The number of students of color that go on to college from the program.
- Rules regulating teachers of dual credit; it is common for teachers to get master's degrees in education, rather than subject area.
- Different funding models for different sectors, and what changes might be needed to encourage this model.
- Determining the cause of the lack of learning by a student; teacher responsibility v. student.

Chief Education Officer

Job Description
The Governor drew the members' attention to Draft 12 of the Chief Education Officer job description. Director Brim-Edwards summarized the accomplishments of this work team to date. Team members have listened to a variety of stakeholders regarding the description and modified the draft accordingly. She then reviewed the differences between Draft 10 and Draft 12. It is the recommendation by the team to adopt the job description. The goal is to have someone hired by March.

No one signed up for public comment on the process.

MOTION: Director Samuel Henry moved to adopt the Draft 12 job description of the Chief Education Officer; Director Kay Toran seconded the motion.

VOTE: Hearing no objections, the motion passed unanimously.

Plans for Recruitment
The Governor noted that a recruitment firm had been tentatively selected and was working with the Dept. of Administrative Services to put a contract in place. Assistant Attorney General Gary Cordy described the proposed selection process, stating that the goal of recruitment and hiring was to comply with the public meetings law, retain the confidentiality for the applicant, and allow the board to consider the applicants in executive session. A committee appointed by the Governor which makes a recommendation to the Governor can do its work in non-public meetings. The Governor will then make a recommendation of candidates to the OEIB. By allowing public comment on the process, it will allow the OEIB to convene in executive session (ORS 192.660(7)(d)(D). The Governor noted that this process will enable the broadest range of candidates to apply. Nesbitt noted that the proposed draft recruitment work plan will be revised following discussions with the contracted recruitment firm and reviewed at the January 3 meeting.

MOTION: Director Samuel Henry moved to adopt work plan as described by legal counsel; Director Richard Alexander seconded the motion.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

The Governor proposed that Director Brim-Edwards, Director Toran, and Director Johanna Vaandering serve on the screening panel, along with Lynn Saxton and another as-yet-to-be-determined from higher education. There were no objections to the proposal.

Governor's Recommendations to Organize the P-20 System
Governor Kitzhaber

The Governor stated that he would like to get a recommendation from the board to proceed on the tasks laid out in sections B and C of his letter dated Dec. 1. Tim Nesbitt recommended changing the date on #5 (of Section B) from September 15 to October 15 and changing the date on #6 (Section B) from October 15, 2012 to November 15, 2012. The Governor recommended making a similar change in section C (3).

Discussion:

- Concerns about wording, such as "work within existing resources" and "flat organizational structure" instead of meeting the needs of what is wanted. The Governor agreed there was a need to seek adequate funding for education.
- Why the P-20 spectrum of boards was not reflected in Section B(3), parallel to those listed in Section A (1)—early childhood and K-12 are not represented. The Governor agreed they two sections should be parallel.
- Whether "recognize" was the best word to use regarding the independence of local boards and relationship to achievement compacts and OEIB.
- The difference between the direction of Section B(1) and Section B(3).

The Governor stated that the letter would be re-written for clarification and brought back at the January 3 meeting. Regarding Section C of the letter, the Governor noted that Rep. Mark Johnson had contacted him to let him know that a legislative work group would be doing similar work regarding university governing boards. He recommended changing the time frame (for when the report was due) from September to October.

MOTION: Director Richard Alexander moved approval of the Section C recommendations with the amended timeline; Director Samuel Henry seconded the motion.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, the motion passed unanimously.

Approval of SB 909 Reports to the Legislature
Early Learning Council
Duke Shepherd, Labor and Human Services Policy Advisory, Office of the Governor

The Governor drew the member's attention to the latest draft of the Early Learning Council's report. Duke Shepherd stated that the ELC had completed its tasks; recommendations affecting the legislative concept are unchanged from last week. However, there are two substantive changes: that the ELC embark on a planning process with the State Interagency Coordinating Council for Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education over the next year to determine those linkages and that the Governor's appointees to the Children's Trust Fund of Oregon (20% of the 25-member CTF board is appointed by the Governor) become Early Learning Council members. In response to questions, Shepherd reviewed the process used to develop the report over the last year.

Discussion:

- Other recommendations made by the Commission on Children and Families and whether they were included (yes).
- The speed of this process; whether all aspects have been thoroughly vetted.
- SB 909 timeline.
- When OEIB would get the legislative draft; opportunity for field to comment on the draft during January 2012.
- Differences from what was turned in on Monday

MOTION: Director Kay Toran moved adoption of the ELC report and that the ELC and OEIB solicit additional input on the legislative draft in January; Director Samuel Henry seconded the motion.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, the motion was adopted unanimously.

Shepherd reviewed the two changes made in the legislative proposal since the OEIB had approved it Dec. 1.—that the ELC create a planning process with the State Interagency Coordinating Council for Early Intervention and Early Childhood Special Education over the next year and that the Governor's appointees to the Children's Trust Fund of Oregon (20% of the 25-member CTF board is appointed by the Governor) become Early Learning Council members.

MOTION: Director Yvonne Curtis moved that the OEIB approve those two changes as described; Director Mark Mulvihill seconded the motion.

VOTE: Hearing no objection, the motion was adopted unanimously.

OEIB Report – Section 1, Section 2, Section 3
Tim Nesbitt, Manager, SB 909 Education Project
Sarah Carlin Ames, Communications Director, SB 909 Education Project

Tim Nesbitt stated that the latest draft was circulated to board members last night, although draft sections had been circulated to members earlier. There are a number of policy issues yet to be resolved. He stated that members might want to schedule an additional meeting, via conference call, if there's interest in going through the report in detail. That would also enable consideration of public input at today's meeting. Members agreed to a Monday (Dec. 12) afternoon meeting.

Nesbitt identified policies not yet resolved:
Section 1, pg. 9: Does the scope of the 40-40-20 Goals include the existing larger adult work force or just those students in the pipeline?
Section 1, pg. 12: whether 4th outcome bullet should be included; this is a budgeting section.
Nesbitt identified policies not yet resolved:

1. Section 1, pg. 9: Scope of 40-40-20 include larger adult workforce?
2. Section 1, pg 12: For purposes of the ten-year budgeting process, four goals were identified and are reflected here. A concern was raised about the "20" in the 40-40-20 Goal—students who take the classes they need to advance in a job but do not earn a certificate. There may be a desire to refine this language. Spilde agrees.
3. Generally: Director Saxton suggested including more on the larger workforce issue.
4. Generally: Director Saxton suggested calling out incentivizing cost-effective practices.
5. Sue Hildick (Chalkboard Project) had suggested more information about teacher quality.

Sarah Ames reviews the report. Section 1 outlines the challenge and urgency we face and draws heavily from the OEIT work. Section 2 gets into key strategies. It summarizes areas of agreement and reflects agreement up to this time, such as achievement compacts. It also flags discussion coming up. Section 3 highlights next steps and becomes more concrete for the next two legislative sessions. Aspects of the 80-page Early Learning Council report will be integrated. In response to questions, Ames reviewed the proposed appendices.

Nesbitt asked board members to identify other issues between now and the Monday meeting. Those subjects he had noted, in addition the earlier ones included the following:

1. Address drop outs
2. Whether achievement compact criteria (OAKS scores) should be broadened
3. Include recent achievement compact samples
4. Emphasize the impact of poverty
5. Distinguish between "students" and "learners"
6. Look at whether study on p. 10, section 1 is good one.
7. Add executive summary, revised glossary, table of contents, appendices

Discussion:

- How to distinguish between Oregon students attending Oregon colleges and out of state students coming and going.
- The desire to highlight the challenge students in rural areas face.
- Desire to include examples of best practices.
- Whether achievement compact should be based on existing data collected as outlined in the report (Section 2, p. 11), under *Standards and Assessment*s.
- Compact criteria; importance of noting other measures.
- How to reflect those students who drop out in the 40-40-20 language (e.g. 40-40-20-0)
- Desire to include more language about poverty.
- Word choice: "student" vs. "learner"
- Desire to cite studies, use more relevant studies.
- Whether to include progression points, such as ninth grade credits earned, on track to graduate
- Whether the OEIB should focus on an executive summary, rather than the longer report.
- Desire to have more public input
- Whether to include in the report the unique mission of community colleges—often they serve those students who have not succeeded elsewhere
- Community colleges share the same challenges as the universities (section 1, pg. 11)

Update on ESEA/NCLB Waiver

Ben Cannon updated the board on the work being done to secure a waiver from the federal NCLB law. Nearly 100 people have worked on this since October. The first stage is completed. On or about Dec. 19, staff will circulate draft application for comment. Will submit in mid to late January. The application is due Feb. 21. There were over 6,000 responses to the online survey. The focus is on Title 1 schools. The state will continue to issue report cards, but the application will suggest ways to improve report cards. Application will have context of achievement compacts. Emphasis will be on individual student growth. We will diagnose cause of low performing schools, prior to prescribing interventions. The groups were still discussing interventions/sanctions.

Discussion:

- How cohort student growth will be measured (OAKS scores).
- How to transition from OAKS to SMARTER/BALANCED (Common Core State Standards) assessments; how to compare.
- Important skills that are not measured by existing assessments.

- Comparing process used in Race to the Top with the waiver process.

Outreach and Communications
Sarah Ames reviewed recent efforts to get public input. There will be an opportunity to have more meetings in January for input.

Discussion:
- Ability to access existing education networks.
- Communicating report to various groups.

Future Meetings
Nesbitt stated that the next meetings are planned January 3 and February 7 at the State Lands Building in Salem. The legislature will be in session February 7. Both meetings will run 1:00 to 5:00 pm. Topics for those meetings are being developed.

Discussion:
- More time to discuss achievement compact contents.
- Securing a speaker on poverty.
- Setting a 2012 meeting schedule.

Public Comments
Sue Hildick, Chalkboard Project, testified on educator quality. She urged stronger language regarding the critical role of educators. Quality educators are a strong predictor on outcomes. She stated that she would like to see adding a principle in the outline about educator supports to improve teaching. She will forward to board staff suggested language.

Margaret DeLacy, Oregon Association for the Talented and Gifted, testified she supported growth models, but growth to proficiency will not meet TAG students' learning needs; we need to measure growth after proficiency. Handout. Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are not adequate for TAG students. Handout. CCSS are deficient in advanced work—they fall short of meeting the needs of gifted learners. She endorsed the goals of 40-40-20 and the goals laid out in the OEIT report. The needs for high performing students should be considered in light of those goals. Need to fund services for high achieving students. Students need to have their learning needs met even if they are "proficient;" some are not ready for college even though they have met the standards.

Cecilia Baculi, Salem-Keizer Title I Parent Advisory Committee and mother of TAG students. Handout. She recommended that parents have some responsibility in student performance. She also recommended that success measures include advanced coursework and college readiness, such as enrollment in honors and AVID courses in middle and high school and successful acceleration in math in middle and high school, and that this be reported by ethnicity, income level, and feeder school. She added that different students should have different growth expectations in the schools' achievement compacts.

Darlene Hooley, Hooley & Naito, testified on behalf of the Northwest Evaluation Association regarding assessments. Handout (1, 2). She described different types of assessments. NWEA offer the type of assessments that most people desire, formative tests that inform teachers about the academic level of a student. She recommended that school districts should be allowed to limit the accountability tests required by NCLB to once every four years and invest dollars saved in formative assessments that help students learn, or allow districts to adopt a blended assessment—part summative (1/6) and part formative (5/6). The CCSS Smarter Balanced assessments will not focus on individual students and their growth. These tests will cost Oregon more than existing tests.

Kris Alman, testified regarding her concerns about the current direction of education reform. Handout. She cited the gross income inequality as a fundamental issue that needed to be addressed. The Quality Education Model is not being funded. Full-day kindergarten, Advanced Placement, and dual credit opportunities are all good, but there needs to be additional money to fund these. Exit exams do not add value for students. Project ALDER treats students as data entry points. The focus should be on quality education. She concluded by stating that she worried about strings attached to the federal waiver.

Adjournment

Chair Golden adjourned the board at 4:05 pm.