Achievement Compact Advisory Committee
Oregon Education Investment Board
Discussion notes
March 8, 2012, 3 to 5 p.m. Oregon State Library, Salem

Committee members in attendance:

- Inge Aldersebaes, OEA Choice Trust
- Eduardo Angulo, Executive Director, Salem Keizer Coalition for Equality
- Lindsey Capps, Assistant Executive Director, Center for Teaching and Learning, Oregon Education Association
- Ed Dodson, Clackamas Community College Board Director
- Jonathan Farmer, Oregon Student Association Board Director
- Craig Hawkins, Executive Director, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators
- Dena Hellums, Stand for Children, Reynolds middle school teacher
- Andrea Henderson, Executive Director, Oregon Community College Association
- Marcie Ingledue, Executive Director of Arc of Oregon
- Mark Jackson, President, REAP Inc. Reaching and Empowering All People
- Dan Jamison, The Chalkboard Project
- Phil Lesch, Executive Director, Portland State University-AAUP
- Jeff Matsumoto, 3rd grade teacher, Oregon Education Association
- Judy Miller, Executive Director of the Oregon Head Start Association
- Betty Reynolds, West Linn Wilsonville School Board, Oregon School Boards Association
- David Robinson, Executive Vice Provost, OHSU
- Daniel Silberman, Co-Chair of Superintendent of Public Instruction's Youth Advisory Team
- Tricia Smith, Government Relations Specialist for Oregon School Employees Association
- Carol Wire, Oregon PTA Executive Director
- Steven Wojcikiewicz, Executive Council Vice President for American Federation of Teachers

Oregon Education Investment Board members attending:

- David Rives
- Mary Spilde
- Hanna Vaandering
- Cam Preus-Braley (ex officio)

Staff participating: Tim Nesbitt, Ben Cannon, Todd Jones, Margie Lowe

K-12 ACHIEVEMENT COMPACT PRESENTATION

Eduardo Angulo: One question for clarification is the issue of trajectory and closing the achievement gap. How do we express that to the affected communities, that we are not getting away from achieving our quest of closing the gap between our well-off students, the middle of the pack, our English language learners, Asian, Black, Latino, Native American and of course our children of poverty. This is embedded in No Child Left Behind and something that we all in the communities of color are looking for. Are we making progress? There's a feeling we are throwing away NCLB but we are forgetting that ESEA is a civil rights bill created to give opportunity to those kids in those neighborhoods that nobody paid attention to. This is an extension of Brown vs. the Board of Education. When you hear "let's throw NCLB away," we don't want to throw away civil rights.

Steven Wojcikiewicz: Disaggregation. It's going to be reported because of federal mandate, but how much is that going to be part of the compact?

Ben Cannon: We will continue to report the disaggregated data, for every subgroup, their scores at every testing level and graduation. The question is whether and how districts are required to set targets for those populations. Whether an aggregation of underserved populations, and goal-setting for those populations is acceptable. And then what will those targets be? How will they be determined to be sufficient or insufficient? What if they set goals for no narrowing of achievement gap? That would not be acceptable: We do expect improvement.

Steven Wojcikiewicz: I think the information should be disaggregated – to direct investment. The concerns or steps you might take to address a gap for English language learners might be different from some other groups. Even if the compacts are very high level, you might break them out.

Judy Miller: My big concern would be about the underserved populations, at-risk children, pregnant and parenting teens, more – the whole array for whom special services are needed to bring them up to standard. Will this lead to selecting those students who are more ready to achieve, and the rest would just fall off because they are more expensive to serve? I also hope there is a way to address the very rural areas of the state. Sometimes we adopt systems that work in urban areas, or where there are more schools and possibly more community resources available and options that urban schools have. I would want to have those things looked at carefully as you implement and look at resources. I hope this doesn't place a burden on schools so they take time away from students in the classroom to follow this reporting.

Dan Jamison: Logistics. We have an assumption that our districts will enter into a conversation in April but the data from the Oregon Department of Education comes in late summer and early fall. That data informs the work of school improvement and site teams. There's a disconnect in the cycle. It would be better for achievement compacts to be produced in the fall, right after data becomes available, but before districts start their budgeting processes.

Inge Aldesebaes: If students are hungry or unhealthy, they are not ready to learn. That needs to be part of the diagnosis. Students do better in school when they are emotionally and physically healthy. They are in the classroom and attending, doing better on tests, etc. The Healthy Kids Learn Better coalition has done research and is proposing health indicators based in evidence. [*See handout provided at meeting.*] I would like to propose absenteeism, a health indicator, as a core component of our compacts. We propose we use it as an indicator not only in 9th grade, but in 3rd and 5th. We need to take a whole child approach. Also you did ask about language. Perhaps change "quality" to include progress.

Carol Wire: The compact includes common measurements of a traditional education system, not a careful analysis of what's causing our kids to succeed or fail: hunger, racism or, for us, parent involvement. Nor does it reflect a visionary approach to what the 21st century will require of our kids. Looks like the status quo, not revolutionary.

Mark Jackson: Problem solving and critical thinking are important skills. Applying learning in community, global, civic leadership. We need to think beyond math and reading and include partnerships outside the field.

Ben Cannon: The K-12 compact hangs on completion – high school graduation. The Oregon Diploma will include technology, community engagement, personal management and teamwork skills, critical thinking. . . those are not yet assessed, but begin to address some of those concerns.

Marcie Ingledue: We have some students who are going to be looking at a modified diploma, an extended diploma, a certificate. By investing in those students, as they start in early intervention and work their way through, they will be ready to meet the employment first policy (for those with developmental disabilities), looking at post-secondary (even for those with developmental and intellectual disabilities). Those students have not been part of the discussion of 40/40/20. I appreciate the compacts' emphasis on outcomes.

Craig Hawkins: One of the hopeful things about compacts is that they are evolving. In time we will determine whether we're measuring the right things. I was just looking at attendance information – with superintendents and nationally – the key points in time for attendance seem to be in Kindergarten, sixth grade and ninth grade. Those are places transition points for kids,

and that can be a challenge for attendance. That might be place to focus. As for completion, I'm not sure if we have the right definition on the K-12 compact now. This definition should speak to how well students are doing in reaching the ultimate K-12 outcome. Under "connection" perhaps that should include not only post-secondary enrollment but also kindergarten preparedness: How well are students prepared upon entry AND exit in k-12?

Tricia Smith: I agree with Craig on the entry connection. Also, I think it is important to disaggregate in the compact. Those groups achieve differently and if you don't keep those data in front of the decision makers, that indicates it is of secondary importance. They are the groups that will help us meet 40/40/20, if we ever do. We need to focus on the kids who don't have the supports – not the well-to-do with mom and dad sitting at the table working with them. We need to drill down and look deeper than the federal categories for subgroups. Also, I think "pilot" indicates it's something someone just made up and we're going to see if it works. Compacts need different language here. Let's move districts to the Quality Education Model, the research-based practices to meet the goals – the things the school should provide students to meet the goals of the state. Which are the things the district is going to put in the schools to move them toward those goals. We have at our disposal those best practices. Let's not call it "pilot" but push it to model best practices.

Dena Hellums: Especially in the first year of implementation, let's focus on a few key measures. When you look at districts across the nation that have closed the gap – Dr. Golden has shared this research – they keep measures "few and focused." The flexibility for local school districts – whether we call it pilot – is useful to us, to see what is meaningful information, and what is not. It would be nice to have something in compacts that states how students fare on kindergarten readiness assessments, to see what students' trajectories are. In the achievement compact measures proposed, there's a big gap between 3rd and 9th grade. There are critical indicators in the middle grade years – it's where the wheels come off for a number of kids. There are research-based indicators to say who's moving along well, and who is at risk of dropping out.

Keep the disaggregated data, which is one of the strengths of NCLB. The weakness is the universal goals to be achieved by every group under a universal timeline with no flexibility. In additional to the state school fund we should identify local resources – PTA, foundations, local levies, more. My kids' elementary school has $100,000 PTA budget – the middle school where I teach, twice the size, works hard to raise $4,000. It makes a difference to student achievement. I like Craig Hawkins' mention on Monday of the need for a funding trajectory. Key community factors – health, employment rates, crime and incarceration rates, homelessness and housing security -- maybe they don't belong on the achievement compact, but on the state report card? They should inform each other as pieces of a broader accountability system. I appreciate the ability to adjust goals, especially this first year. Should it be a one-year goal or 4-year goal?

When I am scaffolding for where I want my students to be at the beginning of 7th grade and where we want them to be when they head off to high school – we need to think beyond one year about the resources we need to get to the point we want to reach.

Craig Hawkins: 7 Keys of College Readiness – Robb Hess, Albany schools superintendent, looked at high performing districts and the measures they used. Some of the measures on the draft compact are there. Some might be added in that 3rd to 9th grade gap. One might be 7th grade writing proficiency, 8th grade algebra (with a B grade or higher), 5th grade math (exceeds). *[The 7 Keys were added to advisory committee notes for March 5.]*

Betty Reynolds: Overall the OSBA would prefer a simple system of measures to allow maximum flexibility, and which recognize the great differences among districts – geographic, demographic – across the state, as well as local control. This current draft allows 3 local measures. Some districts might want more than that. It will be difficult to set a 4-year goal – they don't have data, and because of the rapidity of the implementation, they wouldn't have time to do the community involvement they'd like to around goal-setting. Accountability: We would like stable and adequate funding. In some ways budgets will eventually be linked to performance. We hope that is a collaborative process. The "other funding" category might need more discussion. Property taxes might be worthwhile. What about federal funding? Capital bonds? We might be looking at apples and oranges. It might add up to more than QEM. It might serve as a disincentive to local electorates to pass levies.

Andrea Henderson: I met with council of instructional administrators of community colleges. They wondered if there could be a more explicit measure of dual-enrollment. Perhaps making the connection more explicit – it's transfer courses (toward 4-year college) and also professional/technical courses. Perhaps the K-12 compact's measure could mirror our community college compact with a dual enrollment measure.

POST SECONDARY ACHIEVEMENT COMPACT PRESENTATION

Tricia Smith: We need to have some measure of access, perhaps related to availability of slots, or the relationship between costs and affordability. How many students apply to the school and can't get in? It seems like that would relevant if we're trying to get to 40/40/20. Why do K-12 compacts ask for four-year goals and post-secondary compacts do not?

Phil Lesch: I spent a lot of time talking about quality on Monday night and ended up wondering how we can have an output measure that is meaningful around employer satisfaction. Also, the

four- and six-year graduation rates are a meaningful qualitative outcome measure and are relevant to this conversation.

Dan Jamison: In many measures we're looking at raw numbers, which may be a function of population growth. As a parent or student paying for education, I'd like to see percentages.

Margie Lowe: The statute calls for number and percentage.

Jonathan Farmer: I question whether proposed "quality" outcomes are true measures of the effectiveness of programs in getting students through the system. "Quality" should measure the use of education beyond school.

Andrea Henderson: The targets for next year – I hope they are seen as best guesses for this first year. We won't even have this year's data complete. I hope not too much weight is put on those targets as we start on this. We need definitions, particularly around outcomes. Are these measurements outcomes themselves? Is there a broader outcome of what we're trying to accomplish here that could be clarified?

Phil Lesch: Completion rates are not the whole conversation. Faculty realize how much remedial work is needed before students can start into the queue to graduate. We need some sort of measure talking about incoming students who require remediation. (A sort of "college readiness" measure.) Every student comes in with a different level of need – some across the board, some in single subjects.

Mark Jackson: I'm curious to see what's possible on retention rates at the college level. How are universities being more transparent about the social climate along the way? We're jumping from A-Z so quickly, what about measurements along the way? There are challenges that students who traditionally don't make it to college face when they get on campus. We need to look at that data to see what support our colleges provide to students to make sure they are successful. I speak from personal experience.

Steven Wojcikiewicz: There are good reasons for the input/output distinction. But it can obscure some of the things that happen in the "gap" between the two – are there numbers for participation of students in particular kinds of support programs. That might be a good goal. The input/output conversation somewhat obscures the role of faculty and staff. If you want a quality organization, a happy satisfied workforce is part of that. There may be some way to represent that in there. The first thing that comes to mind might be a satisfaction survey. I hear the quality conversation is being reconsidered? I'd like to piggy-back on that. There is some overlap with the accreditation process – which includes judgment by our peers and others in

the field. We should look again at what we call "quality" – There are many measures of quality. Perhaps we can call these post-graduation measures or next-level outcomes.

Dena Hellums: It doesn't disaggregate data into specific student groups. It could give an incomplete, skewed picture. Where can it be broken down into components? Tuition equity impacts on our 7th graders. The value of a high school diploma diminishes if they believe they won't have opportunities to continue into higher education.

Margie Lowe: There's a question of how much do compacts need to share in common, how much distinction among education sectors. Disaggregated data might be something held in common across the P-20 spectrum.

Lindsey Capps: Some integration across P-20 achievement compacts is important. Also, the commitment to equity is critical. What are the access points for disadvantaged populations to opportunities for high quality programs, curriculum? We can't just look at completion. This gets back to inputs, and shared responsibility. Looking at equity could drive some critical conversation to look at remediation rates, completion rates, actual skills students need to enter the work world.

Jonathan Farmer: What does "connections" mean? To what?

Margie Lowe: It's the connection to their experience before post-secondary, and then once they graduate. From high school college to work force.

Jonathan Farmer: The OIT compact measures connections, incoming freshmen with dual credit, for example. Everyone took their own spin on those. Western Oregon University has information on first generation students. There should be more emphasis placed on connections, and perhaps we should take some of the proposals from the individual institutions like OIT around connections and take them statewide. The general idea of making sure we are assessing the ability of high schools to feed into universities. I like the first to second year retention rate measure in the UO compact – of first-time, fulltime students. It's important to keep the students there, keep them involved, keep retention going.

Ed Dodson: Achievement compacts are a great opportunity for change in education. We need to find a deliberate balance in the number of measures we include and the language we use to describe them – If the measures are too few, or the language too vague, we're tinkering.

Mark Jackson: I don't see the word "equity" anywhere in the compacts. We need to be bold and recognize the circus in the room (Not just one elephant). "Districts ensuring success across buildings and beyond". . .We're talking about high performing schools trying to serve low

performing students. We need to look at resources – How are we distributing dollars, how are we ensuring the transparency of schools and districts. Let's be bold about the language. Let's not be vague. Let's say "equity."

Jeff Matsumoto: We need to go deeper with disaggregation – perhaps break out Pacific Islanders and take an intentional look at this population. In terms of time, we need to take the time to get it right, allow classroom teachers to participate, without taking time from their students and while respecting the fact they already commit many hours outside the classroom. Teachers are tired of building the plane while flying it. Take the time to get it right. The success in meeting the compacts is dependent on mutual agreement with local teachers associations, rather than just giving their "input" – as Chalkboard's work with local teachers associations has shown.

RULES DISCUSSION

Judy Miller: (Regarding Item 4 of the implementation document.) Does the term "pilot" imply test measures?

Tim Nesbitt: Should the OEIB provide a menu of proven, research-based optional measures for districts and colleges to consider, or just let districts develop home-grown ideas?

Inge Aldesebaes: Why not simplify and call it "local measures"?

Betty Reynolds: I think OSBA would concur with that. This is going to be an iterative process, we'd like to see OEIB engage with local districts.

Tricia Smith: Perhaps direct districts back to components of the QEM – whether these measures fit with that body of knowledge.

Andrea Henderson: For community colleges, this is where we express the local mission of our community colleges, which is slightly different from K-12.

Craig Hawkins: I would suggest we provide little or no direction, use it as our learning laboratory. Let local districts learn from each other, try things out, take some chances. I'd hate to see that restricted.

Todd Jones: What if OEIB provide a menu?

Craig Hawkins: If the menu was a list of options okay. If it were a restriction, and you could only pick from that list, no.

Dena Hellums: We all know examples of some doing better. Two neighboring districts, similar demographics, low income students of color might have a 50 percent difference in their chances of graduation from one district's large high school to the next. Optional measures are an opportunity to share best practices and discover where equity is being addressed.

Judy Miller: Agree.

Eduardo Angulo: We have pockets of success. We've been trying to share best practices. Beaverton has a 57% graduation rate with English language learners. Reynolds: 25%. We've been sharing that information, but they don't want to learn – nothing has changed. Communities of color have no control in "local control." It's the establishment, the wealthy, the well-connected. . . There's an inherent inequality built into the system already. Let's get to the starting line at the same time. We're not there.

Steven Wojcikiewicz: I like pointing districts toward evidence based, research-based efforts. Historically school reform has one lesson to them: There is a lot of good research out there that doesn't always get into political realm. For example, positive youth development. Pointing districts toward the collective knowledge that is out there would be helpful.

Tim Nesbitt: Another question – How much guidance should the OEIB provide regarding "progress needed" to hit 40-40-20?

Judy Miller: With regard to districts having to arrive at aggregate subgroup targets by building toward that target subgroup by subgroup, how do you ensure that the data is aligned and includes the single cohort of students? Instruction will need to be provided on pulling data sets together.

Eduardo Angulo: The Massachusetts ESEA waiver is a model. To be a "Level 1" district, school districts need to get all of their schools to be at Level 1. We have one of the largest achievement gaps in the nation. That is a goal we should strive for, getting all schools to Level 1. We don't have what it takes to be there – pulling the kids who are down there up. That is our biggest challenge. *[Eduardo later passed out a handout summarizing states' ESEA flexibility waivers.]*

Betty Reynolds: Could the guidance be discretionary rather than mandatory? Allow some flexibility among districts.

Craig Hawkins: We need to look at all disadvantaged populations individually, and I think our schools and districts would do that anyway, whether we require it or not. It's the piece of NCLB we can't let go. It's really important we keep going there. The next thing is to measure progress.

Steven Wojcikiewicz: Process. If the 40/40/20 is the final goal, there's a danger the process can fixate on the immediate measure as the goal – not the ultimate goal. Maybe this is an issue of communication and buy-in and time. Chalkboard Project is a good model for communication and achieving buy-in. I think when people hear about this they're going to be thinking of a compliance model rather than an investment model. We need to keep the 40/40/20 goal in our sights.

Andrea Henderson: Be flexible the first year, then the second year we can learn from our experiences as we set targets for the next year.

OEIB MEMBER COMMENTS

Hanna Vaandering : Thank you. Your input is very helpful. It's important to hear from all of you your hopes and dreams as we work through this process.

David Rives: Thank you for taking the time. I think we're seeing some of the problems – or tensions -- with the tight/loose. I don't want a top-down model either, but I know it's a little vague. We can work through this. Equity: we have to make sure the administrators aren't just getting the easy numbers, looking at next year's graduation rate but not the long-term goal. We need to focus on our disadvantaged populations. I'd like to go in loose, finding out the problem areas, and we can keep looking at this and improving the model. This isn't a silver bullet. It's going to require people in this room who have expertise in education to keep on going and keep the pressure on in the right areas so this doesn't become just a numbers system.

These notes prepared by Sarah Carlin Ames and reviewed by Todd Jones, Whitney Grubbs and Margie Lowe.