Report to the Oregon Education Investment Board on
Achievement Compact Advisory Committee Meetings

March 13, 2012

At its February 7, 2012 meeting the Oregon Education Investment Board appointed two subcommittees to recommend outcome measures for achievement compacts, one for K-12 public school districts and education service districts, the other for community colleges and universities. An advisory committee of representatives of affected organizations was formed to provide feedback on the proposed outcome measures to the board and the two subcommittees. The purpose of this report is to summarize key themes that emerged from the advisory committee's two two-hour meetings, one on March 5 and one on March 8.

Following this summary are full sets of notes from the two meetings, additional communications received from committee members, and the advisory committee roster.

Themes in Advisory Committee Feedback – K-12/ESD Compacts

A number in parenthesis following a theme indicates how often this topic came up in conversation, not how many committee members mentioned the topic.

Disaggregation – Some members recommended that compacts include disaggregated data for all subgroups, not a single data point for all "under-served" populations combined. Some added this is a way to keep focus on the achievement gap and to keep the state focused on equity. (12) *Note: This conversation carried across to the conversation about post-secondary compacts.*

Broader Indicators – Some members said that proposed measures are too limited and that broader indicators are needed to speak to "21st century skills" like critical thinking and a "whole child" view that might include health indicators. (9)

An Evolving Document – Some members spoke in support of keeping compacts short and simple for now, recognizing that compacts will evolve over time. (6) *Note: This conversation carried across to the conversation about post-secondary compacts.*

"Pilot" Measures? – Some members recommended that compacts drop reference to "pilot" measures, which suggests something being tested, and instead invite "optional local outcomes." (4)

Quality v Progression – Some members questioned whether proposed outcome measures listed under "quality" really are measures of quality, and suggested that "progression" might be a

better term for that collection of measures than quality. (4) *Note: This conversation carried across to the conversation about post-secondary compacts.*

Dual Enrollment – Some members suggested that dual enrollment should be measured in K-12 compacts as it is proposed in the community college compact. (3)

Outcomes v Inputs – Some members suggested that, in order to get a true sense of what factors impact student achievement, compacts need to measure inputs, what goes into the education system, not just outcomes, what comes out of the education system. It was suggested, too, that some of these inputs are qualitative and difficult to quantify, but no less important. (3)

Other Funding – Some members suggested that the "other funding" row at the bottom of the compact may need to be detailed to provide deeper understanding of what goes into it. (3)

"Middle" Measures – Some members suggested that there is a "gap" between grades 3 and 9, and that the board might consider other measures for middle school years based on "Seven Keys to College Readiness." See Appendix B. (2)

Six College Credits Too Low – Some members said that an outcome measure of high school students earning six-plus college credits is too low to serve as an indicator of college readiness. (2)

Attendance – Some members recommended attendance as a key outcome measure, particularly in kindergarten and grades six and nine, key transition points. (2)

Definition of "Connections" – Some members suggested that compacts should measure not only post-secondary enrollment but also kindergarten readiness. (2)

Short v Long-Term Targets – Some members suggested that it is difficult to set targets four years out given "the uncertain world we live in," and that targets should be set just one year out. (2)

Trajectories – Some members suggested that compacts need not only information indicating trajectories entities will need to follow with outcome targets to reach 40/40/20, but also funding trajectories that will prove necessary to achieve 40/40/20. (2)

Themes in Advisory Committee Feedback – Post-Secondary Compacts

A number in parenthesis following a theme indicates how often this topic came up in conversation, not how many committee members mentioned the topic.

What is "Quality"? – Some members commented that "quality" is important but difficult to quantify, and questioned whether draft compacts have the right "quality" measures. (4)

Employer Satisfaction – Some members questioned how "employer satisfaction" can be accurately measured. Some suggested it belongs under the "connections" category rather than the "quality" category. Others questioned whether it belonged on compacts, saying that colleges are not jobs factories. (3)

Other Measures Needed – Members suggested the need for measures relating to incoming students requiring remediation, retention rates, social climate, and workforce satisfaction. (3)

Percentages v Raw Numbers – Some members suggested that percentages will provide more meaningful information than raw numbers. (2)

Themes in Achievement Compact Implementation

Toward the end of the advisory committee meetings, members were asked to respond to specific questions relating to policies for implementing achievement compacts.

Q: How prescriptive do you want the OEIB to be with methodology for developing targets and/or target trajectories?

Consistent response was that entities want maximum flexibility. Members referred to staying true to "tight-loose," with the State describing the "what" and leaving the "how" to local entities.

Q: Should the OEIB provide a menu of proven, research-based optional measures for entities to consider, or just led entities develop home-grown ideas?

Consistent response was that entities want the flexibility to select local measures, and that a menu of optional measures is welcome, but entities do not want to be restricted to that menu.

Q: How much guidance should the OEIB provide regarding "progress needed" to hit 40/40/20?

Feedback suggested that guidance may be helpful in setting targets for subgroups, and that such guidance on trajectory ought to be discretionary and not mandatory.