



JOHN KITZHABER
Governor of Oregon
OEIB Chair

MARK MULVIHILL
Chair Designee

JULIA BRIM-
EDWARDS

YVONNE CURTIS

MATTHEW DONEGAN

SAMUEL HENRY

NICHOLE JUNE
MAHER

DAVID RIVES

RON SAXTON

MARY SPILDE
Chair-Designee

KAY TORAN

JOHANNA
VAANDERING

DICK WHITNELL

Chief Education Officer
DR. NANCY GOLDEN

OREGON EDUCATION INVESTMENT BOARD

Outcomes and Investments Subcommittee

Members: Dick Withnell, Chair, Pam Curtis, Ron Saxton,
Hanna Vaandering, Duncan Wyse

Sept. 2, 2014

1:30pm – 5:00pm

506 SW Mill Street, Room 710
Meyer Memorial Boardroom
Portland, OR 97201

Call-In Number (888) 204-5984

Participant Code: 992939

AGENDA

- 1.0 Welcome & Review of Agenda**
Dick Withnell, Chair, Outcomes and Investments Subcommittee
- 2.0 Discussion and Evaluation of Proposed Investments**
- 3.0 Draft Final Recommendations**
- 4.0 Public Testimony**
*Members of the public wanting to give public testimony must sign in.
There will only be one speaker from each group.
Each individual speaker or group spokesman will have three (3) minutes.*

All meetings of the Oregon Education Investment Board and its subcommittees are open to the public and will conform to Oregon public meetings laws. The upcoming meeting schedule and materials from past meetings are posted [online](#). Staff respectfully requests that you submit 25 collated copies of written materials at the time of your testimony. Persons making presentations including the use of video, DVD, PowerPoint or overhead projection equipment are asked to contact board staff 24 hours prior to the meeting. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for accommodations for people with disabilities should be made to Seth Allen at 503-378-8213 or by email at Seth.Allen@state.or.us. Requests for accommodation should be made at least 48 hours in advance.

All meetings of the Oregon Education Investment Board and its subcommittees are open to the public and will conform to Oregon public meetings laws. The upcoming meeting schedule and materials from past meetings are posted [online](#). Staff respectfully requests that you submit 25 collated copies of written materials at the time of your testimony. Persons making presentations including the use of video, DVD, PowerPoint or overhead projection equipment are asked to contact board staff 24 hours prior to the meeting. A request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for accommodations for people with disabilities should be made to Seth Allen at 503-378-8213 or by email at Seth.Allen@state.or.us. Requests for accommodation should be made at least 48 hours in advance.

Version. 1: 08/26/14

Pathway to 3rd Grade Reading

All students meeting 3rd grade standards and loving to read

Ready for Kindergarten

All students ready to learn when they begin school

Return on Investments		Kindergarten Readiness	3rd Grade Reading
	2-year		88% for all students 80% for students of color
	4-year		95% for all students 95% for students of color

Essential Skills

Relevant curriculum and differentiated instruction that ensures students achieve high standards in reading, writing, math and problem solving.

Collective Impact

Communities coming together to mutually achieve student success.

Educator Effectiveness

Improving educators ability to serve all students especially those most affected by opportunity gaps.

Quality Learning Environments

Creating culturally responsive conditions that achieve high attendance and student engagement.

System Redesign

Changing existing structures and programs within and between agencies to remove barriers and opportunity gaps.

Scope

		Essential Skills	Collective Impact	Educator Effectiveness	Quality Learning Env	System Redesign
Birth to 3	66,000 children					✓
Quality Early Childcare	85,000 children			✓	✓	
Early Years to Kindergarten	250,000 children	✓	✓			
3rd Grade Reading	180,000 students	✓	✓	✓		
Dual Language Progress Monitoring	7500 students	✓				
Full Access to K-12 Mentoring	2900 educators			✓		
Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices	30,000 educators			✓	✓	
Support for Low Performing Schools/Districts	8,100 students	✓				✓
Expansion of School District Collaboration	200,000 students	✓		✓		

Pathway to Post-Secondary Completion

80% of student earning a degree or certificate

High School Completion

All students complete high school college and career ready

Return on Investments		High School Completion	Degree/Cert Completion
	2-year		
	4-year		

Essential Skills

Relevant curriculum and differentiated instruction that ensures students achieve high standards in reading, writing, math and problem solving.

Collective Impact

Communities coming together to mutually achieve student success.

Educator Effectiveness

Improving educators ability to serve all students especially those most affected by opportunity gaps.

Quality Learning Environments

Creating culturally responsive conditions that achieve high attendance and student engagement.

System Redesign

Changing existing structures and programs within and between agencies to remove barriers and opportunity gaps.

Scope

		Essential Skills	Collective Impact	Educator Effectiveness	Quality Learning Env	System Redesign
ELL Funding Formula Change		✓				✓
9th Grade On-Track					✓	
Higher Education Affordability					✓	✓
Higher Education Productivity				✓	✓	
Full Access to K-12 Mentoring	2900 educators			✓		
Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices	30,000 educators			✓	✓	
Support for Low Performing Schools/Districts	8,100 students	✓				✓
Expansion of School District Collaboration	200,000 students	✓		✓		
STEM Hubs			✓			
Dual Credit						
Blended Advising						
Math Instructional Technology 10-14						
Personal Achievement Record						

Pathway to Prosperous Oregon

?

40 / 40 / 20

?

Return on Investments		40/40/20	?
	2-year		
	4-year		

Essential Skills

Relevant curriculum and differentiated instruction that ensures students achieve high standards in reading, writing, math and problem solving.

Collective Impact

Communities coming together to mutually achieve student success.

Educator Effectiveness

Improving educators ability to serve all students especially those most affected by opportunity gaps.

Quality Learning Environments

Creating culturally responsive conditions that achieve high attendance and student engagement.

System Redesign

Changing existing structures and programs within and between agencies to remove barriers and opportunity gaps.

Scope

		Essential Skills	Collective Impact	Educator Effectiveness	Quality Learning Env	System Redesign
Youth and Community Investment				✓	✓	✓
Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices				✓	✓	
<i>High School Equivalency</i>		✓			✓	✓
<i>STEM Hubs</i>		✓	✓			
<i>Post-secondary Talent Development</i>				✓		✓
CTE Revitalization		✓			✓	
<i>Personal Achievement Record</i>					✓	✓

Testimony for OEIB Outcomes and Investments
Subcommittee

By Pat Muller- Oregon Save Our Schools, ELL Teacher
McMinnville School District zettybobo@mac.com

General Comments:

Will we take the time to make sure that what we are doing is the best for students by consulting with those working in the trenches? Or will we pat ourselves on the back and throw around words like leverage and investment without making any investments?

Merely moving around money and increasing accountability measures is not the answer. Many things in this plan merely shuffle around funds, at the expense of other essential programs. Charts have entries for number of “students impacted” but when you look at it from the classroom teacher’s perspective, the resources and help are not trickling down to the classroom level. Instead, bureaucracies grow larger and more expensive, further taking money away from the individual student.

There are some wonderful things happening in classrooms taught by dedicated teachers who have moved heaven and earth to remove the obstacles to success with limited resources. Let’s take some time to find those places and see if practices that have resulted in high achievement can be made sustainable. Every

time the focus changes, then the thing we are no longer focusing on drops back down.

Below are my comments on some parts of the initiatives. Before moving the entire package through, some parts need to be examined for unforeseen consequences and to see if they will indeed impact students and programs in a positive manner.

K-3 Reading Strategy

Full Day Kindergarten

Here we have another unfunded mandate. Unfunded mandates might have noble motivations that could help kids, but take away from other programs.

The measurement to document impact will result in over-testing of students.

EZCBM and DIBELS require constant testing resulting in loss of instructional time.

Projected K-3 Reading Outcomes

95% for students of color? Where has this been done consistently in Oregon?

Please provide a summary of districts that have experienced success in helping 90% of ELL students reach proficiency in reading. I've asked for this data

many times. Growth data that still leaves behind these populations is not sufficient.

School & District Turnaround

Let's get rid of this turnaround word. You will never attract your most qualified teachers to the most difficult schools when under threat of being fired when the school doesn't make it.

School or District Coach on site day/week

More coaches are not needed. Instead you need to provide people to directly help students in small groups.

Equity for ELLs

Contrary to a comment made in this committee's last session, the current funding formula does not provide a financial incentive for districts to keep ELL students in the program after they are ready to exit.

At a recent OEIB meeting, it was stated that districts are taking advantage of the current funding formula by failing to exit students as it is a financial incentive to keep them on the roster.

A close examination of the facts will show that this assumption is far-fetched.

Schools are rated yearly under the AMAO (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) directive from the state and national departments of education. The rating consists of three parts:

- AMAO 1: The percentage of ELL students going up one level on the ELPA test
- AMAO 2a: Percentage of ELL students scoring proficient on the ELPA test.
- AMAO 2b: Percentage of ELL students who have been in the ELL program for **five or**

more years scoring proficient on the ELPA test.

- AMAO 3: Percentage of ELL students proficient on the OAKS Language Arts and Math tests.

If a student is indeed ready to exit an ELL program then they should also be able to pass the OAKS reading and math. So let's compare the AMAOs 1 & 2, and then compare it to AMAO 3.

The chart below shows the low number of districts meeting the proficiency target on the OAKS math and language arts tests. This is a result of pressure to exit students out of the program before they are ready to meet these targets. These numbers include active students and those in the two-year transition period following exiting and further prove the premise. There are also not a high number of students who are passing the OAKS language arts who were not exited from ELL programs.

Please let me know where the districts are who are taking advantage of these monies and have students who are proficient and don't need services.

2013-14 AMAO Results from ODE Website
Number of Districts making AMAO

	AMA01 The percentage of ELL students going up one level on the ELPA test	AMA02a Percentage of ELL students scoring proficient on the ELPA test.	AMA02b Percentage of ELL students who have been in the ELL program for five or more years scoring proficient on the ELPA test.	AMA03 Percentage of ELL students who meet or exceed OAKS math and language arts
Met	16	137	51	2
Not met	101	83	35	74
Not rated	81	77	112	122

Require that spend 90% of the money meant for ELL students on those students.

Why not spend 100% of the money meant for ELL students on those students?

There needs to be a list of what constitutes an ELL expenditure. Would it include the teacher for a non-ELL student enrolled in a dual language program?

Districts receive \$250 whenever an Ever ELL student graduates.

Why not give this grant to the student directly in the form of tuition assistance for college classes? The amount of money offered is not enough to result in any changes in services. If additional money is to be offered, it should be given in time to help the student actually graduate.

Where's the teacher input in all this?

We are told that a group has researched this and the recommendations are based upon research. Who are these people and where is the research? Where are the schools that are a success in other places as a result of initiatives similar to those being proposed here?

If a concern is brought forward, there's no acknowledgment and the agenda is moved forward anyway. I listened to this during the recording of the last meeting when Ms. Vaandering brought up some concerns and the agenda was moved forward "as is" with no provision to investigate her concerns.

And since when is Stand for Children in charge of proposals regarding ELL students? Stand tends to blame teachers for student failure instead of acknowledging lack of resources and advocating for solutions to poverty and other factors, which can be obstacles to learning. **The use of ELL students as poster children to raise money for their organization is a crime.**

The CLASS project schools from the Chalkboard Project have failed to close the achievement gap and their creative presentation of data has yet to be closely examined by the OEIB and the Legislature.

The funding model would destroy secondary programs and services to special education students at that level.

Even though you may not have a lot of students still in the ELL program at the middle and high school level, the percentage of dual-identified (SPED/ELL) goes up drastically as most other students have already been exited. The danger here would be to siphon money off

from the elementary students who are generating money to fund the secondary programs whose students are no longer generating money. In many districts, ELL programs work collaboratively with SPED programs to provide needed support for students even though no money is provided to give that support. Many districts are committed to providing needed ELL support to the students with the greatest challenges. Punishing districts for providing that support is counter productive.

Dual-identified students who receive dual services should receive dual funding. This would help fund time for collaboration between all teachers serving the students and make up for the lack of ELL funding at the middle and high school level. The ELL program receives no additional money for dual identified students yet is required to provide services and is subject to accountability measures for service for these kids. The better job we do at the secondary of exiting kids at the secondary level, the higher the percentage of dual identified that remain and the worse we look on paper.

There is no transition plan for when you are no longer funding long-term ELL students, and these are the students that need the most intensive assistance in order to be successful.

It's a very good idea to provide money for students after they exit and during the monitoring period, but it must be done carefully and not to the detriment of other programs.

Staffing will not necessarily be increased to provide for this service. Caseloads and group sizes could increase as a result of required instruction.

Maximum caseload for teachers needs to be established. The schedule should have mandatory times for collaboration with special education teachers and for helping recently exited students being monitored.

Districts can receive the additional weight for 7 years for students initially identified at a Level 1 or 2 by the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA).

Red Flag! The ELPA is not used to identify students for services.