



Network for Quality Teaching and Learning Advisory Group

December 3, 2015

3:00pm – 5:00pm

Chief Education Office

Somerville Large Conference Room

775 Court Street NE

Salem, OR

Call-In Information:

Dial: (888) 557 8511

Code: 5579138#

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Introductions and Review of Agenda

Hilda Rosselli, Chief Education Office

2. Review of Resource Packet

Johnna Timmes, Oregon Department of Education

3. Advisory Group roles and responsibilities

Hilda Rosselli, College & Career Readiness Director, Chief Education Office

4. 2015-16 Meeting Schedule

Johnna Timmes, Oregon Department of Education

5. Reflection on “The Network for Quality Teaching & Learning Scaled Up”

6. Group Discussions

- **Discussion #1: Improved alignment of efforts across the state**

In what ways can we align the Network with Regional Achievement Collaboratives, STEM Hubs and Early Learning Hubs?

- **Discussion #2: Alternatives to Competitive Grant Funding Models**

- *In what ways could the Network better leverage the interest, capacity and expertise of individual districts and ESDs to extend supports statewide for educators including mentoring supports? What other funds could be leveraged to help districts sustain efforts?*
- *Could a different funding model be identified that funds Network activities for schools, districts, or ESDs based on student or educator FTE?*

All meetings of the Chief Education Office 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. 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.

○ **Discussion #3: Replicating and scaling promising practices**

In what ways can research and evaluation become a more fully developed arm of the Network in order to analyze contribution of practices to improved student outcomes and to disseminate results by recommending particular activities and practices based on their impact?

7. Next Steps

8. Public Comment

*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.*

9. Adjourn

The Oregon Network for Quality Teaching and Learning: Reflections and Next Steps

Created in 2013 by the Oregon Legislature, the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning acts as a statewide umbrella of support for teachers, funding key educator development initiatives that help:

- Support new teachers and administrators through **mentoring**.
- Provide educators with **professional learning opportunities**.
- Improve **recruitment, preparation, and induction practices**
- Build a more **diverse educator workforce** that mirrors Oregon's student demographics
- Form a shared **virtual collaboration space** where educators can work together to access, create and pool their resources that improve practice.
- **Scale up effective practices** and removing barriers to implementation.
- Use data on **educator working conditions** to determine where resources and supports are needed

A Reflection on the 2013-15 Process

Investment and Infrastructure

Significant investments were made by the Legislature in 2013 to create and fund the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning to achieve the aforementioned initiatives. Yet the funding supported mostly discrete projects and **did not fully leverage collaborative synergy needed to scale up promising practices and create a sustainable system**.

Although \$45 M was appropriated for investments identified in HB 3233, there was **not a separate operational fund to support the infrastructure of the Network** for Quality Teaching and Learning.

With only \$125 K the "first stage" of an Oregon Educator Network was launched, resulting in an online tool for educators to locate resources specific to their needs, as well as to link with other educators or groups. The **site cannot be used to host resources**, which many educators have requested. **With additional funding, the OEN could also be enhanced to connect educators with professional development** including online access to PD via the Oregon Online Learning Academy.

Grant-making Process

Districts have expressed **concerns regarding grant mechanisms** for funding that puts them in competition with their peers for resources.

We know that **smaller districts do not have the bandwidth to write for multiple grants**, which creates inequities in opportunities for support across the state. Even providing additional funds to the ESDs to help with this did not ameliorate the problem.

Each grant is managed by a variety of education specialists or by a contracted partner and there is **limited connection/synergy across projects**. We miss the opportunity to purposefully leverage overlap across initiatives and districts engage with multiple grant personnel if there are recipients on more than one grant.

The two-year duration for funds based on allocations from the Legislature results in **limited grant periods during which grantees scramble to try and launch then implement in order to show findings in hopes of gaining additional funding**.

Based on legislation and lobbying efforts, the **priorities for funding change** from biennium to biennium but the grants are not designated as seed funding with absolute expectations for sustainability so projects come and go.

Results

Data are collected for each project to meet legislative reporting timelines but we have lacked **capacity to plan for research across the efforts to identify promising practices, or to examine contribution of each investment to improved teacher quality**.

One of the original intents of the Network was to encourage cultural changes in schools that elevate the teaching profession, increase collaboration among teachers, and provided opportunities for teachers to engage in solving problems of practice.

Example: The state invested significant funds to support teachers' PD around Common Core and Educator Effectiveness that was also intended to increase the involvement of teachers in defining and facilitating collaborative professional development. **We have yet to be able to document changes in how new models of professional development have evolved at the local level.**

Insufficient funds to meet the needs and unpredictable funding priorities

Although the evidence is clear on the theory of action that invests in support for educators who in turn improve student outcomes and contribute to the state's goals, there are **more needs for educator support than current levels of funding can support**.

Example: Mentoring funds continue to be insufficient to provide all new teachers with a mentor. For the 2015-16 year, ODE was only able to fund 7 of 21 proposals (39

/92 districts) which will serve 1272 teachers (1274/2179 or 58% of those for whom funds were requested this year). The 1274 teachers who will receive state funded mentors this year represents only 122 more teachers than were mentored in 2014-15. This year the funds will support 70 out of 141 (50%) of the administrators for whom funds were sought. (2015-16 data on new hires is still not available.)

What's Ahead?

Once again the Legislature has invested significant funds to support educators for the 2015-17 biennium (\$31.7 M). Already, the grant process and contracts are in cycle again. Yet the state still lacks a connected network that maximizes teacher engagement and diminishes the impact of isolated investments.

Per SB 216, the Chief Education Office is charged with providing strategic direction to the Network by “Conducting and coordinating research to determine best practices and evidence-based models.”

2015-17 Strategic Investments for the Network (HB 5016)

- Mentoring (\$10 M)
- District Collaboration Grants (\$16 M) to Chalkboard
- Leadership Development (\$2 M) to Chalkboard
- Innovative models of Teacher Prep (\$1.5M) to Chalkboard
- Assessment Literacy PD (\$2 M)
- Civics PD (\$200 K)

Network Advisory Discussions

The Network Advisory’s insights are being sought to pose solutions around three main issues outlined below.

1. Improved alignment of efforts across the state

Districts do not limit their efforts to support educators to those initiatives funded by the Network. ESDs and larger school districts, professional associations, and many other providers contribute to the overall agenda of educator effectiveness. Each of the STEM Hubs, ELC Hubs, and Regional Achievement Collaboratives has implied roles for educators to support outcomes for students. If the Network were better aligned with the Hubs and RACs, it could provide regions the opportunity to identify their top priorities and purposely structure existing efforts with educators in mind, including professional development, curriculum resources, etc.

In what ways can we better connect the Network with educator needs identified within the Regional Achievement Collaboratives, STEM Hubs, and Early Learning Hubs?

Pros
Could provide a more seamless set of services and supports for educators across the PK- 12 system.
Educators involved in the RACs and Hubs could use the Oregon Educator Network to connect each other to resources and to support increased collaboration.
The TELL Survey could be a useful tool for the Hubs and RACs as well as to track impact on educators' perceptions of teaching and learning conditions.
Cons
A few of the RACS or Hubs may not have prioritized work clearly linked to the purpose of the Network.
Many personnel in the Hubs and RACs currently have limited knowledge about the purpose and intent of the Network.

2. Alternatives to Competitive Grant Funding Models
The current cycle and amount of funding and the competitive grant process 1) limits Oregon's ability to support all educators, 2) results in short-term efforts, and 3) requires use of valuable district resources to develop proposals and manage grants with a short duration. Furthermore, many districts and ESDs are already engaged in local work to support educators but feel disconnected to the efforts of the Network. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In what ways could the Network better leverage the interest, capacity and expertise of individual districts and ESDs to extend supports statewide for educators such as mentoring? What other funds could be leveraged to help districts sustain these efforts?</i> <i>Could a different funding model be identified that funds Network activities for schools, districts, or ESDs based on student or educator FTE?</i>
Pros
If funding were more adaptive to local needs, for example if a district had no new teachers hired this year and had no need for mentor dollars, they could adjust their use of funds to match their prioritized needs in other areas of educator support).
If ESDs could coordinate regional needs, small and rural school districts could be better served.
State agencies and the Network Advisory could employ best practice frameworks that define what works and thus help districts use their pools of funding to enact strong practices with fidelity.
Title II dollars and other appropriate funding sources could be added to the pool of funds; thus, increasing synergy around local priorities tied to the Network.
Cons
Funding would need to be increased to have significant impact. For example, if schools were allocated \$50 per student annually to support educator effectiveness,

the budget would need to be almost twice as much (\$56 M), a significant increase from current funding.

3. Replicating and scaling promising practices

One of the original intents of the Network for Quality Teaching and Learning was to help identify and scale up effective educator practices statewide and improve student outcomes by strengthening instruction. To do so, there must be an enhanced mechanism that systematically “mines” what works related to support for educators both from Network funded activities and other related efforts across the state.

In what ways can research and evaluation become a more fully developed arm of the Network in order to analyze contribution of practices to improved student outcomes and to disseminate results by recommending particular activities and practices based on their impact?

Pros

Expanding the network of research partners to include colleges and universities as well as non-profit organizations could help attract additional external funding that complements efforts to scale effective practices.

Research could also explore and test alternative approaches to Professional Development, teacher leadership roles and recruitment, preparation, induction, career advancement opportunities for educators and efforts to ensure that every student has access to excellent teachers and eliminating disparities among students and communities (Federal Plan)

Partnering with educator preparation programs would inform the content of educator preparation and create a more seamless system for the transition of novice educators into the profession.

Cons

The type of research needed to “mine” effective practices will require more sophisticated analysis (e.g. regression analysis, hierarchical linear modeling, and meta-analyses. This will require dedicated funds and may involve additional data collection from recipients of Investment funds.

Summary

Thinking innovatively about the collective impact of Network investments is essential as we move forward. Regardless of what innovation or revised structure is proposed, changes are needed and the changes should be selected with the assurance that any new design enhances Oregon’s ability to elevate the profession and truly develop teacher leadership by:

- Enhancing a culture of leadership and collaborative responsibility for advancing the profession of teaching among providers of early learning services, teachers and administrators in kindergarten through grade 12, education service districts and teacher education institutions
- Attracting capable and promising new teachers by offering mentoring as well as short-term and long-term professional development and leadership opportunities.
- Retaining effective teachers by providing enhanced career opportunities.
- Strengthen and enhance existing evidence-based practices that improve student achievement and
- Promoting collaboration by developing and supporting opportunities for teachers in schools and districts statewide to learn from each other.
- Rewarding professional growth and effective teaching by providing pathways for career opportunities that come with increased leadership responsibilities and involve increased compensation.
- Improving student achievement by strengthening instruction.