

Meeting Notes
Quality Education Commission
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol St NE Salem, OR 97310
Conference Room 251B
Wednesday, February 13, 2013
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Present

Doug Wells
Sarah Boly
Beth Gerot
Greg Hamann
Maryalice Russell
Judy Stiegler
Peter Tromba

Brian Reeder
Jenni Deaton
Dave Conley, EPIC
John Topogna, ECONorthwest

Absent

Colt Gill
Gail Rasmussen
Julie Smith

Welcome and Introductions:

New members Greg Hamann and Judy Stiegler introduced themselves and were warmly welcomed to the commission. Introducing new perspectives to the commission will allow for a more holistic educational view.

Member Updates and Information:

Peter: Recently participated in an Oregon Public Broadcasting interview re: K-12 longitudinal data systems and the importance of increased access to data. Peter mentioned the work of the commission; unfortunately the interview was reduced to one sentence in an article.

Judy: Attended process meetings with Redmond and Bend school boards, which allowed for a read on where the QEC should be going per school board discussions and perspectives.

Sarah: Recently attended three meetings that addressed Oregon's changing educational landscape. One was a reunion of LearnWorks and included a discussion on implementation gaps.

Greg: Currently involved in a number of state and national projects and workgroups: Regional achievement center and regional achievement compacts work with OSU and mid-Willamette valley school districts; COSA/CC workgroup to create stronger, clearer and more coherent education pathways between K-12 and community colleges; and two national

boards/committees- the AACC 21st Century Implementation Steering Committee and the AACC Presidents Academy, of which Greg is the chair-elect.

Brian: [HB 2866](#) expands quality goals to include a complete, well-rounded education for K-12 students. OEIB and ODE are jointly analyzing the bill to look at the funding gap.

Doug: Invite ODE and OEIB contacts to QEC meetings on a rotating basis for updates, dialogue/collaboration. Whitney Grubbs has been invited to attend the next meeting on March 20th.

Discussion:

John Topogna, ECONorthwest

Two major categories of thought:

- Evidence-based policy- Illustrates an understanding of what has been proven to work for students; rigorously evaluated interventions
- Innovation/redesign- Tension between the two categories; innovation/redesign is not as rigorously tested, but in order to make progress toward 40-40-20, we have to reach beyond the “evidenced-based” box. Accomplishing the goal will require innovative thinking. Set up systems to measure the impacts of the innovation/redesign along the way.

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy only has a handful of fully proven interventions.

Washington State Institution of Public Policy (WSIPP) eases up a bit on evidence requirements for an intervention to be deemed “proven.” A plethora of data and information worth following is available from WSIPP; how they look at effect size, connect it to cost, report to the legislature, and translate achievement and attainment into earnings.

Randomized control models are based on individual achievements, and do not factor in interaction.

- Counter-model: While randomized trials are useful, they do not account for the context and effects of educational interactions present in the classroom.

Greg: The role of context is very important; if the focus is only on individual achievement, we will need a wider array of individual information to draw any conclusions. We miss a lot if we only assess and analyze content knowledge.

The way we measure is a crucial part of the challenge (article by Dave Conley in recent Ed Week; [Rethinking the Notion of 'Noncognitive'](#))

Often miss the learner in our analyses; how can we focus on the individual student and their metacognitive skills?

- Be able to teach the students not only what to learn, but how to learn

Dave Conley, EPIC

If the OEIB makes decisions on investment, then the QEC should serve as the entity that informs how the decisions should be made.

It is an implicit, underlying assumption in OAKS scores that if you pass, you have what it takes to succeed.

Education needs to commit to going down the same road as other sectors and collect more data.

- Consider formative assessments as a medium for data collection (assessments do not need to be threatening or high stakes)

The purpose of education is not to get a diploma or go to college, but to be prepared and ready for next steps.

- We get off track from this purpose when the focus is on eligibility, or just fulfilling the requirements.

Continuum of Readiness:

Work-Ready:

- Impulse control
- Low-level expectation

Pathway-Ready:

- Prepared to go on to career
- Academics are involved
- Beyond entry-level

Job-Ready:

- Speaking/listening/compliance
- Can you be trained on the job?
- Following directions

Life-Ready:

- Includes all of the above
- Key skill: ability to adapt

Focus on behaviors; developing capabilities for learners.

Adaptability is a necessary skill in our economic environment.

4 Keys to College and Career Readiness (readiness is multi-faceted)

- Key cognitive strategies (think)
- Key content knowledge (know)
- Key learning skills and techniques (act)
- Key transition knowledge and skills (go)

Constellation of skills around ownership of learning

- Need to have a goal and persistence skills

The state is not honest about the fact that there is an implicit commitment to a selection model.

The more we move to a competency model, the more we favor students who are able to take control of their own learning (e.g. online)

Competency model: individual student must perform as directed and complete what's required.

- Different roadmap than when students reach a certain cut-score

Novice to Expert Continuum:

- Declarative Knowledge (what)
 - Procedural Knowledge (how)
-
- Crossover to Strategic Learning
- Conditional Knowledge (when)
 - Conceptual Understanding (why)

An expert learner requires more than just declarative and procedural knowledge. We want our classrooms to test all 4, especially middle and high school.

- If most of our education system teaches, tests and measures less than what is required beyond high school, we are not equipping our students fairly.

Add metacognitive skills to student report cards? It would provide information that students could respond to and grow from.

It is difficult to collaborate with folks whose knowledge stops at procedural.

Rethink the funding formula for the QEM; explore options beyond prototype school.

The more we focus on students, the sooner we'll obtain the information we want and need.

Brian: Class size research –incremental increases in class size over time lead to classrooms suddenly larger than expected and recommended.

How do we fix the class size problem if there are advantages and disadvantages to both larger and smaller classes? Would we try to categorize class size and put learners in the class size that works best for them?

- 5-6 measures could be established simply by looking at a range of classrooms to determine best ownership of learning. Look for patterns; what will it take for struggling students to take more ownership of their learning?

Politically and pedagogically different

Current weights in funding are not precise enough

- ESL: There can be a student with limited supports and no facility in English, and a student with grad school parents that still can't speak English. Based on language skills alone, it is incredibly difficult to determine needs.

It is very challenging to determine the right funding to best serve all students.

The weighting categories do not express what the learner needs.

Student performance in relationship to a goal

- Students should understand the need to have a goal in education; their success is a measure of their ability to pursue that goal.

Dignify choices and make sure all students have the foundational knowledge they need

- Often students don't know what they're supposed to do with the knowledge they acquire

Matched pairs: Gather information on student ownership of learning and their connection to goals?

Peter: Commission may not be equipped for in-depth research, but are in a suitable position for advocacy.

- Outside organizations advocate, but there is very limited advocacy from within the state.

Governor's budget has space for more robust policy and research.

There are measures and data points that could be addressed fairly simply to bolster assessments in OR.

More money to specific interventions could focus us closer on individual students (more intentional and pervasive)

Strategic transition points to involve parents?

Provide school principals with more information and data on their students.

Next Meeting Date:

Wednesday, March 20, 2013, **10 am-1 pm** – ODE 251A

- Note that the meeting will be three hours, from 10 am – 1 pm.
- Commissioners should come prepared with their top 2-3 focuses for QEC in this biennium. The meeting goal will be to find points of intersection and consensus in 2-3 areas.