Well Rounded Access Program (WRAP) Engagement Plan

The Well Rounded Access Program (WRAP) is the Oregon Department of Education's (ODE) approach to increase access to well-rounded courses through funding from the US Department of Education's Expanding Access to Well-Rounded Courses Demonstration Grant. This five-year, $9.8 million federal grant was awarded to ODE in October, 2020. ODE was awarded a planning year during the first year of the grant to create a Needs Assessment, gather community input, and develop the process for implementing this grant in the remaining four years of the grant period.

This engagement plan will guide ODE's process in community and education partner engagement to ensure an accurate and comprehensive Needs Assessment, a community-informed and driven four-year plan, and a strong evaluation/revision process. It is the intent of this process to reach out to those who have been omitted from past engagement and who will be most impacted by this program.

This plan is modeled after ODE's Student Investment Account Community Engagement Toolkit and outlines three prior steps to engagement: Reflect on Past ODE Engagement; Identify Engagement Partners; and Establish the Approach.

The questions answered in this plan reflect the point of engagement as of June 2021 at the beginning of the project and have been edited based on the versions listed below.

Version 1.0: Created June 2021 & Published August 25, 2021
Version 1.1: Added Partners August 26, 2021
Version 1.2: Added Partners September 1, 2021
Version 2.0: Added and Revised Partners, Updated Year 2 Goals, and added a Year 1
            Summary Section February 2022

Step 1: Reflect on Past ODE Engagement.

ODE has engaged with community and education partners for many projects over the years, including but not limited to the Smarter Balanced Assessments Rollout, High School Assessment, English Learner Essential Skills Policy, Science Standards Setting, Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey, At-a-Glance Report Card Changes, Every Student Succeeds Act, and the Student Success Act. Although many of these engagement efforts were not related to the WRAP work or well-rounded education directly, there is much that we have learned from these approaches that is referenced in the below questions.

What were the lessons learned?

- Developing a communication and engagement action plan up front helps to ensure a thoughtful, thorough approach to engaging partners from the outset and avoiding significant gaps in perspectives.
- Within an initial action plan, prioritize consulting with internal partners at the outset.
- Internal communications are essential to avoiding overburdening partners with multiple requests. Know who is reaching out to whom for what, especially if there is a designated point of contact.
- It's important for staff to be familiar with the meeting schedule and facilitators for ODE-facilitated groups (e.g., EL Advisory Group) and coordinate up front to work engagement needs into the group's existing meeting schedule.
- Investing in building and maintaining relationships and trust is essential! This makes valuable input and authentic engagement easier, as opposed to more of a cold call approach.
- Traditional recruitment methods are generally insufficient to garner diverse perspectives and representation when forming work groups, committees, etc.
- ODE has seen the most success when:
  - There's clear, two-way communication
  - You meet people where they are – including laying groundwork so everyone has the same baseline knowledge
  - There is space for discussion, wonderings, and probing questions
  - Engagement moves beyond a one-time approach and instead seeks to develop a model of engagement where both parties work together, have healthy tension, and trust and do things like co-construct agendas, goals, outcomes
  - Documentation is clear and available; and communication is timely/relevant

With Whom Have We Already Engaged?

ODE did not have any engagement sessions specific to the WRAP prior to receiving the 5-year Federal Grant. However, many districts across the state have engaged with their communities regarding well-rounded learning opportunities for their Student Investment Account (SIA) grant, and ODE has reviewed initial data from these local engagement sessions.

Prior to external engagement, the WRAP team worked with internal ODE employees including members across the Office of Teaching, Learning and Assessment, the Office of Education Innovation and Improvement, the Office of Indian Education, and the Office of the Director about this grant.

In addition, ODE informed the below individuals/groups about this grant in order to start establishing relationships and prepare for a more formal engagement process.

- Kristen Brayson (Portland Public Schools Arts Coordinator)
- American Indian Alaska Native Advisory Committee
- Oregon Regional STEM and STEAM Hubs
- COSA (Colin Cameron)
- The Miller Foundation (Martha Richards and Jennifer Allen)
- Oregon State Board of Education

Last, ODE has met with the following individuals/groups to learn more about their work in order to lay the groundwork for what currently exists within Oregon and display various options for what Well-Rounded learning opportunities might look like:

- Umpqua Valley STEAM Hub (Gwen Soderberg-Chase)
- Columbia Gorge STEM Hub (Christy Christopher)
- Frontier STEM Hub (Nickie Shira)
- Expanding Computer Education Programs (ECEP)
- Portland Metro STEM Hub (High School Science for All)
- Arts Impact, WA (Beverly Harding Buehler and Sibyl Barnum)

In addition to engagement for this grant, ODE has engaged with community and education partners regarding well-rounded education in the past. As part of the Student Success Act (SSA), ODE required districts to engage with their communities and report this information back to ODE within their Student Investment Account (SIA) applications. Districts can choose to use their funds to support a well-rounded education, and the engagement they had with their communities will be beneficial to include in this process.

ODE has also engaged with community and education partners in 2017 to help inform Oregon's Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which included engagement in creating a well-rounded education system.

What Does Past Data from Engagement Tell Us?

ODE has not formally engaged with external partners regarding this specific project yet, but we do have some past data from other engagement efforts that we can use to help determine what is needed for this project and what we may already know.

District and Local Community Engagement for Student Investment Account (SIA) funding:

Well Rounded Education is one of the four allowable use categories for SIA funds. Districts and eligible charter school SIA applicants were required to engage with their local communities about how SIA funds should be utilized. The SIA applications include evidence of the community engagement conducted by applicant districts and charter schools. Review of community engagement from the SIA applications pertaining to Well Rounded Education is ongoing.

ESSA Community Engagement:
Part of the ESSA plan addresses Well Rounded Education, and prior to completing this plan, ODE did engage with community and education partners to determine what is needed. Here is a summary of the portion of that work that relates directly to the WRAP work:
- The most important school characteristic is Instruction.
- There is a desire for each and every student to receive a rigorous, relevant, well-rounded, engaging educational experience.
- References to well-rounded education referred to enrichment opportunities – within the school day and after school – to support a comprehensive learning experience

In addition, informal engagement regarding this specific project highlight the following themes:
- Arts Educators are fearful of losing their jobs; proposing partnering with arts institutions might elevate this fear. Providing opportunities for arts integration may also elevate this fear, but there is greater support for this amongst arts teachers, as it highlights that the arts is part of the whole and not something other that can be cut.
- Teaching Artists and Art Institutions have struggled considerably during the pandemic. Many have closed/left the field.
- There are many different opinions about what STEAM education is throughout the State (and nation).
- There are a lot of projects, systems, structures, and curriculum opportunities that already exist within this state that center well-rounded education, but many of these are not connected to each other.
- We do not have solid data regarding the state of Arts Education or Well-Rounded Education in this state.

In addition to these themes, two topic areas came up internally that hold great interest: Tribal Arts (partnering with Senate Bill 13) and Computer Science.

Do We Need to Engage with These Same Groups to Get More Information?

The information we have from prior engagement is limited and not focused around course access specifically. In addition, the increase in advancement and usage of digital learning options (due to Comprehensive Distance Learning) has changed the possibilities for how we engage and how we teach students. BFor these reasons, it is important to engage with many of these similar groups again.

If We Need to Engage with These Same Groups, Is It Worth Their Time?

Engagement will need to be structured in a way that shows each group what they are getting out of this time. This engagement will likely not result in payment/reimbursement for time spent. Participation will allow for each group to have a critical voice in determining which courses are increased, where, and to whom, and this message must be emphasized at each session.

Step 2: Identify the Engagement Partners

The list of engagement partners listed below was generated through feedback from internal ODE employees. This may be updated through feedback from engagement sessions.

Who are the racial/ethnic and underserved groups affected?

Currently, ODE has identified the following student groups as underserved in the area of receiving access to a Well-Rounded education: Rural Students, Low Income Students, Black/African American Students, American Indian/Alaska Native Students, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Students, Latino/a/x Students, Emerging Bilingual Students, Students Experiencing Disability, and LGBTQ2SIA+ Students. The results of the Needs Assessment indicated that these student groups are being underserved in access to Well-Rounded education.

What is the potential impact of the resource allocation and strategic investment to these groups?

One of the main long-term outcomes we hope to achieve through this work is to ensure that every student at every school has access to a well-rounded education that provides students with key cross-cutting knowledge and skills: Read and comprehend a variety of text; Write clearly and accurately; Apply mathematics in a variety of settings; Listen actively and speak clearly and coherently; Think critically and analytically; Use technology to learn, live, and work; Demonstrate civic and community engagement; Demonstrate global literacy; Demonstrate personal management and teamwork skills.

Additional long-term outcomes we hope to see through this work include the following:
- School systems sustained beyond the time frame of this grant will not separate well-rounded opportunities from core academic courses. They will be seen as and practiced as equally important.
- Student participation and benefits from a well-rounded education will not be predicted by geography, income, race, ethnicity, gender, or participation in an IEP.
- Students will have been exposed to a broad variety of career options and have the opportunity to explore their interests during their K-12 experience.
- School systems will focus on prioritizing well-rounded learning experiences with core academic learning embedded rather than adding well-rounded experiences as an "extra" option.
- Communities will see themselves, their experiences, their priorities, and their knowledge as integral to the school system.

How have you intentionally involved partners who are also members of the communities affected by the WRAP?

Identified partners include:

Community Affected	Identified Partners
Rural Students	- Frontier STEM Hub - GO STEM Hub - Rural School Districts
Low Income Students	No Specific Partner Identified
Black/African American Students	NE STEAM Coalition
American Indian/Alaska Native Students	- Gov to Gov Tribal Meetings (9 Federally Recognized Tribes) - American Indian/ Alaska Native Advisory Group - Crow's Shadow (Umatilla Tribal Arts Organization) - Native Arts and Cultures Foundation - Portland Art Museum - Native Artist program/ Native American Art Council - Naya Family Center Cultural Arts Program - Salem-Keizer SD - Native Education Program Team
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander Students	- Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon - Oregon Pacific Islander Coalition
Latino/a/x Students	- Oregon Latinx Leadership Network - Adelante Mujeres - Chicas Youth Development Program - Juntos - OSU - Southern Oregon University - Latino/a/x/ Youth Programs
Emerging Bilingual Students	English Learner Strategic Plan Advisory Group
Students Experiencing Disability	- State Advisory Council for Special Education (SACSE) - FACT Oregon
LGBTQ2SIA+ Students	No Specific Partner Identified
All/Multiple student groups listed above	PTA/PTO Parent Groups (e.g. Oregon

Community Affected	Identified Partners
	PTA) ● STEM/STEAM Hubs ● Oregon STEM Investment Council ● Oregon CTE-STEM Employer Coalition (Oregon Business Council) ● Oregon Educator Advancement Council ● Oregon Association of Education Service Districts ● Oregon Science Teachers Association (OSTA) ● Oregon Council of Teachers of Mathematics (OCTM) ● Teachers of Teachers of Mathematics (TOTOM) ● Math Learning Center (MLC) ● Oregon Computer Science Teachers Association (OCSTA) ● Teachers Development Group (TDG) ● Oregon Arts Commission ● Lane Arts Council ● Oregon Society of Artists ● Oregon Ed Tech Cadre ● Miller Foundation ● Regional Arts and Culture Council ● Oregon Community Foundation ● Portland Public Schools Arts Department ● Oregon ASK ● Oregon MESA ● All SD's and Charter Schools ● Private Schools ● PGE Foundation ● Oregon Alliance for Arts Education ● Cultural Advocacy Coalition of Oregon ● Oregon Art Education Association ● Oregon Theatre Educators Association ● Arts in Education in the Gorge ● Oregon Museum of Science and Industry (OMSI) ● Workforce and Talent Development Board ● Young Audiences Arts for Learning ● Art Center East ● Oregon Folklife Network ● Centro Cultural ● American Leadership Forum of

Community Affected	Identified Partners
	Oregon ● Oregon Dance Education Organization ● Ganas Program (PSU) ● Salem Art Association : Artists in Schools ● Oregon Music Education Association ● Umpqua Valley Arts ● Media Arts at Perpich Center for the Arts ● Western Oregon University Arts ● American String Teachers Association ● Chinese American Citizens Alliance

How are you communicating with and addressing communities and groups that are not in the target focal group populations? If challenging or tense dynamics emerge, how will you navigate these?

There is a large list of organizations and individuals that fall into the "All Student Groups" category above. Many of these organizations represent multiple student groups within the target focal group population and will be engaged based on their work with these target populations. However, some groups listed in this category are subject specific (e.g. Math, Science, Arts) groups that will require a different kind of engagement. This focus will most likely result in a 1 or 2 on the Level of Involvement chart below.

Identify the level of involvement with each group.

The below chart identifies different levels of engagement. This chart will be referenced throughout the remainder of this plan. Although this chart was developed to be used by Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with their communities, these principles apply to the State Educational Agency (SEA) as well.

0	1	2	3	4	5
STANCE TOWARDS COMMUNITY					
IGNORE	INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	DEFER
INTENTION					
Protecting School/District Interests **Unintended Impact to Consider:** *Marginalizing Communities*	Keeping Communities Updated **Unintended Impact to Consider:** *Placating & Underestimating Community Wisdom*	Receiving Community Input **Unintended Impact to Consider:** *Tokenizing & Gatekeeping Community Engagement*	Meaningfully Engaging Community Voice **Unintended Impact to Consider:** *Community Voice is Not Heard*	Collaborating and Sharing Power with Communities **Unintended Impact to Consider:** *Collaborative Process Derailed by Power Dynamics & Lack of Relational Trust*	Communities Drive and Own the Work **Unintended Impact to Consider:** *Sovereignty and Core Agreements are Not Honored*
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT GOALS					
Deny access to decision-making processes	Provide students, families & community with relevant information for them to support district/school goals	Gather input from students, families & community without including them in decision-making	Ensure students, families & community needs and assets are integrated into district process & planning	Ensure student, family & community capacity play a leadership role in implementation of decisions	Foster lasting educational equity through community-driven schools that are culturally rooted and responsive to whole and sovereign people and communities
EXAMPLE ENGAGEMENT METHODS					
▪ Closed door meeting ▪ Misinformation ▪ Systematic effort to avoid engagement	▪ Fact sheets ▪ Open houses ▪ Presentations ▪ Billboards or school electronic boards ▪ Videos ▪ Social media posts	▪ Input sessions ▪ Focus groups ▪ Empathy interviews ▪ Surveys	▪ Collaboration or engagement with community organizing and community voices ▪ House meetings ▪ Interactive workshops & forums with accessibility and safety considerations ▪ Student & Parent/Family Advisory Committees	▪ MOUs with Community-based organizations ▪ Leadership Development ▪ Resources & funding allocated for community organizing ▪ Collaborative design and facilitation of community forums to ensure voice, safety & accessibility	▪ Community-driven planning ▪ Student or Parent/Family led community forums to assess challenges and develop solutions ▪ Consensus building ▪ Participatory Action Research and community-driven initiatives ▪ Participatory budgeting ▪ Community schools
KEY EXAMPLE STRATEGY TO CONSIDER FOR ENGAGEMENT METHODS					
Establish who the community is composed of	Language Accessibility	Hospitality and reciprocity practices	Staff training on anti-racist equity and culturally sustaining and responsive practice	Deeper strategy and visioning work with local community-based organizations (e.g. non-profits, churches, etc)	Allocating SIA strategies/activities for community-driven projects and use

The table listed below in previous sections which outlined each level of engagement per year of the grant has been removed from this plan in versions 2.0 and later versions, as the same information is displayed under Step 3 (Goals). This table has been replaced to reflect each engagement partner and their overall engagement level:

- Providing Information Engagement (Similar to Level 1 above)
- Receiving Information Engagement (Similar to Level 2 above)
- Collaborative Engagement (Similar to Level 3 above)
- Sustainable Course Access Engagement (Similar to Level 4 above)

Identified Partners	Overall Engagement Level
• Math Learning Center • Teachers Development Group • Naya Family Center Cultural Arts Program • Adelante Mujeres - Chicas Youth Development Program	Providing Information Engagement
• NE STEAM Coalition • Crow's Shadow • Native Arts and Culture Foundation • Portland Art Museum • Oregon Latinx Leadership Network • FACT Oregon • Oregon PTA • Oregon STEM Investment Council • Oregon CTE - STEM Employer Coalition (OBC) • Oregon Science Teachers Association • Oregon Council of Teachers of Mathematics • Teachers of Teachers of Mathematics • Oregon Computer Science Teachers Association • Oregon Ed Tech Cadre • Regional Arts and Culture Council • Oregon ASK • Oregon MESA • Private Schools • PGE Foundation • Cultural Advocacy Coalition of Oregon • Oregon Museum of Science and Industry • Workforce and Talent Development Board • Art Center East • Oregon Folklife Network • Centro Cultural • PAM Teacher Advisory Council • Salem-Keizer SD - Native Education Program Team • American Leadership Forum of Oregon • YCEP/JDEP/LTCT programs • Juntos – OSU • Southern Oregon University - Latino/a/x Youth Programs • Ganas Program (PSU)	Receiving Information Engagement

Identified Partners	Overall Engagement Level
• Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon • Salem Art Association: Artists in Schools • Media Arts at Perpich Center for the Arts • WOU Arts • American String Teachers Association • Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art - University of Oregon • Chinese American Citizens Alliance • Oregon Pacific Islander Coalition	
• Government to Government Tribal Meetings • American Indian/Alaska Native Advisory Group • English Learner Strategic Plan Advisory Group • State Advisory Council for Special Education • Oregon Educator Advancement Council • Oregon Arts Commission • Lane Arts Council • Miller Foundation • Oregon Community Foundation • Portland Public Schools Arts Department • Oregon Alliance for Arts Education • Arts in Education of the Gorge • Young Audiences Arts for Learning • Oregon Art Education Association • Oregon Theatre Educators Association • Oregon Music Education Association • Oregon Dance Education Organization	Collaborative Engagement
• Rural School Districts • STEM/STEAM Hubs • Oregon Association of ESDs • All School Districts and Charter Schools	Sustainable Course Access Engagement

Identify if any of the groups are "advisory" and qualify for stipends to participate.

Many of these organizations are already part of an advisory group and may be granted a stipend for their work through a different funding source. The WRAP work will not create a new advisory group that would require stipends to participate.

Step 3: Establish the Approach

Reflect on questions and resources from the [Community Engagement Toolkit](#)

(Found on pages 11-14. Reflect on these per level of engagement established above when establishing the dates, meeting locations, times, protocols used, activities, etc.)

1. If there are certain groups or communities who aren't engaging in your project, ask yourself why? Why are they not participating and how can the ODE do better about reaching out and making them feel welcome? (Focus on the system keeping them out, not blame the communities for not showing up).

   This question cannot be addressed during the first year of engagement as the WRAP team has not yet begun engagement. However, the WRAP team will include this question in the reflection process and in preparing for years two through five.

2. What communication and engagement outlets best fit the unique strengths/assets and needs of the families and communities you serve? What conditions support this?

   ● Level 1 Outlet: Email Update and Invitation to join the WRAP Newsletter
   ● Level 2 Outlet: Electronic Survey & other non-electronic survey methods
   ● Level 3 Outlet: In-Person/Virtual Engagement Sessions
   ● Level 4 Outlet: Joining Organization's Established Meetings as a Regular Attendee (if possible) or In-Person/Virtual Engagement Sessions
   ● Level 5 Outlet: Joining Organization's Established Meetings as a Regular Attendee (if possible) and requesting updates from the organization

3. What pathways to deeper collaboration and involvement are you planning and can be communicated?

   Collaboration levels have been determined for each year of the grant to allow for different levels of engagement based on the grant's timeline and expected outcomes. In general, organizations that have been determined to require a level 1 engagement strategy during year one will continue to stay in this engagement level throughout every year of the grant. This is because their work or the students they represent will not be directly affected by this grant. Organizations that require a higher level of engagement during year one generally move to a lower level of engagement for years two and three after the WRAP courses have been identified and then may increase engagement levels if work is anticipated to move over to their organization's control after the grant period has ended, such as with Rural School Districts, STEM/STEAM Hubs, and ESDs.

4. How are you providing families and the community with relevant information regarding current inequities and plans to address them?

Families and communities that will be most impacted by this work are represented by higher levels of engagement in year one (i.e. Levels 2 or 3). In addition to engagement, information about this plan will be dispersed to communities and districts in multiple languages and avenues. This will be described through a WRAP communication plan, which will be one of the next steps in this work.

5. How are you seeking input from students, parents, families, and the community to inform solutions to address educational inequities? How clear and transparent is the information you are providing to inform their input?

The organizations identified for engagement have been selected because they represent student, parent, family, and community voice. Input will be gleaned from surveys to quickly gather and analyze need, and in-person/virtual engagement sessions will occur to better gather a more diverse voice. In addition, data will be collected through our Needs Assessment process to better understand the needs of students and their course availability.

Level 2 engagement surveys will be brief and include succinct information about the grant and its purpose. However, in-person/virtual engagement sessions will be prefaced with an informational presentation on the grant and its purposes but will include more meaningful and informed engagement. If possible, an information presentation will precede the actual engagement session.

6. What conditions are you creating in your input/engagement sessions to ensure that community members feel safe, heard, and powerful?

If possible, engagement sessions will be scheduled during an organization's standing meeting, rather than setting up a separate session for the WRAP purposes. Coming to someone's table, rather than inviting them to yours, allows for deeper engagement and a more welcoming space for those from whom we wish to engage.

In addition, engagement sessions will be followed by informational updates, reflecting what we heard and how we are moving forward based on what we heard.

7. How are you creating expectations about participation and decision-making for clarity on role/involvement for students, families, and community?

The levels of engagement identified above outline the role/involvement for the organization. This information will be communicated in the goals/objectives of each session.

8. How are you creating opportunities in existing structures (e.g. school site councils) for traditionally marginalized groups to participate?

   The WRAP is not intended to create any groups or engagement sessions separately from an existing structure, but wishes to use the existing structures of the groups identified as the platform for engagement. The WRAP team plans to leverage the chair of the organization or existing, established listservs to disseminate surveys and emails.

9. How are you learning to listen deeply to different voices, perspectives, and ways of knowing (e.g. culturally responsive trainings for participating staff)?

   In preparation for engagement, the WRAP Senior Strategist has participated in culturally responsive trainings, including ODE's sponsored Critical Friends training. All WRAP Team members are encouraged to participate in ODE sponsored trainings and continuous learning opportunities.

10. How are you creating space/ opportunity to name, address, and heal from historical harm inflicted by the State Educational Agency system?

    Much of this process stems out of personal growth through question nine above. In addition, engagement sessions will include practices such as Tribal Land Acknowledgements to increase awareness of current and historical racist practices and model anti-racist systems change practices. In addition, the WRAP Needs Assessment will highlight current and historical inequities in well-rounded course opportunities for students, which will be presented during engagement sessions.

11. How are you demonstrating a commitment to change historical practice and policy?

    This engagement plan is one step designed to change the ODE's practice of moving forward with work prior to hearing the voices of those directly impacted by the work. The first year of the WRAP work was also set aside as a planning year, allowing for time to slow down and be thoughtful about how to approach this work well.

Identify specific goals for each engagement session

Goals for engagement sessions vary based on the pattern of levels identified. Listed below are various patterns of engagement levels and their specific goals:

Providing Information Engagement:

Year 1 - Level 1	Year 2 - Level 1	Year 3 - Level 1	Year 4 - Level 1	Year 5 - Level 1
Provide information	Provide an update to the	Provide an update to the	Provide an update to the	Provide an update to the

Year 1 - Level 1	Year 2 - Level 1	Year 3 - Level 1	Year 4 - Level 1	Year 5 - Level 1
regarding what the WRAP is, what it might be used for, and how these organizations may be impacted by it.	previous information shared.	previous information shared.	previous information shared.	previous information shared and a final analysis of the program.

Receiving Information Engagement:

Year 1 - Level 2	Year 2 - Level 2	Year 3 - Level 1	Year 4 - Level 1	Year 5 - Level 2
Provide information regarding what the WRAP is and what it might be used for. Gather feedback from the group about what their needs are to help inform the Needs Assessment. Determine what other projects exist that support well-rounded course access.	Provide an update to the previous information shared. Share results of the Needs Assessment and request feedback to better inform future work. Request feedback regarding programs already in place and those selected for future implementation.	Provide an update to the previous information shared.	Provide an update to the previous information shared.	Provide an update to the previous information shared and a final analysis of the program. Gather feedback about how this program worked and what needs still exist.

Collaborative Engagement:

Year 1 - Level 3	Year 2 - Level 2	Year 3 - Level 2	Year 4 - Level 1	Year 5 - Level 2
Provide information regarding what the WRAP is and what it might be used for. Gather feedback from the group	Provide an update to the previous information shared. Share results of the Needs Assessment and	Provide an update to the previous information shared. Gather input on how the program is currently	Provide an update to the previous information shared.	Provide an update to the previous information shared and a final analysis of the program. Gather feedback

Year 1 - Level 3	Year 2 - Level 2	Year 3 - Level 2	Year 4 - Level 1	Year 5 - Level 2
about what their needs are to help inform the Needs Assessment. Determine what other projects exist that support well-rounded course access. Identify creative solutions to expanding access.	request feedback to better inform future work. Request feedback regarding programs already in place and those selected for future implementation.	working.		about how this program worked and what needs still exist.

Sustainable Course Access Engagement (those who will be taking over this work once the grant period ends):

Year 1 - Level 3	Year 2 - Level 2	Year 3 - Level 2	Year 4 - Level 4	Year 5 - Level 5
Provide information regarding what the WRAP is and what it might be used for. Gather feedback from the group about what their needs are to help inform the Needs Assessment. Determine what other projects exist that support well-rounded course access. Identify creative solutions to expanding access.	Provide an update to the previous information shared. Share results of the Needs Assessment and request feedback to better inform future work. Request feedback regarding programs already in place and those selected for future implementation.	Provide an update to the previous information shared. Gather input on how the program is currently working.	Support the work of the organization in creating a plan for sustainability beyond the grant period.	Support the work of the organization in their implementation of a plan beyond this final year.

Examples of Activities for Year One:

Level 1: (Email)
- Basic Summary of WRAP
- Provide link to website and Listserv to stay informed
- Ask if they would like to receive any other kind of regular update

Level 2: (Email, Phone Call, or Virtual Meeting)
- Basic Summary of WRAP
- Provide information about how to stay informed
- Survey to inform Needs Assessment
- Request for information about what other programs exist

Level 3: (Virtual Meeting)
- Summary of WRAP including logic model, which may be edited based on feedback
- Provide information about how to stay informed
- Set up regular meetings to discuss topics
- Survey Questions to add to Survey distributed to others (if time allows)
- Survey to inform Needs Assessment
- Identify programs that currently exist
- Brainstorming time to allow for creative problem solving and solution making

Identify how the Needs Assessment will be incorporated into this engagement

A preliminary needs assessment is currently being written and will be shared with engagement groups once it has been developed. This preliminary version will be shared for information building purposes with all engagement partners.

Partners with engagement levels of 2 or 3 in the first year will also be asked for information that will be included in a second, more robust version of the needs assessment to be written during year two of the grant. This second version will be used to guide the work through the remaining grant period. It will also be shared back with engagement partners as noted in the above goals.

Identify a timeline

Engagement Level	Year 1[1]	Year 2[2]	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Providing Information	August/ September 2021 Email	January 2022 Email (Needs Assessment)	Fall 2022 Updates	Fall 2023 Updates	June 2025 Final Reports

---

[1] Year one meetings may change depending on agenda availability during regularly scheduled meetings.
[2] The timeline for Years 2-5 are flexible.

Engagement Level	Year 1[1]	Year 2[2]	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Receiving Information	August/ September 2021 Email	January 2022 Email (Needs Assessment)	Fall 2022 Updates	Fall 2023 Updates	June 2025 Final Reports
Collaborative Engagement	July/ August 2021 Virtual Meeting	Various Meetings throughout the year	Various Meetings throughout the year	Various Meetings throughout the year	Various Meetings throughout the year
Sustainable Course Access	July/ August 2021 Virtual Meeting	Various Meetings throughout the year	Various Meetings throughout the year	Various Meetings throughout the year	Various Meetings throughout the year

Address additional questions:

Access: How have you incorporated different abled bodied access and needs? Are the physical or virtual spaces you use comfortable for community members? Which engagement sessions would benefit from translation services?

Due to DAS travel restrictions during the first year, all engagement sessions will be held virtually. Since most sessions will be embedded into the organization's regular meeting time, additional access requirements will not need to be included by ODE. However, meetings set up by ODE will include closed caption options on Zoom. During the scheduling process, ODE will ask the organization if they have members who would benefit from translation or interpreter services and will use ODE's process to provide those services over Zoom. Sessions will also be recorded if all members of the organization approve this process, in order to send to participants who were unable to attend or had internet connectivity issues during the scheduled time. Surveys and other documentation distributed will be translated upon request prior to the scheduled meeting.

As travel restrictions are lifted, in-person meetings will occur only at locations that are physically accessible. Travel and parking costs will also be reimbursed (or pre-paid if this option exists).

Basic Needs: Have all basic needs been accounted for through engagement (bio-breaks, food, etc)?

Currently, no engagement sessions will be scheduled for longer than 2 hours.

Cultural space: There are many different ways that communities are accustomed to gathering. Have you considered how one formation (e.g. a circle or smaller groups) might be more culturally responsive than others (e.g. desks in rows)? To create the conditions for meaningful two-way dialogue, you may consider less formal or small group structures.

Most engagement will occur at the organization's regularly scheduled meeting using their standard preferences for seating, etc. However, ODE scheduled engagement sessions will include many forms of seating structures, pair-shares, written and verbal responses, etc.

Location: Consider where you are holding your gatherings

Most engagement sessions will occur at the organization's regularly scheduled meeting location (virtually or in-person). ODE has budgeted for travel to include locations throughout the state and will hold sessions in areas most directly affected by the WRAP.

Intentionality: Community members are often juggling multiple responsibilities, which does not mean that they do not wish to provide input. Consider how you have incorporated their life and work rhythms into your planning. What time of the day/week is best to engage them? How long is necessary?

Since ODE is planning to engage with organizations at their regularly scheduled meetings, we are prepared to meet during or after the workday to accommodate these already scheduled times.

Additional considerations:

Promptness: Honoring community members time is vital, so ensure that you are beginning and ending on time so they can attend to other needs. However, notice when there is energy and momentum, which could mean you make additional times to engage or stay for longer than you initially anticipated.

Flexibility: Many community members are busy and taking precious time that they hope will affect school change. Consider how different modes of engagement can be flexible with time, including if community members have to show up late or leave early and how to create ample opportunity to provide input.

Inclusion: Throughout any engagement method, from an informal Zoom call to structured focus groups, consider how you will create space for community voice to be welcomed, invited, and included. Whose voice is taking the most time/ space during these engagements? What structure/facilitation method are you using to create proportionate representation from the community and target focal groups?

Appreciation: Consider how you consistently express gratitude and appreciation for the input you are receiving.

Next Steps:

This engagement plan is a working document that is subject to change. However, changes will be noted for historical purposes.

Year 1 Summary and Changes for Year 2 Engagement

This engagement plan was initially created in June 2021, prior to most of the engagement for the Well-Rounded Access Program (WRAP). This additional section was added during the second year of the WRAP and has been included to summarize the experiences of the first year of engagement and document recommended changes for the second year of engagement.

Purpose:
The purposes for initial, year 1 engagement were:
- To inform partners about the WRAP;
- To identify barriers for students in accessing well-rounded education; and
- To build relationships with partners who are doing work in the field that can inform the work within the WRAP grant.

Although these purposes were clearly understood internally to WRAP team members, they were less clearly understood by engagement partners. Many partners were seeking a greater understanding of what this project would look like and how it would impact them, which had not yet been defined. Partners also struggled to understand the definition of "well-rounded" and how this term was being used. Even with these barriers, the following outcomes have occurred because of this engagement:
- Strong partnerships and relationships with increased trust and collaboration;
- Shared understanding of the challenges that students face in receiving equitable access to well-rounded education across the state; and
- Increased knowledge and awareness of impactful work happening in STEAM and the arts.

The purposes identified for year 2 include:
- To identify which activities, courses, and professional development to move forward and then help inform/evaluate those activities;
- To identify what outcomes, outputs, quality metrics, or measures of progress to use;
- To follow up with partners and let them know how their feedback has been incorporated;
- To build data structures and support leadership access structures;
- To create a deeper commitment with existing partners and create a wider network of partner organizations.

Structure:
Engagement sessions were scheduled at the engagement partners' regularly scheduled meetings, rather than creating separate sessions. This approach had several benefits for engagement partners, including reducing the need to find time for this topic and shifting the power dynamic away from ODE, helping to build trust and receive honest feedback.

Recommendations for Future Engagement:

Listed below are recommendations to improve the engagement process:

- Create a system/structure to come back to the questions identified in this plan on a regular basis.
- Create space within the engagement sessions for conversation.