Agenda and Notes
9 November 2021
Media Program Standards Study Advisory Panel Meeting 4

Media Program OAR 581-022-2340
Budget Note Language

Update about Public Meeting Status (3:30-3:40)
- Introduced advisory group members to ODE support staff who joined meeting for first time
- Reviewed new process for public meetings
  - Meetings will not be recorded
  - Public may listen but will not have access to speak or comment in chat
  - All meeting agendas and minutes will be posted here:
    https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/standards/library/Pages/default.aspx

Review Draft Report (3:40-4:50)
- Reviewed what has happened since last meeting -- Made sense of data analysis, reviewed open-ended comments to identify themes, created a report outline, and started drafting the report
- Provide feedback and/or recommendations
  - Group took 20 minutes to read first draft of the report
  - Group members used "suggesting" mode and comments to leave feedback on the document
  - Tina shared a draft doc and explained it doesn't cover all the elements. While the data analysis was comprehensive, the consultant, Judah, seemed to convey a different interpretation to some of the information; more time was spent cross-checking some of the info. This contributed to the delay time on getting the draft completed.
  - Last 2 days the focus was on writing; but it took Tina and Jen about 10 hours putting items together that support the data from the survey.
  - It was encouraged at this meeting that everyone take some time to review the document and put their feedback in the comments mode to track changes/suggestions.
  - The gist of the matter is that the language of the OARs relating to media programs for students and the school library segment requires a rewrite.
  - The survey was sent out to individuals who are familiar with usage of school media programs.
  - Senator Gorsek would be the main legislator contact as he supported this SB, and Tina is awaiting confirmation about whether to name the other bill sponsors.
  - Tina reiterated to this advisory group that other work needs to be done on this draft and wants feedback today, so the draft can be (hopefully) finalized in an improved revision from what is being reviewed in this doc this afternoon.

- The question of when was the OAR last revised was brought up. Need to include other elements. It was also agreed the survey brought forth more questions worth exploring.
- Jen explained as the draft gets re-shaped, be aware it will look slightly different while key elements are factored in and the document gets edited.
- A question about definitions was explained that these are in the report.
- The suggestion to have a guidance document was well-received and the viable idea of having a "toolkit" be created so that it can help SDs determine compliance and alignment with OAR. This will also help districts write more meaningful action plans.
- Part of the ongoing challenge is that people lack tools / need resources. Workload concerns might be a better phrasing.
- The discussion/feedback from the legislature was just focusing on 3 main priorities, but this group agreed that we don't want to narrow the scope down too tightly; there is no wiggle room for bringing on other important elements that would enhance / aid those priorities.
- Pay equity problem = leads to potential legal liabilities.
- Another challenge: Lack of a prep program. Not finding librarians for open positions.
- A suggestion to create a Glossary would also be helpful.
- The audience of the report is the legislature. There was confusion about what 'standards' were in question. Tina explained that the OAR requirements are also called standards, which the legislature was referring to in the Budget Note (not instructional standards).
- The SB didn't pass, so there are no amendments.
- Note: Because the library standards are not listed in statute, they are not ODE standards.
- There was a question about addressing the concern for respondent anonymity. Respondents were asked to identify their county region instead of their actual county.
- Also noted was adding limitations in a study.
- The group agreed that sharing statistics as visuals (charts or graphs) instead of just text would be helpful.
- Focus Area: Differentiate by district size. School library staffing requirements for a large metropolitan area school district cannot be the same as for a small, rural district.
- Requirements vs. what is needed by districts; the need for an instructional program for the high school is critical. However, instructional standards for dual credit courses (and the equivalent) are outside the scope of the OAR standards.
- Re: dual credits; Michelle will draft a blurb about this re: supporting missing instruction and get it back to Tina.
- Kids aren't prepared or know how to do research in college even at the HS level; so this needs to be incorporated somehow.

Next Steps (4:50-5:00)
- Process update
  - Email check-in on 11/16/21
- Continue to provide asynchronous feedback

- Next meeting on 11/18/21
    - Provide final round of feedback
    - Tina informed the group that the next draft will be ready for review at the 11/18 meeting, and hopefully a bit before.
    - The final draft will be due to ODE Leadership on 11/22.
- Meeting concluded at 5:00 p.m.