Meeting Notes
Quality Education Commission
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol Street NE, Salem, Oregon 97301
May 24, 2010
10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Present:

Susan Massey
Vic Backlund
Beth Gerot
Lynn Lundquist
Frank McNamara
Mark Mulvihill
Gail Rasmussen
Maryalice Russell
Peter Tromba
Duncan Wyse
Brian Reeder
Marjorie Lowe
Drew Hinds
Tom Owen
Michael VanKleeck
Diane Rush

Absent:

Welcome and Introductions

- Commissioners, visitors and new commissioners Gail Rasmussen and Peter Tromba introduce themselves.
- Tom Owen discusses book *The Death and Life of the Great American School System* by Diane Ravitch as well as the fact that he is a supporter of the four year Benson model.

Reports:

- Best Practices Panel Update (Frank McNamara)
    - Verbal update today. Written report will be presented at the June 23, 2010 meeting
    - Panel met last on Friday, May 21and meeting notes are not completed yet
    - Panel's essential question is very focused and looks at the relationship between course-taking patterns in high school and performance on state assessments
    - Features of the school having a high impact on outcomes are LEP, geometry by 10th grade, low income factor, tstat score -4, tstat +5.5 for taking geometry, actual score, predicted score, difference + or –
    - Schools were paired in similar demographics and interviewed in sets
        - What is sequence for math course-taking in the high school?
        - What is the sequence for teacher certification (basic, out of endorsement)?
        - What is the sequence for proficiency?
        - What are the other special factors in the school?
    - Team members were hand selected for specific representation
    - Questionnaire was converted into a web based survey and sent to approximately 54 schools
        - 29% (15) of 54 schools completed the survey
        - 14 paired schools
        - 12 were interviewed
    - Interviews were meant to be done with principal and math teachers

- Most interviewed were small rural schools; a few were larger schools
- Findings
  - Confirmed of best practices as stated in the report for several years
  - Success in closing the achievement gap
  - Integration of survey data and in-school interviews
    - Continuity of instructor, staff, relationships
    - Changes in teaching staff and building administrator (a lot of turnover) had poorer results; stability showed stronger results
    - Schools with a version of looping or bookending (using same teacher/team/administrator in classes/grades) showed strong results
    - Algebra I taken in 8th grade for credit matters
    - Algebra 1 taken in 7th or 8th grade, no credit, may not matter
    - Scope and sequence down to 4th or 5th grade matters
    - Strong district framework for math and articulation matters
    - Class size matters for performance (17 and lower = positive effect; 21 and higher = negative effect)
    - Students receive extra individual attention in smaller classes
    - Student/teacher relationship matters
    - Little difference in structure of school schedule (below 60 minutes is not enough time; 90 minutes may be too long to focus on math)
    - Control focused on professional development (job embedded, ongoing, onsite = better outcome)
    - Score assessments, calibrate learning tool, data driven schools = better outcome
  - Better performing schools had better facilities, etc.
  - Double-dosing resulted in better performing schools
  - Better instructors with math endorsements resulted in better performing students
  - Panel sensed that teacher quality is very important but have no data to confirm this
  - Distribution and communication of the Quality Education Model (QEM) is still an issue
  - PLC talking points could work
  - Principals make things happen in their schools
  - Teacher quality matters but is difficult to talk about
    - Lacking data to track this
    - Cultural political issue
  - Commission hopes best practices will help reach the goals with the resources we have; may not have the confidence level needed
- Things outside the panel's realm but kept coming up and matter
  - Teacher with roots to the school
  - Well articulated programs
  - Middle school to high school to community college

<u>Governor's Office Update (Marjorie Lowe)</u>

- Preliminary Reset Process Report has been released
- Preparing for a 'decade of deficits' on current service levels

- Must move on to a new platform as normal operations
- The education portion of the budget has grown at the slowest rate
- Final details of the report will be presented June 25, 2010 at the Portland City Club and will be rebroadcast in the evening on OPB radio
- New revenue forecast due Tuesday, May 25, 2010
- Education budget now stands at only 47-48%

Cost Panel Update (Beth Gerot and Brian Reeder)

- Capital component model (slide)
    - Land costs vary greatly
    - $1675 average cost per student per year in '08-'09
    - $1576 average cost per student per year in '06-'07
    - Washington has specific methodology that Brian will review and incorporate later
    - The QEM is now a fully comprehensive model
    - Maintenance/operating cost is approximately $700 per student per year
    - Total building cost is approximately $2300 per student per year
    - At what point does facility pay off (construct a new building vs repairing old building)?
    - The system has a bias toward short-sightedness on capital spending
    - Discussion regarding Salem-Keizer 2008 bond passed with one half for repair; Salem-Keizer will spend at least $6.5 million per year on maintenance
    - Discussion regarding what's being done in Medford to rebuild schools and lower maintenance costs
    - Local level is responsible for capital costs by bond measures
- Parameters and assumptions that drive the model (slide)
- Education funding
    - Exists mainly at the state level
    - Few options exist to change education funding at the local level
    - Prototype schools (slide and demonstration)
        - Where data is fed into the model
    - Baseline scenario (slide and demonstration)
        - $754 per student per year
        - Maintenance costs includes energy to heat the building, etc.
        - Does not include long term major repair costs
        - Example: Total cost per student in elementary school in Oregon of component cost is $9,837 for '08-'09
        - ARRA stimulus money relates and is included in the federal amount
        - Some of the lump sum was used in '08-'09 school year and the remainder in the'09-'10 school year
        - Use current service level vs. actual funding level to change the process for school revenue forecast; this would require a change in budget rules to establish a new baseline
        - This is stated in the current 2008 QEM report on page 25
    - Summary Output – 10th grade math (handout)
        - If all else is equal, does having geometry make a difference?
        - The magnitude of the geometry effect is rather large
        - Frank's observation talking with math teachers, taking geometry for credit does make a difference; Brian's table confirms this statement

Written Report and Timeline (Susan Massey and Commissioners)

- Goal to produce final written report by August 1, 2010
- No preliminary report will be produced this year
- Preparing one report will save time, work and money
- A basic outline has been prepared
- Graduate student from the University of Michigan will be arriving June 1, 2010 and working with Brian Reeder to prepare the 2010 Quality Education Model Report
- Commission will consider ways to educate the governor and candidates about the report and this work as quickly and efficiently as possible before the final governor's budget is submitted

Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m., Room 251B

Adjourn