



EAC VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, May 23, 2018

4:00-5:30pm

Via GoToMeeting: <https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/455845789>

Conference Call: (877)336-1828, public access code 8478084 (*listen only*)

Directors Present: Chair Oakes, Vice-Chair Grotting, Director Andrews, Director Capps, Director Cox, Director Girod, Director Gomez, Director Graupp, Director Homer-Anderson, Director Koskela, Director Lynn, Director Martinez, Director Richards, Director Rosilez, Director Scruggs, Director Wilk, Director Yoshioka, and Sara Mickelson for Director Calderon

Directors Not Present: Director Gill, Director Schadler

Non-EAC members present with roles: Cheryl Myers, EAC Transition Director; Hilda Rosselli, College & Career Readiness and Educator Advancement Director (CEdO); Angela Bluhm, Executive Support (CEdO); Julie Smith, Prototyping Contractor

Agenda and meeting materials

1.0 **Welcome Remarks, Agenda Review**

- 1.1 Context, Outcomes - Chair Oakes called the meeting to order at 4:07pm and indicated outcome goals as: develop a shared understanding of what educator networks are, how we want them to run, and determine subcommittees/work groups.
- 1.2 Roll Call - Angela Bluhm conducted a verbal roll call; a quorum was established. Chair Oakes reviewed technology details for directors.

2.0 Homework Questions - Chair Oakes requested Hilda Rosselli to facilitate this discussion. Directors engaged in a robust discussion of the network questions. Many indicated a preference to first focus on local priorities, and to then consider providers. Questions were posed about the reality of achieving bill language “by which every educator has access to ...” especially for those who aren’t aware of the EAC. Additional conversation included being mindful of small and rural districts, early learning considerations, geographic reach, and ensuring the networks have adequate support for a successful launch. Hilda Rosselli remarked if networks are identified fairly soon, there is still time in the 2018-19 year to support their preparedness to receive EAC funding in 2019-20.

POLL: Question “I am ready to reach consensus on question of one network or two.” 60% answered “I feel comfortable different perspectives raised by EAC members have been considered adequately and it does not prevent us from moving forward. 40% answered “I don’t yet feel comfortable that different perspectives raised by EAC members have been considered enough and would like more discussion.” 15 out of 17 Directors responded; Directors chose to review the next item before making a definitive decision.

3.0 Scenarios 1 and 2 - Hilda Rosselli reviewed Scenario 1, shared at the last meeting, drafted last Fall and providing an initial idea to provoke better ideas and discussion. Scenario 1 tilts toward ESDs receiving the funding to support local identified needs. Process would include review of current work underway in a region, results of teacher focus groups, TELL survey results, title plans, and a potential menu of areas to stimulate thinking of the local group. The network would be expected to leverage/braiding additional funds and resources. Possible general outcome metrics: retention,

increased mentoring, diversity, filled positions, types of professional learning. Local plans would align with equity focus, embracing high-leverage practices, lessons learned from prior network investments. Council would review, finalize plans, then have the responsibility of determining fund allocation. EAC would make their requests to the Legislature with priority recommendations.

Julie Smith introduced Scenario 2, considering the GC Recommendations and Characteristics. Prototyping learning: flexibility! Definition stemming from effective network characteristics were around “local need” rather than priority. In her experience across many school districts, they have similar local needs, but the **reasons why** those needs exist are unique to that local need. If a Community of Practices organizes around a priority (see Quality Network of Practice visual) ... focus area shared, key drivers shared, but root cause analysis showed *different* primary drivers. Ability to move faster, to meet their goals they'll need to eventually work on all the areas, but each may begin at a different place. SB182 notes a central sponsoring organization like an OEA, can focus on a shared priority, local context and leverage each other's resources ... Julie highlighted the flexibility to address root causes, yet leverage a network as a whole.

Query: this seems to fall into the 2nd category of communities of practice. If this was our sole model, how would we ensure every educator is impacted? Julie responded: Effective networks centered around the users BEFORE they focused on priorities. Historically, we have a vacuum of decision-makers who set priorities, but when you elevate barriers of students, parents, communities. Meeting educators/students where they are, when understood, then organize in the community of practice. Some networks are working very hard on career continuum initiatives and wouldn't start from scratch, but some are not this far along and would still receive support.

Query: seems like this began as the first type of network then moved into 2nd? Julie responded: the NWRES D project began with “What do you want our services to be?” and topics naturally developed from this question. For example, a similarly structured network could be sponsored by higher education, early learning, or other organizations as specified in SB182, organically through a region.

Query: helpful to view scenario and focus on user before priority. If a district wants to focus on multiple topics, what would you recommend? Julie responded: through prototyping/collaborative grants, part of this work teaches the participants a model for improvement they carry with them in their work, not tied to the specific initiative. For instance, North Clackamas currently has six networks operating simultaneously and are approaching each with a similar process.

Comment: still advocate for first scenario, want to assure power dynamics is really based on the local perspective. Might a vacuum still exist? Might some voices be louder? Want to err on side of caution and lean toward local. Julie responded: before you can get to #2, ensure #1 was done and done well, not a symbolic box check. When understanding system barriers, users must be heard.

Query: does #2 seem too far removed from ‘every’ educator by affecting only the team member? How does this reach all? Julie responded: to clarify - definitely a design theme, in characteristics you're testing system changes: teachers/administrators are testing changes to classroom assessment practices, as they test/collect data they begin scaling, testing wider. Even in Medford, in each of 10 schools, micro-changes occur to fit that distinct culture. Goal is to spread throughout district, adapted to each unique classroom.

Hilda query: would it be useful to design a 1 pager displaying each stage of the continuum, where work is occurring, if a need is identified 'locally', they could be a part of a network focused on this need (mapping). Consensus: yes ; Hilda will send out follow up.

Comment: appreciated the clarification that #2 is contingent upon the notion that local is defined first, completely support the power dynamics/local perspective priority. Many school districts who don't have capacity to identify. Love the idea of resources, OEA, Chalkboard, others, who could help us work on these issues. Need to identify needs first. Questions whether 19 ESDs is too many, perhaps consider other, existing hub configurations. Define regions, then approach Scenario 2-style; those educators choose. Follow by connecting different regions across common needs.

Comment: concur with previous comment, Scenario 2 has strong potential. Whether an ESD or another type of hub. Our responsibility to ensure local needs are met. Flexibility and variation, need to be learners and see what's working-variation that outperforms. Want to see thought leaders. Build capacity in network members, improvement science carries on.

Comment: As we define 'local' avoid the definition of a single district being a network; would prove challenging for our smallest districts to function by themselves.

Query: have any costing considerations for implementation been conducted, recognize desire for flexibility? Hilda responded: not as yet

Comment: insight on how program administration would occur. More clear line of allocating line of resources to ESDs. Some history of ESDs as conveners with regional or collective impact models. Could help this be implemented with more fidelity. ESDs sit a little distant from classrooms.

Chair Oakes: Hearing consistently from the group step one, local – work begins first, regions define their need and priorities; then get to the bigger picture with a follow-up phase. Subcommittees and work groups can begin defining.

Julie: could design a process with what we've learned with characteristics, how they elevated teacher voice, identified systemic barriers, bring back to council. Maybe in partnership with ESDs.

Chair Oakes reminded group the EAC is the final approval for all ideas generated.

- 3.1 POLL: Phase One of the networks starting locally as they identify local users and local priorities: Poll question "I feel comfortable with networks being responsible for identifying local users and priorities." 71% indicated "yes", 7% "no", and 21% "I need more information". 14 out of 16 Directors responded.
- 4.0 Chair Oakes reviewed context for work groups and subcommittees. This item will be brought forward in the next agenda.
- 4.1 At this point in the meeting, a Standing Director departed and a quorum was no longer in effect. Instead of taking action to identify the types of groups, Director Capps suggested a consensus to direct CEo staff to develop brief foundational documents for each potential group and further summarize notes from today's meeting for council review. Directors indicated consensus to move in this direction and will forward their top three choices for participation on groups by 5/30/18 to

Cheryl. Final details regarding subcommittees/work groups will be determined at the 6/27/18 EAC meeting.

- 5.0 EAC Informational Materials** - Cheryl reviewed the draft informational one pager, intended for directors and staff to share with audiences/interested stakeholders, and drawn from materials previously shared with EAC. Directors and others to share with audiences and interested stakeholders. Directors discussed nuances and made suggestions which CEdO will update; Directors provided consensus to use the document as adjusted.
- 6.0 Meeting Debrief** - Due to time constraints, this item was not discussed.
- 7.0 Public Comment** – for the record, Angela Bluhm noted no public testimony was received.
- 8.0 Adjourn** - Meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm