

**Meeting Notes**  
**Quality Education Commission**  
**Oregon Department of Education**  
**255 Capitol Street NE, Salem, Oregon 97301**  
**January 13, 2010**  
**10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.**

Present:

Susan Massey  
Frank McNamara  
Lynn Lundquist  
Beth Gerot

Brian Reeder  
Tom Owen  
Michael VanKleeck  
Diane Rush

Absent:

Duncan Wyse  
Emilio Hernandez  
Vic Backlund  
Marjorie Lowe (no Governor's office report today)  
Morgan Allen (no Legislative report today)

Welcome and Introductions

- **Note:** We are unable to connect commissioners by phone when meetings are held in the basement rooms.

New Member Update

- Governor's office was unable to confirm Stella Dadson. No reason was given.
- Chair Massey is working with Nancy Goss-Duran in the Governor's office to fill the vacant positions on the Commission.
- Paperwork has been submitted for Mark Mulvihill (replacing Ed Jensen)
- Paperwork has been submitted for Gail Rasmussen (replacing Larry Wolf, OEA)
- Paperwork has been submitted for Peter Tromba (from Eugene)
- Paperwork has been submitted for Maryalice Russell (replacing Deborah Sommer)

Member Updates

- Beth Gerot discussed the work of the QEC at the Oregon School Boards Association meeting (at the Sunday meeting)
- Lynn Lundquist is doing work related to charter schools

Reports:

- Ballot Measures 66 and 67
  - The two measures could possibly raise \$700 million. Some of this money would go to the districts for their potential K-12 losses.
  - The last poll showed 50% for both measures passing but still 20% undecided
  - Effect on schools will vary – some schools budgeted for it
  - Districts would show uneven effects
  - Districts are already beginning the process of next year's budget

- Anything significant will be challenged and things could be piece meal by the Legislature

### Best Practices Panel – Frank McNamara

- Panel has met twice to date
- Brian Reeder has developed several sets of data for the panel
- For high schools with student population over 300, Brian did regression analysis
- Much discussion over which case study to use
- Study whether course-taking sequence really matters (course-taking patterns are related to the results)
- Schools with student population over 300 are concerned about small rural schools.
- A new set of data was completed after the second meeting and checking if it could be paired demographically.
- Other things to look at:
  - Pairing similar size
  - January 22 is the next meeting
- Some data has been available since 1955
- The same five things identified will continue to drive the work
- Must focus on the one specific question asked by the Commission this time which is driving the work
- Frank McNamara has received no responses to the matrix he sent to panel members
- Panel member Ed Jensen responded that a matrix could be developed into a set of questions as a web-based survey. This would make it possible for it to go out to a broader base of schools (more than the original two dozen).
- If this can be done, we may find that course-taking may not be the key but that something else may come up as being equally as important.
- Results of the regression show that the course-taking variable was very strongly correlated and is significantly related.
- The percentage of students who qualify for free or reduced lunches also shows strong correlation.
- The statistical implication is that the correlation of poverty showing up with course-taking may be driving the result.
  - Brian will examine the data again.
  - This is important information to know
  - The four schools are all in Portland and show a very high percentage taking geometry and very low percentage passing the 10<sup>th</sup> grade test
  - Brian will confirm if the data are correct
  - Key aspect is the biggest factor being exposed to content or is it being prepared for it?
  - Keeping this in mind during the interviews is important
  - Students may not be ready to be pushed into the classes and may need more time to prepare
- Question: What kinds of schools do they choose to pair? 8 or 10 sets in over 300. Three sets of data from the smaller schools group will be pulled.
  - Good attendance at meetings
  - Core of 10 seem to participate; group is very motivated
  - A decision will be reached by the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting

- Web-based questionnaire
- Will meet again one month later.
- Report was prepared following the first meeting and and email update after second meeting
- Bring a written summary to Commission meetings
- Chair Susan Massey will outline and orient the specific question being asked for new members on the panels and new commissioners
- Update on Cost Panel – Beth Gerot
  - All newly appointed commissioners will serve on the Cost Panel
  - First meeting of Cost Panel was held on January 11, 2010
  - Brian Reeder has specific assignments with the panel and potential revisions to the interface (not many school districts use the interface of the model)
  - Brian is unsure how the school districts interface with the model but it is important to keep the flexibility (this makes it more difficult to use the model)
  - As a practical matter, if a parameter is changed, it would highlight it; now with multiple years it's nearly impossible to do that
  - In the past, legislators used it to change parameters; this was not very useful in the districts
  - A few districts have changed the model to make it look more like their district models (e.g., Corvallis, Lincoln County, Gresham)
  - If schools find it useful, it would be good to spend time to make that work out
  - Chair Susan Massey has been with Brian when he gave the demonstration to legislators; it was very useful to them. It is unclear how widely used that would be
  - Frank McNamara will be using the information at the Off the Record Meeting to provide useful information to school superintendents
  - Brian Reeder uses the model a great deal
  - Internally embedded in the model is all the data we collect here in some way; all of the data is connected
  - Susan Morgan in the Legislature was interested in the past; QEC would appreciate having more legislators to show this information to
    - How can we make the model better known in the Legislature?
    - Governor has called together forums in the past and there were times when it could have been done
  - Brian Reeder makes the code changes in the model and they come out with each new QEM report every two years
  - Michael VanKleeck is in the software business and can offer some guidance in that area
  - Structure of the model has not changed greatly but narrative has worked to make the changes identified
  - ODE is fairly separate from statewide information technology centers
  - There have been two attempts to pool all information technology services for higher ed, K-12, etc. and failed
  - ODE has autonomy in IT collection and IT storage systems
  - Cost Panel has been charged with adding a capital component to the model
    - Once a capital component is added to the model, it becomes comprehensive
    - Must be kept bifurcated and not just blend it in

- What are the start-up costs of school/school districts? (e.g., sell 30 year bonds rather than 75 year bonds for what makes sense from your starting point)
- Frank related his story about a building his organization once had for sale
  1. The vision of the life of the building makes all the difference
  2. The uses of the building also affects its life
  3. The variables are open to judgment
  4. Maintenance practices also affect the life of a building
- Now is the time to put in the time to do it and determine the annualized cost per student for capital costs
- The annualized cost could potentially be put into the model at different levels; this would greatly increase the gap
- Lynn Lundquist related his story regarding a group that came into Crook County years ago, talking about demolishing buildings
- Beth Gerot discussed the cost implications of proficiency-based instruction
  1. Is proficiency-based just another fad?
  2. How did Race to the Top application define the cost of proficiency-based?
- Cost Panel will coordinate with the Best Practices Panel and meet jointly with them
- Legislature has appointed facilities task force
  - They will report back to the Legislature in January 2011
  - Brian serves on the finance subcommittee of that task force
  - They have \$1.5 million to spend and they can hire consultants
  - Brian will propose a fairly simple model for a theoretical prototype school
  - Does not take into account the real situation of schools currently operating in Oregon
  - This new task force will be positive for the QEM (some districts cannot maintain their facilities and there is pressure from the districts)
  - What drives this task force:
    1. Districts that cannot get voters to pass a bond to pay for maintenance
    2. Short-sightedness of districts – maintenance vs. classroom needs
    3. Who decides which schools to close?
    4. Instructional component and how it impacts student achievement
  - Small schools did not have the payoff people expected but small schools communities and populations do support the data
  - It is appropriate to have the term *proficiency-based credits* defined
  - Colleen Mileham made an excellent presentation on this topic at the last QEC meeting that was anecdotal
  - New diploma talk came up years ago
    1. Granting credit for proficiency has been around forever – pass a test and you don't have to take a course
    2. Proficiency-based instruction/organization is now what we are involved with and it is based on demonstrating students have learned what they are supposed to learn (making time a variable)
    3. This is more of an approach than a structural change to the model – individualizing instruction in its simplest form

- It could take the dropout rate to zero
  - It does take more time
  - Use the schools where they buy-in
  - Look at contract time
- It is premature now to talk about changes to the model in terms of proficiency-based
- Careful talking about things costing more and looking like a bad idea
- It is more an investment than a cost
- Frank serves on the Higher Education Quality Education Commission where they are looking at the abilities of students coming in and retention rates and graduation rates
  1. One report was produced by the Higher Education QEC
  2. Frank will obtain copies of that report for the Commission
- What level of education must a student achieve to establish baseline level of education?
- Brian will provide a demo of the model for the Cost Panel and the QEC at the next meeting
  1. Brian has some difficulties with the way it sits now
  2. The front end has changed and looks different
  3. Could be most useful to have the ability to overlay an actual district over on the model (baseline/model/specific district)
- Course-Taking Analysis Update – Brian Reeder
  - Initially did simple correlations and there were moderate correlations
  - Next – bring in other factors and variables that affect student performance
  - Then to better understand if exposure to content or prior preparation is a larger factor
  - Devise some measure of their past preparation and what was done to prepare for taking the 10<sup>th</sup> grade assessment
  - Tom Owen stated that David Douglas gave him all of the course data for two cohorts
  - Brian will enhance regression with a prior year
  - We previously had data by school on a mobility factor (e.g., 8<sup>th</sup> grade vs. 10<sup>th</sup> grade)
  - To define a mobility rate we can follow kids around and create one easily
  - SES measures have been added
  - No preconceived notions of what the next step is going to tell us
    1. Pure effects
    2. Production function model

#### Next Meeting Dates

- QEC will not meet in February
- Monday, March 15, 2010 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
- Monday, May 10, 2010 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.