

Integrated Data Analysis: Student and Staff Surveys

A Toolkit for School Districts

May 2026



OREGON
DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

Oregon achieves . . . together!

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Contributors	2
Introduction.....	3
Purpose of the Toolkit.....	3
Intended Use and Outcomes	3
Definitions and Principles	4
What is Integrated Data Analysis?	4
Principles for Integrated Data Survey Data Use	4
Overview of the Statewide Student and Staff Surveys	6
Integrated Data Analysis Protocols	7
Integrated Data Analysis Planning Protocol	7
Notice and Wonder Protocol	8
Question Bank for Data Conversations Protocol.....	9
Case Study: Using Integrated Data Analysis to Explore Student Success Priorities	11
ODE’s Student Success Priorities.....	11
Appendix A	16
Accessing Survey Data	16
Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey	17
Student Health Survey (SHS).....	18
Elevating Voices in Education (EVE) Workforce Survey	19
Student Voice Summer Survey (SVSS)	20
Appendix B	21
Notice and Wonder Protocol: Facilitator Guide	21
Purpose of This Guide.....	21
When to Use This Protocol	21
Materials Needed	21
Facilitator Preparation (Before the Meeting)	21
Facilitation Steps	22

Executive Summary

Integrated Data Analysis: Student and Staff Surveys - A Toolkit for School Districts provides Oregon school districts with practical guidance for using multiple statewide surveys together to support equitable planning, improvement, and decision-making. By integrating student and staff voice from the Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey, the Student Health Survey (SHS), the Elevating Voices in Education (EVE) Workforce Survey, and the Student Voice Summer Survey (SVSS), the toolkit helps districts move beyond isolated data points to understand patterns in learning conditions, school climate, and system health. Grounded in research-based principles, it emphasizes equity-centered, strengths-based interpretation; attention to participation and local context; and responsible use of survey data. Structured protocols and a case study aligned to the Oregon Department of Education’s (ODE’s) Student Success Priorities demonstrate how integrated data analysis can surface both strengths and disparities, guiding collaborative inquiry and informed action rooted in the experiences of students and educators.



Contributors

This toolkit was developed as part of an ongoing collaboration between the Oregon Department of Education (ODE), the Oregon Health Authority (OHA), and the Educator Advancement Council (EAC) to support district use of statewide survey data. [ORS 329.078](#) requires ODE to “... review the surveys ... and make any revisions in the collection of data and the distribution of data to enable school districts to assist schools in providing an environment that encourages healthy and successful learners.” It will be updated regularly.

Questions should be sent to: ODE.SEEDSurveys@ode.oregon.gov

Introduction

Purpose of the Toolkit

Oregon’s vision for student success requires safe, inclusive learning environments; high-quality instruction; meaningful engagement with partners; a committed and supported workforce; and aligned systems that focus on equitable outcomes. This toolkit supports districts in bringing together statewide surveys through integrated data analysis. **This guide is designed to support equity-centered, strengths-based data use and responsible interpretation of statewide survey results.**

The statewide surveys referenced in this toolkit are:

1. Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey
2. Student Health Survey (SHS)
3. Elevating Voices in Education (EVE) Workforce Survey
4. Student Voice Summer Survey (SVSS)

Refer to [Appendix A](#) for more information about each survey.

Intended Use and Outcomes

The intended use of this resource is to support integrated planning and investment processes, school improvement cycles, and community engagement – helping ensure that student and educator voices are central to decision-making.¹

Through integrated survey data analysis, districts will be able to:

- Use data from multiple surveys to inform and understand root causes.
- Prioritize equitable outcomes for focal student groups and communities.
- Align actions and resources to district and state goals for all students.



¹ Examples of integrated planning and investment processes: Student Investment Accounts, Early Indicator and Investment Systems, Continuous Improvement Processes, HR/Retention Plans, School Improvement Plans.

Definitions and Principles

What is Integrated Data Analysis?

Data from one statewide survey tells only part of the story of experiences in schools. The insights are stronger when combined with results from other surveys and district data. Integrated data analysis uses multiple data sources and types to examine how different sources and types confirm, complement, or challenge one another. Integrated data analysis can help districts see patterns that aren't necessarily visible in a single dataset as well as understand complex problems – such as chronic absenteeism – from a holistic perspective.

Principles for Integrated Data Survey Data Use

The Oregon Department of Education and the Oregon Health Authority recommend that the following principles be applied when exploring data from multiple sources. This list is not necessarily exhaustive; however, it represents a set of key best practices for integrated data analysis.

- Use data through an equity-centered lens; communicate findings respectfully using strengths-based language.²
- Prioritize student and staff voice as essential - not ancillary - evidence for decision-making.³
- Ensure responsible interpretation by considering local context and implementation conditions: How do rates of poverty, houselessness, or other family and community contextual factors play a role in the data you're seeing?⁴
- Use holistic and inclusive indicators to avoid generalizing from single indicators and to reveal trends across groups and systems.⁵
- Use multiple measures – surveys complement but do not replace other local and state data sources.⁶
- Check participation and representativeness before interpreting. Review survey participation, note suppression risks.⁷

² Bocala, C., & Boudett, K. P. (2022). Looking at data through an equity lens. *Educational Leadership*.

³ Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Student voice across contexts: Fostering student agency in today's school. *Theory Into Practice*, 59(2), 182-191; Gillett-Swan, J. & Baroutsis, A. (2024). Student voice and teacher voice in educational research: A systematic review of 25 years of literature from 1995-2020. *Oxford Review of Education*, 50(4), 533-551.

⁴ Levinson, M., & Cohen, A. K. (2023). Social determinants of learning: Implications for research, policy, and practice. *AERA Open*, 9(1), 1-8.

⁵ Bernhardt, V. (2025). *Data analysis for continuous school improvement*, Routledge, New York, NY; Kolczynska, M. (2022). Combining multiple survey sources: A reproducible workflow and toolbox. *Methodological Innovations*, 15(1), 62-72.

⁶ Bernhardt, V. (2015). Towards systemwide change. *Educational Leadership*, 73(3), 56-61; National Forum on Education Statistics, (2022). Using education indicators: A forum guide for state and local education agencies. *U.S. Department of Education*.

⁷ National Forum on Education Statistics, (2022). Forum guide to data quality. *U.S. Department of Education*.

- Center student/staff/family voice in sense-making. Share the integrated data analysis back with survey participants and other involved groups to validate interpretations and refine action steps.⁸



⁸ Geurts, E. M. A., Reijis, R. P., Leenders, H. H. M., Jansen, M. W. J., & Hoebe, C. J. P. A. (2024). Co-creation and decision-making with students about teaching and learning: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Educational Change*, 25, 103-125.

Overview of the Statewide Student and Staff Surveys

In this section of the toolkit, the four statewide surveys are briefly described. More detailed information about each survey (e.g., administration processes, accessing results, and contact information) can be found in [Appendix A](#).

The **statewide surveys** referred to in this toolkit are:

1. Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey
2. Student Health Survey (SHS)
3. Elevating Voices in Education (EVE) Workforce Survey
4. Student Voice Summer Survey (SVSS)

Table 1 summarizes the topics and participants for each survey. Becoming familiar with what is asked for on each survey is an essential starting place for integrated data analysis. More detailed information about each survey can be found in [Appendix A](#).

Table 1: Summary of Statewide Surveys

Survey	Topics	Participants
SEED	Belonging, opportunity to learn and self-efficacy in academic areas, career connected learning, well-rounded education, extracurricular engagement, post-graduation planning, access to learning resources	3 rd - 11 th grade students. Districts must offer 3 rd - 11 th grade students an opportunity to participate.
SHS	Mental, physical, & sexual health; school climate; access to care; bullying; climate change; social media use; substance use; injury and violence; absenteeism; problem gambling; nutrition; suicide and self-harm; post-graduation planning	6 th , 8 th , and 11 th grade students. Districts must offer 6 th , 8 th , and 11 th grade students an opportunity to participate.
EVE	Workplace climate, culture, and conditions; job satisfaction; professional development and advancement; well-being and belonging	Teachers, administrators, classified school staff
SVSS	Sense of belonging, identity-affirming environment, student voice and choice, mental health, well-being, safety, well-rounded learning opportunities	3 rd - 12 th grade students in summer programs

Note that each survey has a distinct focus: the SEED survey emphasizes conditions related to learning in schools during the school year, the SHS explores the intersection between health and learning, the EVE Workforce Survey gathers educator perspectives on topics that impact student learning, and the SVSS leverages student perceptions about their expanded learning experiences over the summer. “Belonging” as a topic cuts across all four surveys.

Integrated Data Analysis Protocols

In this section, three protocols are provided to help schools districts look at their data in an integrated way using the four statewide surveys. A facilitator is recommended for each protocol. A sample facilitator’s guide for the Notice and Wonder Protocol is provided in [Appendix B](#).

Integrated Data Analysis Planning Protocol

This planning protocol draws from research-based principles for integrated data analysis. It offers a basic model for moving through the research cycle.

1. Identify leadership and members of a data team.
 - a. This could be an existing group, such as a District Equity Committee, or the convening of a one-time group.
2. Identify research questions.
 - a. These questions are your goals. Clear goals will determine how you filter and prepare your survey results.
3. Identify and gather data.
 - a. Retrieve the survey results from their sources.
 - b. Create a file or document with data relevant to your goals/research questions.
 - c. Consider if your data exploration would benefit from other data sources, such as attendance data, local school climate surveys with students, staff, and families, and local/regional data about social and economic factors.
4. Discuss the data.
 - a. As a team, make observations, check participation and representativeness, refine research questions, and determine if additional data are needed.
5. Examine the data.
 - a. Identify patterns and areas of alignment or inconsistencies or dissonance in the data sources. Draft potential “if-then” statements that connect conditions to outcomes related to student/staff experiences in schools. Generate potential interpretations, keeping in mind asset-based framing.
6. Develop a plan for using actionable insights.
 - a. Post-analysis actions include communicating findings to district leadership, parent and family groups, community partners, and student groups; co-constructing goals with involved school community members; and recording suggestions for further integrated data analysis.

Notice and Wonder Protocol

This protocol centers *what* the data say before interpreting *why* and creates space for multiple perspectives. It is effective for integrated data analysis because it is designed to support exploration of multiple surveys that measure related, but not identical, constructs.

1. Establish clear purpose and norms
 - a. Name the focus of the data review (e.g., student sense of belonging, engagement in learning)
 - b. Set norms: avoid “means,” “because,” or “caused by;” honor student and staff voice as valid expertise; use strengths-based, non-judgmental language
2. Prepare the data for integrated viewing
 - a. Display data in parallel formats (e.g., same grade bands, same student groups, same years)
 - b. Use simple data visuals with clear labels
3. Individual, silent noticing
 - a. Individuals write what they observe, using sentences such as “I notice staffing-related support results on EVE are lower than student-reported support results on SHS” “Across surveys, I notice that middle school students report lower belonging than high school students” “The percentage of students who report that an adult at their school cares about them is between 85-90% for elementary school students on the SEED Survey and the Student Voice Summer Survey”
4. Share and cluster “notice” statements
 - a. Facilitator chooses a format for sharing that promotes equity of voice
 - b. Record “notice” statements on chart paper, cluster by theme
 - c. Redirect interpretation statements back to “notice” statements
5. Individual, silent wondering
 - a. Wonder questions are generated using sentence stems such as, “I wonder why...” “I wonder how students might experience...” “I wonder what else we would need to know about...” “I wonder how staff perspectives related to what students reported...”
 - b. Strong wonder questions are open-ended, avoid blaming, center system conditions over individuals, and invite multiple data sources or voices
6. Share and cluster “wonder” questions
 - a. Facilitator chooses a format for sharing that promotes equity of voice
 - b. Record “wonder” questions on chart paper, cluster by theme
 - c. Redirect attempts to answer the questions back to sharing and grouping by theme

- d. Note: this step often reveals shared assumptions, data gaps, and new inquiry directions
7. Identify priority wonders for deeper inquiry
 - a. Move from many questions to focused learning: Which wonder(s) are most aligned with district priorities? Which involve student voice across multiple surveys? Which could inform action if explored further?
 - b. Product: 1-3 priority wonders to carry forward (documentation of questions, not conclusions)
 8. Next steps planning
 - a. Clarify what comes next. Examples include examining disaggregated data, conducting empathy interviews, revisiting survey items for deeper understanding, connecting to improvement planning or professional learning
 - b. This last step is important for laying a data-informed foundation for actionable insights.

Question Bank for Data Conversations Protocol

This protocol uses a set of prompts to help data review teams make meaning of multiple data sources, and stay focused on shared priorities, surface patterns, context, and root causes. Rather than asking, “What do these survey results say?” this protocol encourages participants to ask, “What story do these data tell us together?”

1. Prepare the context for integrated data analysis
 - a. Clarify why these four surveys are being viewed together and establish conversational norms: stay curious, name strengths before needs, center student/staff voice, treat questions as generative not interrogative, distinguish data signals from conclusions
 - b. Prompts: *What problem of practice are we exploring today? Which student or staff experiences are we most trying to understand or improve? How will we ensure this conversation remains strengths-based and equity-centered?*
2. Establish the contribution of each survey
 - a. Position the surveys as complementary lenses
 - b. Prompts: *What types of experiences are captured well by each survey? Where do we see conceptual overlap across surveys? Whose voices are present – and whose may still be missing?*
3. Notice patterns within and across surveys
 - a. Examine aligned domains (e.g., relationships), looking for converging evidence, disaggregating where possible and appropriate

Case Study: Using Integrated Data Analysis to Explore Student Success Priorities

In this final section of the toolkit, an example is offered of integrated data analysis using all four statewide surveys and ODE's five Student Success Priorities. In this example, data tables have been prepared using state-level results to demonstrate an exploration of student and staff voice data as indicators of system health measurements.

ODE's Student Success Priorities

One of the central organizing components of improving the educational experiences of all Oregon students is ODE's [five priorities for student success](#):

- High Quality Learning Experiences for All Students,
- Aligned and Focused Educational Systems,
- Engaged Partners and Communities,
- Safe and inclusive Schools, and
- Committed and Supported Staff.

For each priority, ODE has identified levers for change and system health measurements. By utilizing your survey data to track system health, you can build support for accountability metrics and help meet your district's targets.

Data teams need to be familiar with what is in each survey to select data that addresses their research goals. In the last section, each protocol began with identifying a research goal.

For this case study, the goal is based on ODE's Student Success Priorities of Safe and Inclusive Schools as well as Committed and Supported Staff. The four statewide surveys offer districts insight into student and staff perspectives related to each priority area. Table 2 shows state-level survey results for sample items from each survey that connect to the priority Safe and Inclusive Schools. While state-level results are offered as an example, districts will want to examine district or ESD level data to learn more about their own systems. Note that the results include students at multiple grade levels. The SEED Survey includes results from students in grades 3-11, the Student Health Survey includes results from students in grades 6, 8, and 11, and the Student Voice Summer Survey includes results from students in grades 3-12.

Table 2: 2024-25 Survey Responses (SEED, SHS, EVE Workforce, and EVE)

Survey	Item	Responses				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
SEED	I feel safe talking with adults at my school	31%	51%	13%	5%	
SHS	I feel safe at my school	21%	50%	11%	4%	
		Strongly Agree/Agree			Strongly Disagree/Disagree	
SVSS	I feel safe at my summer program	87%			13%	
		Very	Quite	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at All
EVE	How confident are you that you can foster respectful relationships between students?	28%	34%	14%	3%	1%
EVE	How confident are you that you can create a welcoming environment for students?	47%	28%	4%	<10%	<1%

The system health measurement for Safe and Inclusive Schools that is most aligned with these survey items is “Scholars feel safe within their classrooms and schools.” A related system health measurement is “Scholars feel a sense of belonging within their classrooms and schools.”

There are different ways data teams can explore the student and staff perception data in Table 1. For example, teams could look for patterns that show up across the different surveys. In this case, most students across the state say they feel safe at school (71% on SHS, 81% on SEED, and 87% on SVSS). Educators report that they feel confident in building respectful relationships and creating welcoming environments. These results suggest that educators’ confidence matches most students in Oregon reporting feeling safe in school.

From an equity perspective, a next step might be to break these results into student groups to see if all students feel safe at the same levels. Some helpful prompts from the Question Bank for Data Conversations Protocol include:

- *What types of experiences are captured well by each survey?*
- *Whose voices are present – and whose may still be missing?*
- *What might be contributing to these patterns in our local context?*
- *How do instructional practices, school climate, or system structures show up in these data?*
- *What assumptions might we be making – and how can we check them?*

- *What additional data or student/community input would help us refine our analysis?*

Table 3 shows survey results that are aligned with the system health measurements from two student success priorities: Committed and Supportive Staff and Safe and Inclusive Schools.

Table 3: 2024-25 Survey Responses (SEED, SHS, EVE Workforce, and EVE)

Survey	Item	Responses				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
SEED	There are adults at my school who are like me and my family	25%	45%	20%	10%	
SHS	It is easy to talk with teachers and other adults at this school.	23%	46%	14%	6%	
		Yes		No		Not Sure
SHS	There is at least one teacher or other adult in my school that really cares about me.	69%		13%		18%
		Strongly Agree/Agree			Strongly Disagree/Disagree	
SVSS	Adults in my summer program respect people from different backgrounds.	93%			7%	
		Very	Quite	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at All
EVE	How confident are you that you can create a welcoming environment for students?	47%	28%	4%	<10%	<1%

As with the previous example, the statewide results show that many feel connected to teachers or other adults at school. Most teachers also say they feel confident creating welcoming environments. Together, these results help show the system health measurements for Committed and Supportive Staff and Safe and Inclusive Schools can be drawn.

At the same time, the data also show that some students do not feel safe or connected. Since Oregon's Student Success Priorities are intended to reach all students, we need to learn more about which students are not feeling a sense of belonging.

To dig deeper, some of the student voice data can be broken down by student groups. Not all the statewide survey data is publicly released this way. For example, SEED Survey results cannot be broken down by student group at the survey item level, but ODE does share SEED Survey results by

student group (as reported on the SSID) for some of the survey's domains.⁹ Table 4 shows the SEED Survey domain scores for sense of belonging among 6th-8th grade students, sorted from highest to lowest by student group. For this exercise, districts would want to refer to their own data, not just to state-level data.

Table 4: 2024-25 6th-8th grade Students' Domain Score Responses for Sense of Belonging, by Student Group (SEED Survey)

Student Group (as reported on SSID)	Domain Score	Count of Respondents
Asian	74	3,044
Recent Arriver	70	1,134
Male	69	30,405
All Students	68	61,736
Multiracial	68	4,696
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	68	553
White	68	35,988
English Learner	68	8,796
Female	67	31,087
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	67	15,747
In Migrant Education	67	1,247
Students With Disabilities	66	7,613
Black/African American	65	1,221
Experiencing Poverty	65	18,153
Experiencing Homelessness	64	1,725
American Indian/Alaska Native	63	487
In Foster Care	63	247
Nonbinary	60	244

By breaking down the data, we can see a more complete picture of which students are not feeling a sense of belonging in school. In the 2024-25 results for 6th-8th grade students, many student groups – a total of 14 - reported lower domain scores than the “all students” domain score.

Often, integrated data analysis may lead to new questions. For example, the results shown in Table 3 can be compared with results from 6th and 8th grade students who participated in the 2024-25 Student Health Survey, to see if similar patterns appear. Districts may also have their own

⁹ For more detailed explanation of how ODE creates domain scores from items on the SEED Survey, refer to [Understanding Domain Scores](#), located on the [SEED Survey webpage](#).

local surveys. Statewide data and local data can be used together to better understand the focus (in this example, Safe and Inclusive Schools and Committed and Supportive Staff).

It's important to consider local context. What conditions are present that might impact students' sense of belonging? For example, what challenges do students experiencing poverty face that may limit their connections in schools? How are McKinney-Vento programs being implemented? Looking at local context helps keep integrated data analysis focused on the systems level and avoids blaming individual students. This produces results that are actionable for districts and schools.



Appendix A

Accessing Survey Data

- **Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey**
 - To obtain state, Education Service District (ESD) boundary, and district results, go to the [SEED Survey webpage](#), and scroll down to the “Survey Results and Specifications” section. The state report is also in the “Survey Results” section.
 - Note: Districts receive their item-level results through the Achievement Data Insight application. Contact your district’s [District Security Administrator](#) to access item-level results.
- **Student Health Survey (SHS)**
 - To obtain state and county results, go to the Oregon Health Authority’s [Health Surveys webpage](#).
 - To obtain ESD-level results [submit a request here](#)
 - Note: Districts receive their item-level results privately through the survey delivery vendor. To obtain school and district level data you need Superintendent approval.
- **Elevating the Voices in Education (EVE) Workforce Survey**
 - To obtain state, Regional Education Network (REN) boundary, Education Service District (ESD) boundary, and district results, go to the [EVE Workforce Survey webpage](#), and scroll down to “Survey Results and Reporting.” The state legislative report is also in the “Survey Results” section.
- **Student Voice Summer Survey (SVSS)**
 - To obtain district-level results, email ODE at ODE.SummerLearning@ode.oregon.gov
 - To read a state-level report, go to the [State Summer Learning Grant webpage](#), and scroll down to the “Past Reports” section.

On the following pages, information about each of the surveys is provided in a table format. These tables can be reproduced and used as handouts when exploring the survey data with people who are unfamiliar with the four statewide surveys.

Student Educational Equity Development (SEED) Survey

Survey webpage	SEED Survey webpage
Which state agency oversees the survey?	Oregon Department of Education
Who is required to provide this survey?	School districts (as provided in ORS 329.078, 2023)
What population is surveyed?	3rd to 11th grade students *Alt-SEED available for students who use alternative assessments
When is the survey administered?	Early February to mid-June
What is the degree of anonymity and privacy?	Private (survey responses are individually identifiable, but this information is not shared outside of ODE unless there is a student safety concern)
In what languages is the survey available?	English, Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Ukrainian, Chinese (Simplified and Traditional), Arabic
How long does it take to complete the survey, on average?	20 minutes
Is parental notification required?	Yes
How do participants (or, if applicable, parents/guardians) decline to participate?	Parents/guardians may decline their student's participation, verbally or in writing during the administration window. Students may decline to participate in the entire survey. Students may choose not to answer a particular question.
What topics are covered?	Access to learning resources; opportunity to learn; self-efficacy; sense of belonging; well-rounded education; career connected learning; extracurricular engagement; post-graduation planning
What level of results are shared?	State-level and ESD boundary results: aggregate item and domain score data publicly reported District-level results: privately reported aggregate item data made available to individual districts; aggregate domain score data publicly reported
Can results be broken down by groups?	Domain scores can be disaggregated by student groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, students receiving special education services, students experiencing poverty and other groups)

Student Health Survey (SHS)

Survey webpage	Student Health Survey
Which state agency oversees the survey?	Oregon Health Authority
Who is required to provide this survey?	School districts (as provided in ORS 329.078, 2023)
What population is surveyed?	6th, 8th, and 11th grade students
When is the survey administered?	Districts select a two-week window between October and December
What is the degree of anonymity and privacy?	Anonymous (survey responses are not linked to any identifying student data)
In what languages is the survey available?	English, Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Somali, Chinese (Simplified)
How long does it take to complete the survey, on average?	30 minutes
Is parental notification required?	Yes
How do participants (or, if applicable, parents/guardians) decline to participate?	Parents/guardians may decline their student's participation, verbally or in writing before the survey is run. Students may decline to participate in the entire survey. Students may choose not to answer a particular question.
What topics are covered?	Mental, physical, & sexual health; school climate; access to care; bullying; climate change; social media use; substance use; injury and violence; absenteeism; problem gambling; nutrition; suicide and self-harm; post-graduation planning; demographics. Note: some topics vary across even and odd years.
What level of results are shared?	State-level results : publicly reported County-level results : publicly reported ESD-level results: available on request District & School level results: privately reported data made available to individual districts. Districts may share data on request.
Can results be broken down by groups?	Individual item results can be viewed by demographical data through the data portal

Elevating Voices in Education (EVE) Workforce Survey

Survey webpage	EVE Workforce Survey
Which state agency oversees the survey?	Oregon Department of Education
Who is required to provide this survey?	All public education providers (defined in ORS 342.676, 2023): School districts, Public charter schools, Education service districts, Long term care or treatment facilities as described in ORS 343.961, The Youth Corrections Education Program, The Juvenile Detention Education Program, The Oregon School for the Deaf
What population is surveyed?	Licensed and Classified Staff employed and under contract by the public education provider
When is the survey administered?	Early February to mid-March
What is the degree of anonymity and privacy?	Anonymous (survey responses are not linked to any identifying staff data)
In what languages is the survey available?	English, Spanish
How long does it take to complete the survey, on average?	15 minutes
Is parental notification required?	N/A
How do participants (or, if applicable, parents/guardians) decline to participate?	Staff may choose not to participate in the survey. Staff may choose not to respond to particular questions.
What topics are covered?	Workplace climate, culture, and conditions; job satisfaction; professional development and advancement; well-being and belonging
What level of results are shared?	State-level results, ESD boundary results, REN boundary results, District-level results: aggregate item and domain score data publicly reported
Can results be broken down by groups?	Domain scores can be viewed by role (e.g., administration, teacher, staff)

Student Voice Summer Survey (SVSS)

Survey webpage	State Summer Learning Grant webpage
Which state agency oversees the survey?	Oregon Department of Education
Who is required to provide this survey?	Recipients of the State Summer Learning Grant and 21 st CCLC Grant who offer summer learning programming in Oregon
What population is surveyed?	3rd-12 th grade students who participate in a summer learning program funded by a State Summer Learning or 21 st CCLC Grant
When is the survey administered?	June to September (typically administered during the last week of summer programming)
What is the degree of anonymity and privacy?	Anonymous (survey responses are not linked to any identifying student data)
In what languages is the survey available?	English, Spanish, *Vietnamese, *Russian <i>*Available beginning 2027</i>
How long does it take to complete the survey, on average?	15 minutes
Is parental notification required?	No
How do participants (or, if applicable, parents/guardians) decline to participate?	Student may decline to participate in the entire survey. Students may choose not to answer a particular question.
What topics are covered?	Sense of belonging, identity-affirming environment, student voice and choice, mental health, well-being, safety, well-rounded learning opportunities
What level of results are shared?	State-level, by item, publicly reported District-level data by request from the district, shared privately
Can results be broken down by groups?	No

Appendix B

Notice and Wonder Protocol: Facilitator Guide

Purpose of This Guide

This facilitator guide supports district and school leadership teams in leading objective, equity-centered data conversations using the *Notice & Wonder Protocol*. The protocol intentionally separates observation (what we see) from interpretation (what we think it means) to support disciplined sensemaking—especially when integrating multiple surveys that reflect different voices and systems.

When to Use This Protocol

Use this guide when:

- Reviewing newly released survey results
- Comparing findings across multiple surveys
- Exploring differences across grade bands, student groups, or years
- Preparing for deeper inquiry, stakeholder engagement, or improvement planning

This protocol is most effective **early in the analysis process**, before decisions or action steps are determined.

Suggested Session Length: 60–90 minutes (adjustable)

Segment	Time
Purpose, norms, and setup	10 min
Individual Notice	5 min
Group Notice share	10–15 min
Individual Wonder	5 min
Group Wonder share	10–15 min
Prioritizing Wonder questions	10–15 min
Closing and next steps	5–10 min

Materials Needed

- Prepared data displays (slides, dashboard, or printed handouts)
- Chart paper or shared digital note-taking space
- Two clearly labeled sections: NOTICES and WONDERS
- Sticky notes or digital equivalents (optional)

Facilitator Preparation (Before the Meeting)

1. Clarify the focus area (e.g., belonging, engagement, access to supports).

2. Select aligned data across the four surveys (same grades, student groups, or timeframes when possible).
3. Ensure visual simplicity—use clearly labeled charts.
4. Review survey content and purpose so you can help participants distinguish between similar-sounding constructs, domains, and topics.
5. Plan reminders to redirect interpretation back to noticing when needed.

Facilitation Steps

Step 1: Set Purpose, Context, and Norms

Time: 10 minutes

Facilitator Script (adapt as needed):

“Today we’re using the Notice & Wonder Protocol to look at data from multiple statewide surveys. Our goal is not to explain or solve yet, but to understand what the data are telling us—across student and staff voices—before we draw conclusions.”

Share Key Norms

- Notice = facts only (what is visible in the data)
- Wonder = questions, not answers or explanations
- Avoid words like *because*, *means*, or *caused by*
- Use strength-based, non-judgmental language
- Treat student and staff voices as expertise

Post or display norms throughout the session.

Step 2: Frame the Data for Integrated Viewing

Time: 5 minutes

Facilitator Actions:

- Name which surveys are included and whose perspectives they reflect.
- Clarify what participants should look for (patterns, similarities, differences—not reasons).
- Confirm shared understanding of key terms when necessary.

Example Framing:

“You’ll see student-reported belonging from SEED alongside SHS protective factors and staff perceptions from EVE. Right now, we’re just looking for what stands out.”

Step 3: Individual Silent Notice

Time: 5 minutes

Participant Task: Individually review the data and write **only observable statements**.

Sentence stems to display:

- “I notice that...”
- “Across surveys, ... appears higher/lower...”
- “I notice a difference/similarity between...”

Examples of strong “notice” statements:

- “I notice that 10th-grade students report lower belonging on SEED than 7th-grade students.”
- “I notice that staff access to support on EVE is lower than student-reported support on SHS.”

No discussion yet.

Step 4: Share and Record Group Notices

Time: 10–15 minutes

Facilitation Tips:

- Invite participants to share one notice at a time.
- Record statements verbatim in the NOTICES section.
- Group similar notices, without summarizing or interpreting.

If interpretation appears, gently redirect:

“Let’s pause—how could we restate that as something we directly observe in the data?”

Step 5: Individual Silent Wonder

Time: 5 minutes

Participant Task: Based on what was noticed, write open-ended questions.

Sentence stems to display

- “I wonder why...”
- “I wonder how students experience...”
- “I wonder what else we would need to know about...”
- “I wonder how staff perspectives relate to...”

Examples:

- “I wonder how students define ‘support’ across different surveys.”
- “I wonder how staffing capacity in EVE relates to student belonging in SEED.”

Step 6: Share and Cluster Wonder Questions

Time: 10–15 minutes

Facilitator Role:

- Capture all wonder questions in the WONDERS section.
- Cluster by theme (e.g., relationships, access, engagement, systems).
- Avoid answering or validating one question over another.

If deficit-based framing appears, reframe toward systems or conditions:

“How might we phrase that as a question about conditions rather than people?”

Step 7: Prioritize Wonders for Deeper Inquiry

Time: 10–15 minutes

Participant Task: Work as a group to select 1–3 priority wonder questions using criteria such as:

- Alignment to district or school priorities
- Relevance across multiple surveys
- Potential to inform improvement if explored further

Sample Prompt

“Which of these wonder questions, if explored further, could most help us better support students?”

Document the selected questions clearly.

Step 8: Close and Name Next Steps

Time: 5–10 minutes

Participant Task: Clarify what comes next

Examples may include:

- Disaggregating data for specific student groups
- Reviewing qualitative data or listening sessions
- Engaging students or staff in follow-up conversations
- Connecting findings to improvement planning

Closing Script:

“Notice & Wonder helps us slow down, so our actions are grounded in what students and staff are actually telling us. Today’s priority wonder questions will guide our next phase of learning.”

Facilitation Tips for Success:

- Protect silence—thinking time matters
- Expect and normalize discomfort with not jumping to solutions
- Honor differences across surveys rather than forcing alignment

- Re-center student voice if adult perspectives dominate

Optional Adaptations:

- Virtual meetings: Use chat or collaborative documents for notices and wonders
- Student participation: Use smaller groups and student-friendly language
- Extended sessions: Pair this protocol with a root cause or empathy interview process