

Report Card Redesign Project

Final Report Card Content Recommendations

Oregon School Report Card Steering Committee

Co-chair Tony Hopson, Sr., President & CEO, Self-Enhancement, Inc. (SEI)

Co-chair Sandy Husk, Superintendent, Salem-Keizer School District

David W. Edwards, Project Manager

April 15, 2013

Background

The Oregon School Report Card Steering Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) was assembled in September 2012 to provide the Deputy Superintendent with a comprehensive recommendation for a “best in class” annual school and district report card.

The Committee was convened to recommend a design, content, and rating methodology for Oregon’s annual school and district report card with the following qualities:

- Present clear, easily understood report for all stakeholders on how schools and districts are performing relative to others.
- Build awareness and acceptance of common metrics that define excellence. These should reinforce, but not be limited to, metrics adopted by the OEIB for achievement compacts and metrics established in Oregon’s approved ESEA Flexibility Application for the identification of Priority, Focus, and Model schools.
- Drive high-level strategy, allowing for intervention and support, especially in a school or district with a large and not improving achievement gap for students of color and English language learners.
- Facilitate public accountability at the state, district, and school-level, especially in a district with a large and not improving achievement gap.
- Show progress toward excellence, rather than simply a snapshot in time.
- Evolve over time as a living document, changing as data availability expectations, or goals change.
- Provide dynamic, online access to report card data, in addition to an annual, static report.

The volunteer Committee consists of 17 members, including co-chairs Tony Hopson, Sr., President and CEO, Self-Enhancement, Inc. (SEI) and Sandy Husk, Superintendent, Salem-Keizer School District. (For a full list of Committee members, see Appendix A.) Staff members from the Department of Education have participated on the Committee in an advisory capacity re: data collection and rating methodologies.

The Committee has met once or twice a month since its initial September meeting, receiving reports and public input via broad-based outreach efforts. Public outreach efforts have been funded by a generous grant from the Oregon Community Foundation (OCF) in the amount of \$ 75,000. These monies have been used to fund two large-scale Web surveys and an accompanying online media campaign designed to encourage public comment on the current state-issued school report cards and the Committee’s report card prototypes.

More specifically, the public outreach process has consisted of three distinct phases. The public outreach process began in earnest in October with a series of targeted pre-design focus groups.

During these groups, the Committee gathered input from key stakeholder representatives on potential report card metrics and designs. Each group consisted of eight to ten participants and ran about 90 minutes. This phase consisted of 12 focus groups and 99 participants:

- Four among parents (organized by the Parent Teacher Association and Self-Enhancement, Inc.; included one group among Spanish-language parents and another among parents of color)
- Three among teachers (organized by the Oregon Education Association; four were planned, but there were only enough participants to constitute three groups)
- Four among administrators (organized by the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators)
- One among students (organized by Self-Enhancement, Inc.)

The results of the first phase informed the development of two first-draft report card prototypes which were subsequently evaluated via a comprehensive online survey conducted in January. The survey was accessible from a public outreach website: oregonreportcardproject.org. Sample for the survey came from three sources: 1) a reputable panel vendor (for parents); 2) email solicitations from key stakeholder groups; and 3) ad hoc respondents prompted to take the survey by an Internet campaign (social media and banner ads on various media and education-related sites). The total sample size was over 1,300 and split about evenly between parents/concerned citizens and professional educators. One of the key findings was that three times as many respondents (over 60%) liked the prototypes over the current state-issued report card. Respondents appreciated both the content and design of the prototypes, with most rating them highly in terms of clarity, readability and relevance.

The results of the second phase, in turn, helped the Committee refine its initial report card prototypes. The resultant prototypes underwent a similar online evaluation from February 28th to March 10th. Over 1,100 surveys were completed during this round. As in the previous round, the prototypes were generally considered three times more appealing than the current report card.

The results led to the development of a single, hybrid prototype, which was, in turn, subject to review via focus groups during the third week of March and the first week of April. This round of focus groups consisted of two groups of parents (one of which consisted entirely of parents of color), two groups of teachers (one in Portland and another in Salem) and one group of administrators. Thirty-six people total participated in these discussions, providing valuable feedback on the penultimate version of the recommended report card. The Committee further refined this iteration of the report card in its final meetings.

This report constitutes the Committee's ultimate recommendations to the Oregon Department of Education. It addresses the following:

- High school report cards

- Middle school report cards
- Elementary school report cards
- District report cards;
- Supplemental website
- Recommendations for future action

The latter acknowledges that the Department’s report cards are living documents which require continuous improvement.

Report Card Recommendations

The following details the Committee’s final report card content recommendations based on a combination of public input and considered discussion. Given that the high school report card entails the largest range and number of elements, that document is described first, with the middle school and elementary report cards following. Fully designed prototypes of these documents have been provided under separate cover. Please note that the Committee expects the Oregon Department of Education to issue report cards in both English and Spanish as well as consider other languages as necessary.

High School Report Card

Header

Purpose: to clearly identify the school and responsible administration. These descriptive points are intended to run along the top of each page of the report card.

Report Card Element	Source
Name of high school	District/ODE
Street address	District/ODE
Main phone number	District/ODE
URL for school (or district in absence of separate school website)	District/ODE
Name of principal	District/ODE
Name of superintendent	District/ODE
Grades served, e.g., 9 – 12 (if necessary, include grades offered with no students)	District/ODE

Letter from the Principal

Purpose: to personalize and improve the relevance of the report card. The Committee recommends limiting this letter to no more than 250 words (or the rough equivalent in characters) and requiring principals address the following:

- The school's performance as reflected in the overall state rating.
- The interventions, initiatives or other actions designed to address identifiable weaknesses, e.g., closing the achievement gap. This portion should be both backward- and forward-looking in order to explain what happened in the previous academic year and to outline plans for the new academic year. Comments made along these lines should be consistent with the school's school improvement plan (SIP).
- The school's expectations of and/or strategies for involving parents, e.g., the school expects parents to read to their children every night for 20 minutes.

In terms of format, the Committee recommends providing a template for the letter and encouraging the use of bullet-points as much as practicable.

Below, you'll find a sample letter that, with modification, could be used as a template:

Dear Parents and Community Members,

This redesigned annual report card issued by the Oregon Department of Education offers a comprehensive picture of what Anytown High School offers.

In the 2012-2013 school year, Anytown High School received an Overall State Rating of average. That means our students are performing about as well on standards-based tests and graduating in about the same numbers as students at other Oregon high schools. When compared to schools with similar student demographics, Anytown High School is above average. That means our students are generally outperforming those at like-schools.

Key academic highlights:

- 89% met/exceeded state standards for reading
- 80% met/exceeded state standards for math
- Our graduation rate for students who attended Anytown High School all four years increased by 10 percentage points

In the same time frame, however, we have seen relatively slow growth in our writing scores. We've chosen to address this issue by focusing our resources on implementing the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which reinforce literacy across content areas. We promise to deliver the same excellence you have come to expect from us here at Anytown High School.

You can help by monitoring your student’s homework, attending parent-teacher conferences, or even volunteering. You can review your student’s assignments and grades at any time by visiting www.anytowngrades.org.

We look forward to partnering with you over the coming year to make sure all of our students reach their potential!

In the event a principal fails to supply a letter, the default will be a letter from the Deputy State Superintendent.

School Profile

Purpose: to provide an overview of the school’s most salient characteristics—those aspects that are likely to impact student test scores or other academic outcomes.

Report Card Element / Definition or Rule	Source
Enrollment (Based on student count as of May 1 to ensure enrollment aligns with the testing population.)	District/ODE
Percentage change from the previous year (+/-)	District/ODE
Average class size in core classes (Based on average number of students in core classes—defined as those required for graduation, namely, English, math, science and social studies. The Committee understands that the fall 2013 report cards may use a ratio of certified teachers to students in core classes as an interim measure.)	District/ODE
Percentage of English language learners (Definition: students who whose first language is not English who receive direct language instruction <i>or who have completed a language instruction program</i> . This means any student who has ever received direct language instruction should be included in this group.)	District/ODE
Percentage of low income students (Definition: students eligible for free/reduced lunch.)	District/ODE
Percentage of students with disabilities (Definition: students eligible for special education services, including both those on IEPs and those qualified for IEPs whose parents/guardians have refused services.)	District/ODE
Number of different languages spoken	District (Based on student enrollment forms noting first language)
Student race/ethnicity breakdown (displayed in pie chart)	District (Based on student enrollment forms noting race/ethnicity)

Overall State Rating: How are students performing compared to those at other schools?

Purpose: to provide a summary measure of student performance. The Committee recommends showing two distinct views of the overall state rating. The first compares the subject school to every other school in its category, e.g., Anytown High School vs. all Oregon high schools, on a normative five-point scale. The second compares the subject school to Oregon schools with similar student demographics or like-schools, along a similar scale. The Committee leaves it up to the Oregon Department of Education to determine how, exactly, like-schools are defined. But we expect the department to arrive at a reasonable formulation, taking into account the most salient profiling data, such as enrollment, student composition by factors like income and race, and per pupil spending. Standard principle components analysis, e.g., factor analysis, will best reveal the factors that make significant contributions to the overall state rating.

The recommended text follows:

The overall state rating is intended to summarize this school’s particular successes and challenges. It’s based on a combination of four factors. Three of these factors come from standards-based test scores from 11th graders in reading and math. The fourth is graduation rate. Please be aware that this rating is based mainly on high-stakes testing and accordingly, represents a limited view of student performance. Other aspects of this report card are designed to put this rating in the proper context.

Compared to other high schools statewide, this school is [insert semantic score].

Compared to high schools with similar student demographics, this school is [insert semantic score].

[The scales for each of these scores will vary as necessary based on the relevant cut-offs for each of the five points. The explanation of the semantic scale will follow the same format for each. This basic format is provided below.]

Significantly below average = Falls into the bottom x% of schools

Below average = Falls between x% and x% of schools

Approaches average = Falls between x% and x% of schools

Average = Falls between x% and x% of schools

Better than average = Falls into the top x% of schools

Progress: Are students making gains over time?

Purpose: to describe the extent to which students are making progress on standards-based tests. The Committee recommends this section provide a general overview of student performance on state exams in the following areas: reading, mathematics, writing and science. (The Committee understands that some areas, specifically, writing, may not be applicable in future years.)

The data for each subject area will consist of the following:

- School performance for the previous three years, e.g., 2010 – 2012. The graphics will show the percentage of students who did not meet, met and exceeded state standards. The latter two data points will be shown both separately and together (see prototype for illustrative).

- School performance for current academic year (defined as the year in which testing occurred, e.g., 2013 for the 2012 – 2013 academic year).
- Oregon average (statewide averages for did not meet, met and exceeded).
- Like-schools average (comparison school averages for did not meet, met and exceeded).

The Committee also recommends this section remind readers of the availability of additional state exam results online.

Outcomes: What are students achieving?

Purpose: to report key measures of success. The Committee recommends this section consist of the elements noted below across the same dimensions in the Progress section—school performance for the previous three years, along with the current year, etc.

Report Card Element	Source
On Track Freshmen on track to graduate within 4 years (Definition: students entering as sophomores who completed at least 6 credits in core classes)	District
Graduation Rate (Definition: students graduating with a standard, modified or extended diploma within 4 years) Overall graduation rate (Based on enrollment minus dropouts who have not re-enrolled within 16 months)	District/ODE
Students who attended this school all 4 years (aka, intact cohort)	District
Students who attended this and other schools (aka, students that don't qualify for intact cohort)	District
Completion Rate Overall completion rate (Definition: students graduating with a standard, modified or extended diploma, certificate, or GED within 5 years)	District/ODE
Dropout Rate Overall dropout rate (Definition: students who dropped out without enrolling in an alternative program within 16 months)	District/ODE
Students who attended this school all 4 years	District/ODE
Students who attended this and other schools	District/ODE
Continuing Education (Definition: students preparing to further their education through the following demonstrable steps) Students taking SAT or ACT	District/ODE
Students who enrolled in a community college or four-year school within 16 months of graduation	District/ODE
Student Group Outcomes (On track, graduation, completion and dropout data for school during relevant academic year, the Oregon average and the difference between the two. Please note that only groups at school with 10 or more students should be represented to ensure confidentiality.)	

<p>Groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English language learners (ELL) • Low income students • Students with disabilities • Migrant students • Talented & gifted (TAG) students • American Indian/Alaskan native • Asian/Pacific Islander • Hispanic/Latino • Black/African-American • White (not of Hispanic origin) • Multi-racial/Multi-ethnic • Males • Females 	<p>District/ODE</p>
---	---------------------

Curriculum & Learning Environment: What is the school doing to improve student learning and to prepare students for the future?

Purpose: to characterize the school’s programs and resources as well as note any associated indicators of success. This section of the report card allows principals to cite points of pride and other noteworthy aspects of their schools. Ideally, it will be somewhat flexible, giving principals the option of including or excluding certain sections. This flexibility will permit principals to tailor an accurate description without the danger of forcing unfair comparisons, particularly when it comes to special programs. The following describes each of the recommended elements of this section. Elements followed by an asterisk are optional.

The resources listed in each subsection are designed to be illustrative. Common resources, however, should be described using the same language whether through a dropdown menu or another mechanism for submitting the information. Relevant community partnerships should be included on an ad hoc basis in the appropriate section. The Committee strongly recommends School Site Councils provide input into this section.

School Readiness

This section is intended for key student impressions and resources related to ensuring students enter the classroom ready to learn.

Report Card Element	Source
<p>Student Impressions (These elements are intended to be sourced from school-administered climate surveys. Ideally, these surveys would be standardized and administered statewide.) Percentage of students who rate their physical and emotional health very good/excellent*</p>	<p>School/District</p>
<p>Percentage of students who rate this school as very safe*</p>	<p>School/District</p>
<p>Key Resources Universal/daily breakfast program*</p>	<p>School/District</p>
<p>School-based health clinic*</p>	<p>School/District</p>

Teen parent program*	School/District
Counseling for academic, emotional and behavioral issues*	School/District
National P.E. standard: School does not meet/meets national standard of 225 minutes/week of physical education (PE) for each enrolled student (please note that students are required to take one year of PE or receive a waiver)	School/District
Bullying and harassment prevention program*	School/District
Peer conflict mediation program*	School/District

Academic Support

This section is intended for key resources related to basic academic support.

Report Card Element	Source
Bilingual/ESL model program: support based on language proficiency and grade level*	School/District
Special education program: support for students with qualified learning disabilities*	School/District
Study skills strategies course*	School/District
Peer tutoring program*	School/District

Academic Enrichment

This section is intended for key resources related to academic enrichment.

Report Card Element	Source
World Language Courses	
List of languages offered	School/District
Percentage of students enrolled in at least 1 course (plus note that college-bound students are expected to complete 2 years of a world language, or demonstrate proficiency by exam)	School/District
Honors & Dual-Enrollment Courses	
List of relevant courses, eg., advanced placement (AP) courses: 2 English, 2 math, 4 social studies, 3 science, 6 music/arts	School/District
Percentage of students enrolled in at least one honors course	School/District
Percentage of students enrolled in at least one dual-enrollment course	School/District
Percentage of students who earned college credit through AP/IB exams or dual-enrollment course	School/District
Special Programs	
Talented & gifted (TAG) program*	School/District
Spanish immersion program*	School/District

Career & Technical Education

This section is intended for key resources related to CTE.

Report Card Element	Source
List of relevant courses, e.g., business education, marketing, family & consumer science, computer-aided design/computer-aided manufacturing (CAD/CAM)	School/District

Extracurricular Activities

This section is intended for key resources related to extracurricular activities.

Report Card Element	Source
List of relevant activities, e.g., interscholastic sports: 14; academic clubs: 12; service clubs: 4; theatrical shows: 2	School/District
Percentage of students participating in at least 1 extracurricular activity	School/District

Federal Title 1 Designation

Purpose: to show the federal designation for Title 1 schools. The Committee recommends that this section appear only on report cards for Title 1 schools and further, that only the explanation that corresponds to the school's designation appear.

Rating explanations to appear on the report card consist of the following:

This designation applies only to high poverty schools that qualify for federal Title 1 funds.

Priority schools rank in the bottom 5% of high poverty schools in the state. These schools generally have very low student test scores and need additional support to make improvements.

Focus schools rank in the bottom 15% of high poverty schools in the state. These schools need additional support in helping historically underserved student populations improve their test scores.

Model schools rank in the top 5% of high poverty schools in the state. These schools serve as models of success and can help other schools make improvements.

Elementary & Middle School Report Cards

The following details the differences between the proposed high school report cards and the report cards for other schools within the K-12 system. Only the differences are noted; all other elements are assumed to be the same or comparable, e.g., the header information.

School Profile

Key changes in this section for the **elementary school report card** are noted below.

Report Card Element / Definition or Rule	Source
Enrollment Student counts should be provided in the following grade categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-3 • 4-5 or 4-6 (depending on grades offered) • 7-8 (if K-8 school) 	District/ODE
Change in enrollment from previous year (+/- overall, not for each grade category)	District/ODE
Percentage of students entering Kindergarten ready to learn (Data derived from Kindergarten assessment)	District/ODE

Overall State Rating

This section will be identical to that in the high school version, except the explanation will note the grades in which state exams are administered, e.g., in the elementary school version, the third sentence of the standard explanation will read: Three of these factors come from standards-based test scores from students in grades three, four, five [and six, if applicable] in reading and math.

Progress

The key changes here concern the testing grades cited and the inclusion of student group performance. In terms of the latter, the Committee recommends the elementary and middle school report cards provide student group performance data for reading, mathematics and other applicable subjects whereas the high school report card reserved these data breakouts for outcomes such as graduation and completion, which aren't applicable here.

Outcomes

As implied above, this section doesn't apply to either the elementary or middle school report cards.

Curriculum & Learning Environment

This section will be largely the same for elementary and middle schools as for high schools. The Committee envisions just three key changes:

- Under School Readiness, the physical education standard should be different for elementary and middle school students. The Committee recommends the following language:
 - Elementary: School does not meet/meets the state standard of 150 minutes/week for students in grades K-5 the entire school year.
 - Middle school: School does not meet/meets the state standard of 225 minutes/week for students in grades 6-8 the entire school year.
- Please note that state standards apply to elementary and middle schools, but a national standard applies to high schools.
- The Career & Technical Education section will not appear on the elementary school version, but will be an option for middle schools with relevant courses, such as industrial arts.
- The Extracurricular Activities section will be re-titled Extracurricular Activities & Afterschool Programs in order to accommodate afterschool services such as childcare, supervised arts & crafts, mentoring, etc.

District Report Cards

The Committee recommends the district report cards contain all of the information on the elementary, middle school and high school report cards, with the exception of the Letter from the Principal (substituting a Letter from the District Superintendent) and the Curriculum & Learning Environment sections. Data should be combined as necessary in cases where there are a multiple schools in a given category, e.g., the report card for a district with two high schools will show a combined or aggregate overall state rating for the two schools rather than separate ratings for each. By the same token, the report card should display all student subgroup exam data (aggregated).

The Committee further recommends including a number of additional measures in the District (rather than School) Profile section.

Report Card Element / Definition or Rule	Source
Average Class Sizes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced Placement (AP) Classes • International Baccalaureate (IB) Classes • Self-contained classrooms for English language learners • Self-contained classrooms for students with disabilities • Study halls • Online courses (Definition: courses provided by school/district directly or through a partnership) 	District/ODE
Student Mobility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of students who transferred in and transferred out of the 	

<p>district during academic year covered by report card</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students who transferred in and transferred out of the district in the prior 3 years 	District/ODE
<p>Race/Ethnicity Profile</p> <p>The Committee recommends separate race/ethnicity profile pie charts for students and staff (teachers and administrators) by the appropriate grade levels, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K-3 4-5 / 4-6 6-8 / 7-8 9-12 	District
<p>Statement re: Racial Equity in Hiring</p> <p>Districts with a student population of color of at least 15% and a minimum of 30 such students should include a statement re: its strategy for hiring teachers and administrators of color to better match its student demographics</p>	District
<p>Teacher Proficiency</p> <p>Percentage of high qualified teachers (as defined by the federal government)</p>	District/ODE
<p>Per Pupil Spending</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per pupil spending for the district and state as a whole Amount below or above what Oregon’s quality education model (QEM) suggests is adequate per pupil funding (should show both the per pupil dollar amount and percentage difference plus or minus) 5-year trend of per pupil spending 	District/ODE
<p>Funding Sources</p> <p>Percentage of district funding derived from the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributions from non-profit foundations, parent and community groups Local taxes and fees State funds Federal funds 	District/ODE
<p>Building & Student Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key building maintenance issues and, if applicable, approximate total cost of deferred maintenance Seismic safety rating Expulsions and suspensions (both the raw number and percentage of disciplinary actions in each of several key categories: chronic absenteeism, violence, drugs and weapons) Total expulsions and suspensions should be displayed by race/ethnicity in districts where students of color comprise at least 15% of the student population and the number of such students enrolled in the district is at least 30 	District/ODE
<p>Student Wellness Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Districts participating in the USDA’s school meal program should provide a brief summary of their wellness policy. 	District

Supplemental Website

The Committee strongly recommends the presence of a supplemental website along the lines of the Colorado Growth Model site. The Committee struggled with ways to clearly and accurately display measures of student growth on the report cards and ultimately decided that the website represented a better venue. Members believe this site should be an integral platform for communicating the extent to which students as a whole and various student subgroups are making progress against state standards.

Future-oriented Recommendations

These last recommendations address a variety of future-oriented topics that don't fit neatly into any single category.

Report Card Redesign Process

The Committee recommends an annual review process to ensure the state's report cards are aligned with student testing protocols, school improvement plans (SIPs), achievement compacts, teacher and staff evaluation systems and other pertinent developments. Members feel strongly that this review process should involve a representative committee and significant public input in the form of structured stakeholder discussions or surveys. The Committee found the results of its public engagement efforts very useful in its deliberations, and at the same time, stakeholders appreciated the opportunity to have a meaningful role. This proposed review process will be especially important with the advent of Smarter Balanced assessments, which will require substantial upfront public education.

Report Card Content

- New English language learner (ELL) measures should be developed to better identify the factors contributing to long-term ELL classification. The Committee has proposed changing the definition of ELL students (for the purposes of the report cards) to include all students who have ever received direct language instruction to ensure a fairer representation of this student group when reporting standards-based test results. The Committee believes an examination of long-term ELL students in the context of school-based resources and other factors will likely uncover new measures of interest.
- Teacher and administrator proficiency measures should be included once standardized, uniformly applied and validated evaluations have been implemented.
- Parent involvement measures, such as the percentage of parents who participate in parent-teacher conferences, should be considered by future committees reviewing the report cards.
- Once Smarter Balanced assessments have been implemented, report cards should include comparisons at the state level to the Smarter Balanced consortium as a whole and to like-states—other Smarter Balanced states with demographically similar student populations. Also, given the discrepancies in scoring between OAKs and Smarter Balanced assessments, the Committee recommends that once the latter is adopted, OAKs-based longitudinal data should no longer appear on the report cards. In other words, the longitudinal data should begin again from scratch.

- The department should develop distinct report cards for alternative schools, which require significantly different types of measures, especially related to student progress and outcomes.

Report Card Implementation

- Site Councils should counsel principals on what, exactly, to include in the Letter from the Principal and Curriculum & Learning Environment sections of the report cards.
- Special consideration should be given for very small schools in terms of the number, variety and timing of deliverables.

Appendix A: Oregon School Report Card Steering Committee Members

- Tony Hopson, Sr., Co-chair, President/CEO, Self-Enhancement, Inc. (SEI)
- Sandy Husk, Co-chair, Superintendent, Salem-Keizer School District
- David W. Edwards, Project Manager

- Inge Aldersebaes, school health expert, Healthy Kids Learn Better Coalition
- Nina Carlson, Vice-President, Parent-Teacher Association of Oregon
- Nancy Coronado, parent & former teacher
- Se-ah-dom Edmo, Director, Indigenous Ways of Knowing Program, Lewis & Clark College; Vice-President, Oregon Indian Education Association
- Laura Foley, AVID Coordinator, Sprague High School
- Carolyn Leonard, retired administrator, Portland Public Schools
- Mike McLaran, Director, Oregon State Chamber of Commerce; Director, McLaran Enterprises
- Eileen Nittler, parent, Eugene
- Anabel Ortiz-Chavolla, Director of Federal Programs and School Improvement, Ontario School District
- Scott Perry, Superintendent, Southern Oregon Education Service District
- Gail Rasmussen, President, Oregon Education Association
- Kevin Ricker, Principal, Centennial High School
- Rebecca Schulte, special education expert, Pacific University
- Anthony Veliz, small business owner, Woodburn
- Jill Zurschmeide, member, Tigard-Tualatin School Board