

## 2011 OBP Summit – 2<sup>nd</sup> Day Notes - EDUCATION

### PART 1 – QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS

- What makes this initiative different from past ‘failed’ or ‘waived’ initiatives?
- Seems like another level of (burden?)
  - Doesn’t seem like real change and yet subtracting \$ from system
- Union choke-hold on system blocks ‘real’ ed innovation
  - How do we make real change with politization (sp) of education?
- With increased funding, teacher-student ratio, how can we improve the system?
- K is a gap bet. Pre-K (ELC) and 1-12
- Need to maximize/identify funding opportunities
- Should the initiative include family involvement in education to improve outcomes?
  - Without family = unachievable
- Should pre-K be an outcome or input measurement?
- Is year-round school being considered?
- Need out-of-the-box thinking for higher-ed funding
- More focus on higher ed
- How does this address changes in society and unions and tech changes?
- Realistic career pathways
  - Oregonians who are adults today will make up most of the population in 20 years. What does this do to help them realize meaningful employment?
  - Even if we make it more seamless, kids don’t actually all behave this way. How do we accommodate the reality that all kids interact differently with education?
  - Lifetime learning
  - How does the reform line up with the jobs that will actually be in our economy today and into the future?
- Public, bottom-up ownership and support
  - We need more opportunity for public input
  - We must be vigilant in working with local communities and civic institutions to build local support and ownership
  - Community partnerships are critical, i.e. organizations that address hunger, poverty, etc.
- Institutional buy-in
  - Tight-loose is critical
  - Institutions must be willing to look beyond their own interests
- Must clarify accountability
  - Outcomes are key, but there is confusion about what happens if they are not met. Should help them improve rather than just punish
- We must be audacious and stick with it
  - Don’t let effectiveness be diminished by ‘death by 1000 cuts’
- Other points:
  - Data systems are key
  - Teacher training is key
  - Must be ‘transcendent’ of political leadership and landscape

- Concern that longitudinal data will be used for old-style student tracking
- What's the role of ODE?
  - I noticed the emphasis in our discussion was early learning and K-12 – not community colleges and universities
- How will this transition include the existing work of local boards to leverage their support for this process?
- Long-term funding of some components is vital to success
  - Both the level and the duration of funding is important
- Do we really need a new model or do we need to fully fund QEM?
- How are we measuring success? HS degree? College degree?
- Does the road map allow for innovation or is this NCLB with a different name? How can we be sure that \$ for innovations is equally distributed?
- Concerning the database idea: how do we get permissions to combine that data and track across a student's whole experience of education?
- Tight/loose sounds good but those details need to be figured out and the timeline is concerning
- Timeline is very fast
- What happens to local boards?
- How can we ensure that the outcomes we choose will help children be successful?
- We are limited by old paradigms and federal vision
- How are we investing in quality teachers?
- Need to abolish board of higher ed
- Need to decide what we want from the system before we build a database
- 40-40-20 mathematically impossible – and missing voc/tech
- How do we assess this initiative and ensure its right? We tend to create and then waive systems of reform
- How do we make real change in a politicized environment? How do we work around unions?
- Should pre-K be an input or output measurement?
- What are the outcomes? How/who will measure them?
- This is a big goal and it is under-resourced
- Disagreement on what works
- What are the roles of the major players:
  - Teachers
  - Students
  - Private institutions?
- Just another 'reform' movement? 'Organizational chart' change?
  - How do you legislate the plan?
- Lack of public input
- Silos still a problem
- Outcome-based education is hard to understand
- Is this change for the sake of change? The concept is appealing but the devil is in the details
- How students are tested and monitored will be important
- This is a more complex approach that will require the resources to be successful

- Concerned about data management system and putting them together:
  - Staff, \$, IT
- How specific the outcomes will be?
- Will those who succeed get more money or less?
- Concerned the aggressive goals = the \$ and resources to achieve
- Concerned that the state needs to manage and hold accountable higher ed
  - Accountability is key
- Pre-K: there are no current structures to coordinate/unify pre-K
- Prefer the initiative be preK-20 and not include early childhood can be integrated
  - Early childhood is too big/complex to include initially
  - Funding for 0-5 is small
  - K-20 is large
- Concerned that incentive aligns with the goal, i.e. adult basic ed (GED, ESL)
- Concerned that the needs of parents and effect of system on them be considered
  - Parents are a key partner in success
  - How will they be engaged?
- Concerned that federal laws will not mesh with state laws
- If we don't get the waiver, what then?
- How will the state manage two major program transformations (ed system and healthcare)?
- Concerns on lack of clarity for 2 areas: kids of color/social services/stability for and kids in poverty
- Concerned that there is no nexus to economic (devel?) to education
- Concerned the higher ed board needs time to review higher ed requirements for fed etc and overload them
- The accountability factor. How are (crieng?) holding government accountable?
- Concerned that we have no additional \$ and more to achieve
- Concerned that the info on 40-40-20 is not well understood broadly – need more information
- Concerned these be enough options for non-college track
- Concern that education equity and attention to improving gaps in education

## PART 2 – WHAT IS NEEDED FOR SUCCESS

- Correlation between teachers and outcomes not based on test scores
- Need to focus on average kids and help them strive higher and farther, and gifted kids so they don't get bored
  - How do we help the middle, encourage the best and empower the lowest?
- Remember value of community colleges and 2-year programs
- Built-in mechanism to perform
- Mentors would be valued addition
  - May be non-union, retirees, etc.
- Family involvement via hours/month in the school and home
- How do we define success?

- Apprenticeships, trade schools, training programs count towards ‘success’
- Keep the ‘loose’ loose, encourage teacher buy-in
- Figure out – do we really want this reform enough? Is the will there?
- Push for measurable and comparable outcomes across educational levels
  - How do we collect data up to 20 years of age?
- Motivated students and quality teachers are the key
- Push the time line out or let school districts know right away how the budgeting methodology will work (those budget discussions are happening now)
- Engage OSBA and other local groups in planning
- We need clear info and communication on what will be happening and that needs to get out to schools and parents
- Keep other community needs and realities in mind when pushing/relying on things like parental support/involvement
- Need to measure student intent
- Achievement compacts should foster collaboration
- Need to figure out the value of education beyond mere achievement
- Use U of O’s career (imprimotion?) system. Don’t throw away what’s working!
- Need to be consistent with descriptions of proficiency, etc.
- Need to focus on higher education
- 80/20 rule often under-motivates gifted kids. How do we best serve all levels of learners?
- Focus on value of community colleges and trade programs
- Establish mentor program and consider non-employee, non-union volunteers
- Consider year-round schools
- Set family-involvement requirements
- Slow down and engage
- Need to discover what works (think tank)
  - Longer days/years
  - Foreign exchange
  - On-line
  - Easier pathways to teaching
- \$
- Strategic communications – broad-based and regionalized message to ensure all understand the change
- Do the doable first – consider incremental improvements
- Need to clearly (and understandably) define proficiency – common understanding
- Look beyond 20
- Need to hire a good chief ed officer
- Need buy-in from stakeholders and educators in classrooms
- May require change in legislative budgeting process
- The investment board’s work is key to bring an investment mentality, i.e. decrease risk and increase outcome, produce more for the same \$
- Integrate technologies
- Invest in infrastructure
- Incentives (i.e. graduate in 4 years and get a \$4K scholarship)

- Need to align \$ with desired outcomes i.e. right now \$ follows ‘butts in seats’ not good enough, need to change ed (requalins?) move use of on-line learning and college credit in HS