

## QUALITY EDUCATION COMMISSION

### Meeting Minutes

March 19, 2003

**Meeting Location:** Oregon Department of Education  
Basement Room A  
10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

**Tapes 49- 51**

**Members Present:** Chair Ken Thrasher, Elaine Taylor, Lynn Lundquist, Yvonne Curtis, Peggy Penland, Co Chair Susan Massey , Duncan Wyse, Ralph Breitenstein; Kristine Kain, Jill Kirk, Keith Thomson, Ron Naso

**Absent:** Harriet Adair, Ozzie Rose

**Staff Present:** Brian Reeder; Paula Merritt; Pat Burk, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Steve Novick, Legislative Coordinator

**Others Present:** Kevin McCann, OSBA, Tom Owen, James Sager, Governor's Education Advisor

#### **Agenda Items:**

- 1. Welcome/Introduction of Pat Burk**
- 2. Legislative Update**
- 3. Review of Commission Goals**
- 4. Review of State Board of Education Goals**
- 5. Review of Commission Communication Plan**
- 6. QEM 2002 Review Document**
- 7. Commission Goals for 2003-04**
- 8. Future QEC Meeting Topics, Presentations**
- 9. Closing**

Chair Ken Thrasher called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and Introduced Pat Burk

#### **1. Pat Burk, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction: ODE Goals**

Pat Burk, Superintendent of Public of Instruction, and ODE spoke about his experience with past discussions, which lead to the QEC and expressed his happiness to be back with this work.

He explained the current ODE goals. He said that the Department has lacked focus and clarity in part on the fact that there has been recent turnover in leadership. Nancy Heiligman will continue to be involved with the Commission, under contract, until the end of session. This will be re-assessed at that time.

Superintendent Castillo has identified three focus areas. 1. Closing the achievement gap with additional focuses on the Latino-and African American populations. 2. Focus on literacy. Even though kids are meeting standards there is still a broad range of illiteracy. 3. Accelerated learning. This may include credit by exam and high school reform.

He explained the bad press with the media regarding No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliance standards. He addressed the comments that Oregon was lowering the bar for students and explained that at no time did anyone in this agency lower a bar for students. We actually raised the standards. This was not reported correctly. He explained "safe harbor". We proposed an alteration of safe harbor and the Oregonian reported that we lowered the bar. This is not true. He explained that the Department did not receive federal legislator support, which was difficult and disappointing. The implications are not good and there are policy issues. Increased participation level is needed and this is not only an Oregon only problem. There are only consequences to Title I Funded schools.

He said that the good news is, for the first time we have data that links college and community college success with kids who meet 10<sup>th</sup> grade level standards.

## **2. Commission Appointments**

Mr. Burk has talked with Jim Sager, Governor's Education Advisor, about the Commission's open appointments. Chair Thrasher asked Mr. Sager about the status of the QEC budget. Mr. Sager will check and get back to Chair Thrasher.

Mr. Burk explained the recent criticism of the State's testing model, and the recent article entitled: *Brainwashed*. He explained that there is no data backing this up. Validation studies are expensive and we have already done several. "Off the shelf" testing violates federal law and NCLB guidelines require the state to establish tests for each state standard. Quotes to administer new tests are approximately \$40 per students and we currently spend about \$14.

## **3. Legislative Update**

Steve Novick, Legislative Coordinator, ODE, commented on the *Brainstormed* article. He said there has been discussion about CIM and CAM at the legislature but it has gotten more rational. He explained that the Department and COSA gathered information on the cost for teachers to administer CIM testing and that information is available on the ODE website. He commented on Senator Miller's bill, getting rid of CIM and buying off the shelf tests from somewhere else.

Bill Auty testified that prisoners and contractors are doing some of the work and it is very cost saving. We will continue to have more discussion but have laid good groundwork. Mr. Novick mentioned Representative Backlund's bill. He believes that the Department needs to be trumpeted that the 10<sup>th</sup> grade assessment does predict higher education success. He explained that next week is focused on funding in the Ways and Means Committees.

### **Tape 50**

Chair Thrasher suggested testimony of Commission members at these upcoming legislative. We should all be aware of the schedule, dates and times. He asked Mr. Novick to work with Paula Merritt regarding the distribution of the legislative schedule.

Yvonne Curtis commented on sharing her school's focus as an example and asked if it would be helpful for her to present this information. Mr. Novick said that we will find a way to do that.

Mr. Wyse suggested that Ms. Curtis lay out an actual school budget and how the different funding levels effect students. They can see that we are trying to improve education because it becomes tangible. Mr. Novick agreed and said we should have been doing this weeks ago. He will check into this and get back with the Commission.

Brian Reeder explained that Representative Morgan has asked for data and a demonstration of the Model and that it impressed her. She believed it was an incredible tool and asked that it be put on a CD for each member.

## **4. Review of State Board of Education Goals**

Jill Kirk explained that the Board's goal continues to be to building policy - the best education policy and improved student performance. She said there were three subset goals; 1. Accountability. 2. Equity. 3. Capacity.

Chair Thrasher suggested taking Mr. Burk and Ms. Kirk's goals and tying them into the Commission's goals.

Chair Thrasher suggested composing a list of speakers for various presentations.

## **5. Review of Commission Goals**

Chair Thrasher referred to and reviewed the Commission Goals, **Exhibit A**. Mr. Thompson asked about the cost of the Model. Chair Thrasher responded that in 2013-14 we will have to be at 100%.

## **6. Federal Presentation**

Introduction of Ken Meyer, Legislative Liaison, U. S. Department of Education and Scott Jenkins, Deputy Assistant of the Secretary of Government Affairs, U.S. Department of Education.

Mr. Jenkins explained his state background as an educational advisor in Michigan and explained how data drives school reform. He explained their desire to hear from the Commission for taking the existing system and integrating it into the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) federal legislation. He explained the possible difficulties and he noted, that Mississippi's state plan has been approved and that Oregon can do the same.

Chair Thrasher explained the challenge of the Commission and the similarities of the NCLB. He invited the Secretary of Education to Oregon within the next 60-90 days.

Mr. Jenkins said that he would extend the invitation to the Secretary and acknowledged that Oregon had been working for alignment for a long time.

Ken Meyer commented on NCLB as a priority and he and Mr. Jenkins are available to the Department in any way.

Ron Naso commented on the interactive process and asked about the Reading First program fitting in to specific Oregon School Districts. It is his hope for more interaction and communication. Scott Jenkins explained to Mr. Naso that he would contact him for discussion.

Yvonne Curtis reiterated the importance of the Secretary of Education's visit.

The entire Commission agreed and urged the Secretary's visit within the next 60-90 days.

Peggy Penland commented on the law and the lack of support and funding from the government. She suggested resources and education on how to not leave children behind.

### **Tape 51**

Mr. Jenkins explained that every school district in the country is in need of improvement. He said it is up to the school districts to focus their resources and develop in the proper area. He agreed that the government needs to do a better job at sharing and people in turn need to share with our department.

Lynn Lundquist commented that the public should be our focus and is concerned about how we strategize.

Ralph Breitenstein explained the requirement for a review at the national level after 5 years and how there could be a dark sided review, which may mean vouchers, etc.

## **7. Review of Commission Goals (continued)**

Chair Thrasher referred the Commission to the goals sheet and asked for comments. Elaine Taylor asked about interest in the development of prototype small schools. Brian Reeder explained that as part of the small school study this was developed. It was done last fall and this could be brought into the Commission now.

Lynn Lundquist believed we need visibility from now until 2004. At some point the Model needs to get out there and this is key for long term funding. Chair Thrasher asked Mr. Reeder if he and Nancy Heiligman are able to participate or help with presentations. Mr. Reeder responded that Ms. Heiligman probably is not available but he is.

Chuck Bugge commented on strategizing for local school districts that lack resources, what can be set in place now for when the dollars are available, how can people buy into the QEC Model?

Chair Thrasher suggested the need for a legislative plan, school plan, and media plan with a presentation to these groups.

**8. Review of Commission Communication Plan.**

Elaine Taylor referred to and explained **Exhibit E**, Communication Plan.

Chair Thrasher adjourned the meeting at 1:10 p.m.

The next Commission meeting will be held on **Wednesday, April 16, 2003 at ODE Vick Building Location.**

The time is to be determined.

Presented by,

Paula Merritt,  
Administrative Support

Approved by,

Chuck Bugge,  
Administrator

**EXHIBITS:**

- A – Agenda
- B – QEC Goals 2003
- C – Work plan 2002-03
- D – Roster
- E – Communication Plan