

Data Quality Work Group
Feb. 4, 8:30-11:30 a.m.
Willamette ESD, Salem

1) Mickey Garrison gave an update on Instructional Strands 1, 2 and 3. She asked the DQWG for help identifying evaluation considerations and mapping out Year 3 (moving from training into practice)

Here's the question: How should we select the ESDs to spearhead this project? They would work with districts in looking at implementation considerations, and then gather enough information to replicate that process to make these practices part of the culture of this district. Need to figure out what are the criteria in selecting the ESDs and what are the criteria in selecting the districts

Input from DQWG on ESDs:

- How many workshops have ESD employees attended in this movement?
- How involved have the attendees been in statewide project endeavors?
- How many curriculum and data people are involved from that ESD?
- What implementation strategies are already in place with the ESD?
- Has that ESD hosted or helped sponsor the attendance of their component district personnel's attendance?
- What percentage of their districts have been involved?
- How integrated in this project are curriculum and IT?
- How has the ESD worked to create a data culture?
- How do the districts perceive the involvement (intrusion) of their ESD—partner or dictator?
- What population is served demographic, tech level, admin structure, cultural involvement, student turnover, population—to reflect statewide diversity?
- Commitment of the ESD in terms of existing (involved) personnel, time, involvement.
- ESDs perceived identification of potential cooperating districts.
- Identification of existing people to pursue this project who have already been involved—not the hiring of new personnel.
- Have participation in the DATA Project and/or TLC efforts
- Level of involvement in the DATA Project and TLC
- Able to commit to a full year
- Curriculum and evaluation resources—understand assessment, research, and analysis
- Have individuals on staff who cross over between tech and instructional folks
- Established relationships between ESD and district so they are jointly chosen as a team
- ESDs familiar with more than one system (not just ESIS) so that the data can be viewed
- Willingness to act as a model to other ESDs or districts as we move on.
- They provide support after the year's time—or a model, come in and talk with people.

- Willingness to gather best practices from successful districts. Decrease the gap between those who have been using data, and those who are just starting. Don't make the newbies "invent" their "best practices" but collect Oregon's best practices. The ESDs become the collectors of the data and practices from those who are leading the way.
- Selected districts should reflect demographic, size, geography, and variety of students/regions served.
- Evaluation process at the ESD level—part of the RFP should include the ESDs evaluation process, and include some key components to be included. Guidelines from the RFP, but the ESD molds the project that fits them.
- Clear capacity for ongoing support—the ESD has the ability to provide the embedded professional development, ongoing best practice support.
- Willing to be "open books" with the process—what works and what doesn't—transparent.
- ESDs have to be an "evangelist" for data quality and analysis.
- Demonstrate this is a proven practice they're committed to
- Need to make this a systemic project rather than picking out a certain area to try it out on.
- Where is the administrator's focus directed? Is the focus on student achievement and data collection?
- A budget-crunched time is a good time to look at data to justify expenditures.
- How is the relationship with the community evaluated?
- Input from DQWG on Districts:
- As above, substituting District for ESD
- Did they submit a CIP this year so we have baseline data?

Item 2) Tony Alpert gave an update on Oregon's Growth Model

Item 3) Ron Hoppes gave an update on the Technical strands and on assessment. He asked for help from the DQWG to identify relevant questions.

Input from DQWG:

- What else can we get into the notes?
- What kind of follow-up was done after the training?
- Who was contacted?
- What was done during that contact time—discussed?
- How did the ESDs follow up?—training, coaching, meetings, other...
- Since this will go to every strand participant, for those ESDs which are providing services on the train the trainer model, there is a questions about the teacher in the building who has been trained by the ESD
- Who provided the training for you?
- What is your job?
- What kind of support have you gotten?
- Track the trickle-down effect
- What type of training will the survey focus on?

- Since the Strand 1 training, or since the Strand 2 training...
- What kinds of activities have been provided---give examples
- Who provided that?
- A pull-down list of possible trainings to support the two strands
- How did you feel supported, and in what ways?
- How can you reflect that you get training with one ESD, but support from other ESDs? Does it matter?
- “Your local ESD”
- Did I get support from my local ESD?
- Did I get support from my regional ESD training center?
- The areas are broad. What about breaking it down to next steps, trainings they could use, services we need...
- What we need now, next steps, future...

Item 4) Updates on data warehouse providers were given by the relevant ESD personnel.

administrative support
technology
school improvement
special needs



Oregon DATA Project training is supported by the EESC, a partnership among ODE, ESDs, K-12, the Governor's Office and Higher Education