



March 13, 2002

775 Summer Street NE, Suite 330
Salem, Oregon 97301-1283
503-986-0039 Fon
503-591-5115 Fax
www.econ.state.or.us/opb

JOHN A. KITZHABER M.D.
Governor
Chair

BRETT WILCOX
Vice Chair

LINDSAY BERRYMAN

NEIL BRYANT

BOBBIE DORE FOSTER

DAVE FROHNMAYER

STEVE HARPER

MICHAEL JORDAN

DIANE SNYDER

ED WHITELAW

MAX WILLIAMS

MICHAEL GREENFIELD
Ex Officio

HEATHER KAPLINGER
Student Ex Officio

JEFFREY TRYENS
Executive Director

TO: Progress Board Members

FROM: Jeff Tryens
Executive Director

Robin Peterson
Data Analyst

SUBJECT: Oregon Progress Board January 15, 2002 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Brett Wilcox called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. Members present were Bobbie Dore Foster, Michael Jordan, Mike Greenfield, Heather Kaplinger, Diane Snyder, Ed Whitelaw, and Representative Max Williams. Lindsay Berryman, Neil Bryant, and Senator Steve Harper joined the meeting by phone.

Brett welcomed new members Diane Snyder, Steve Harper and Max Williams.

1. Minutes

The Board unanimously approved the November minutes.

2. Performance Measure Guidelines

Jeff distributed a draft version of the *Performance Measure Guidelines for Oregon State Agencies*. These guidelines are being prepared for the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) to include in instructions for state agency budgeting so that agencies will have an across-the-board, consistent way to develop and report their performance measures for the 2003-05 biennium. The guidelines are basically set of principles that each agency's performance measures should meet. In the short-term performance measures should be linked to each agency's goals, should have targets and should use common language. Agencies will receive training on how to meet these goals. Board staff will put together a review group made up of state employees who have knowledge and training in this area. This review group will critique each agency's performance measures. Comments will follow each agency's budget through the budgeting process.

In response to some Board members' questions about agency participation, Mike Greenfield explained that a recent advisory group meeting included a constructive discussion that he thinks reflected a realistic engagement on the part of agencies. Mike explained that the Governor and the legislature would hold agency administrators accountable for targets and outcomes based on each agency's performance measures.

DAS will establish guidelines for holding agencies accountable for their performance. DAS should be able to articulate standards to state agencies using the guidelines developed by the Oregon Progress Board (OPB.) Another mechanism that will facilitate accountability is the review of agency performance measures by the legislature.

Jeff gave the Board a memo with a list of items that the advisory group agreed should be modified. These items would change the performance measure draft guidelines, copies of which Board members received in their pre-meeting packets. The advisory group recommended that the Board accept the guidelines with the addition of these items. Jeff also urged the Board to accept the draft guidelines and modifications in principle; however, he suggested the Board appoint a subcommittee to monitor any further changes that may develop. This way, the Board will be able to forward the recommendations to DAS in time to get them into the instructions for state agencies to guide their budget making processes.

The copy of the memo sent to Board members attending the meeting by phone did not include one recommendation: a request to move the target setting exercises to January 2003 instead of trying to force agencies both to develop measures where they didn't have any previously and to set targets for those measures within the next four months. The advisory group agreed that agencies would be required to have targets for 2005, which is the end of budget cycle. Those targets would have to be in place by January 2003.

Steve Harper emphasized the importance of keeping the advisory group's recommendation to include incentives for achieving targets. Mike Greenfield explained that he felt that managing to achieve targets would become a part of the overall management approach for state agencies and he feels that this type of performance is a reward in itself.

Jeff said OPB staff would look into what other states are doing and which states have crafted successful incentives.

The Board unanimously approved the draft guidelines.

3. Anita McClanahan, Department of Education

At the November meeting the Governor inquired about the possibility of expanding the Department of Education's (DOE) Ready-to-Learn Survey that the Department of Education administers every other year. The Governor requested that the DOE explore the possibility of conducting the survey on an annual basis and that the survey becomes mandatory rather than voluntary, as it is presently. Anita, who currently oversees the project, gave the Board some background information on the survey. Currently, there is a 70 percent response rate to the survey. Anita feels that this is an outstanding rate of response and that continuing to collect the data every other year is sufficient. She explained that requiring this survey to be administered by every school on an annual basis would require a mandate from the legislature. She was not sure if mandating the survey would improve the response rate, but she noted that since it is a priority for the Governor, the DOE would continue to research the idea.

Jeff explained to the Board that one reason the Governor is interested in making the survey mandatory is to insure that the survey will continue to be administered after Anita leaves the DOE. Anita explained that the Oregon Benchmark itself is a significant factor in motivating the collection of data and that local communities would not let the survey dissolve.

Steve Marks, the Governor's chief of staff was present. He reiterated the Governor's desire to pursue an annual survey and he state that the Governor would like the discussion to continue.

4. Benchmark Update Process

Brett Wilcox told the Board that the executive committee met last week to determine what they wanted to come out of the benchmark update process. Based on today's presentations, the executive committee requests that Board members provide comments and/or observations for each benchmark under review to Michael Jordan. Michael Jordan will chair a subcommittee that will review each benchmark in-depth and will make a recommendation to the Board at the March meeting. Other members of the subcommittee include Bobbie Dore Foster, Diane Snyder & Heather Kaplinger. No decisions on the adoption or deletion of benchmarks will be made at today's meeting.

The Board heard testimony from twelve speakers regarding the adoption of current developmental and new benchmarks. Each presenter provided written testimony as well as other relevant materials as appropriate.

Testimony provided on the adoption of current developmental benchmarks

- Developmental BM 2021 – Art Ayre, Employment Department
- Developmental BM 2002 – Ron Fox, Economic & Community Development Department
- Developmental BM 2004 – Inga Deckert, State Treasurer's Office
- Developmental BM 2005 – Lynn Marie Crider, AFL-CIO
- Developmental BM 2006 – Lynn Marie Crider, AFL-CIO
- Developmental BM 2009 – Bill Hanable, Oregon Heritage Commission
- Developmental BM 2011 – Joel Young, Department of Human Services
- Developmental BM 2012 – Dr. Astrid Newell, Department of Human Services
- Developmental BM 2013 – Dr. Astrid Newell, Department of Human Services
- Developmental BM 2014 – Dr. Astrid Newell, Department of Human Services
- Developmental BM 2016 – John Beaulieu, Department of Geology & Mineral Industries
- Developmental BM 2020 – Sherry Sheng, Economic & Community Development Department

Testimony provided on the adoption of new benchmarks

- Bert Kile, Director of Emergency Services for the Oregon Trail Chapter of the American Red Cross – Emergency Preparedness

Public Comments

- Mike Howden, Oregon Center for Family Policy – Fatherlessness

Jeff explained the current status of developmental benchmark 2015 – measuring positive youth activity. At the Board's request Jeff and staff have been trying to identify a positive social youth measure. Currently, the Oregon Healthy Teens survey includes the following true or false statement: "There are a lot of adults in my neighborhood that I could talk to about something important." Access to supportive adults is often seen as a predictor of good teen behavior. There is no national comparator for this data. The Board feels that this is not a measure of teens but rather a measure of the particular community in which a teen lives. The Board asked that the Progress Board staff continue to look for a

positive youth measure and that a space be held on the developmental benchmark list for the time being.

The Board asked that representatives from Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI), the Red Cross and the Office of Emergency Management get together between now and the March 19th meeting to coordinate efforts to develop a combined benchmark that addresses emergency preparedness. Jeff said that he would facilitate this meeting.

5. Clark Brody, Department of Education

Clark Brody, deputy superintendent at the Department of Education discussed developmental benchmark 2007, which deals with the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM). The CIM data will be available on January 23, 2002. The DOE is currently in the process of collecting and validating the data in preparation for the school report card. Clark told the Board that he believes the DOE will be able to provide the Board with the percentage of students statewide who have completed the CIM.

Clark also discussed with the Board the new federal legislation that requires assessments to be done in math and reading in the "off-grade levels" (grade 2, 4 and 7). He feels that this testing will complement the current DOE evaluation system. A little over 80 percent of schools in the state are currently funding and administering off-grade assessments. He believes the new legislation will win tremendous support from the school districts for two primary reasons: first, because the schools are already doing the testing and second, off-grade level testing will provide evaluation that will help schools become more effective in their teaching. This will be a great window of opportunity for the Department of Education to be able to monitor student progress from one grade level to the next.

Max Williams questioned the school districts enthusiasm for more testing. He explained that from his discussion with members of the Beaverton School District he has the feeling that the school districts are frightened of this federal testing requirement because it will increase demands on them. The school districts essentially asked Max and other legislators to be relieved of some of the current testing burden. Max asked if the DOE anticipates any changes in the way that current state assessments of Oregon schools for the 21st century will be conducted as a result of the new federal testing requirements. The only effect that Clark could anticipate as a result of this new federal legislation is the substitution of the off-grade assessments that counties are currently doing on a voluntary basis. This will save districts money. The DOE acknowledges that the reporting requirements are a significant frustration for the districts.

The final question Clark addressed was whether the Progress Board should be thinking about possible changes to the existing 3rd and 8th grade skill-level benchmarks as a result of the new federal legislation. He explained that once the off-grade assessments are being administered, the DOE would collect data in some very different ways than it has collected data before. This will afford the Progress Board the ability to look at data very differently if it chooses to so.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.