

Date: March 10, 2025

From: Jill Vogt

Subject: Testimony in Support of House Bill 2009

Dear Chair Neron, Vice Chairs Dobson and McIntire, and Members of the Committee:

For the record, my name is Jill Vogt. I have worked in Oregon public education for over 15 years, partnering with districts, ESDs, and the Oregon Department of Education (ODE). As a native Oregonian, I am deeply committed to student success and the power of education in shaping our state's future.

I support HB 2009 because research demonstrates that clear expectations, strong policies, and evidence-based strategies drive student achievement. States like Louisiana and Mississippi, once among the lowest-performing, now lead in student growth due to their commitment to accountability and instruction. As we develop policy and move into implementation, we must rely on evidence and learn from successful models. My testimony focuses on strengthening this bill and recommendations going forward.

Clear Priorities with Focused Investments

The success of HB 2009 relies on ODE's capacity and investments. Strong-performing states share common elements:

- **Data-driven accountability:** Prioritizing and aligning investments with attendance, literacy, and math proficiency, especially for struggling learners.
- **A commitment to statewide, science-based professional development:** State education agencies (SEAs) are leading statewide professional development while also engaging site-based educators. For example, Mississippi's model engaged 400+ teachers in advisory committees, which directly shaped and iterated their teacher training.
- **Unified state leadership:** Strong backing from the Governor, Legislature, and State Board of Education with local partnerships ensures consistency.
- **Family engagement:** The SEAs provide aligned instructional resources in multiple languages to empower families.
- **High-quality instructional materials:** SEAs identify a select set of high-quality instructional materials and provide incentives and support to help districts adopt and implement them effectively.

Coaching Capacity & Expertise

The success of this model depends on ODE's expertise and capacity. A well-defined theory of action, aligned with growth indicators and grounded in proven evidence-based practices, is essential for the coaching model's effectiveness. While the bill focuses on district accountability, it can hold ODE accountable in this area.

For example, more explicit language can be added regarding student success team expertise. The bill references expertise in "improvement strategies, including the use of differentiated instruction and

inclusionary practices." However, research consistently emphasizes "evidence-based, high-quality curriculum, instruction, and educator professional development" as the most impactful school improvement strategies.

Reporting and Transparency

I support data transparency and accessible school performance reporting for families. Many state leaders and SEAs also play an active role in this effort. I appreciate ODE's commitment to transparency and encourage prioritizing family-friendly (i.e., easy to understand, prioritized on key metrics, and accessible) reporting tools whenever possible. Two additional areas where Oregon can do this:

1. **Statewide recognition of high-performing schools:** Many state leaders recognize and celebrate schools demonstrating growth through public relations campaigns--fostering hope, showcasing successes, and sharing what works. Rhode Island's Governor-led campaign, for example, highlights top-performing schools to celebrate schools increasing their attendance.
2. **Enhanced online report cards:** While the bill assigns school reporting responsibilities to districts, redesigning Oregon's Online Report Card for families would improve the clarity and accessibility of performance data.

Priority-Based Reduction of Redundancies and Administrative Burdens

Districts invest significant resources in compliance. Expanding the study of reporting requirements to include all state-mandated data collections—covering over 100 grant applications and reports--will provide an additional reprieve from the compliance burden.

Prioritizing data collection based on research and student outcomes that are aligned with growth targets would also enable districts to focus their resources on students, making the right work easier to do. However, state statutes often pose barriers to true reductions. I urge the Oregon Legislature to commit to the necessary statutory changes for a streamlined, prioritized, and student-centered data collection process.

Additionally, integrating grants and reports should be assessed for actual reduction in administrative burden. The Integrated Guidance was intended to provide relief but instead added complexity and co-located many requirements.

School Improvement Alignment & Visibility

The Longitudinal Performance Growth Target (LPGT) framework focuses on districts, but individual schools—especially charters—should not be overlooked as the data are aggregated at the district level. State charters operate with additional independence and are accountable to the State Board of Education.

Additionally, clear school identification and exit standards for improvement and coaching are critical for the accountability model. Ensuring the alignment, criteria, and transparency for identifying

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) designations under ESSA is also important for transparency and accountability.

Assessments

Interim growth measures are vital for tracking student progress. Norm-referenced assessments (e.g., iReady, MAP) are research-based, correlate with state assessments, and are widely used in Oregon. I recommend explicitly including norm-referenced assessments in addition to criterion-referenced.

The bill states that districts and charters "shall implement statewide assessment systems in math, science, and language arts and the interim assessment" however science is not a growth target. If science is a required interim assessment, it could divert focus from prioritized indicators and add a significant time requirement.

Oregon's stance on assessment needs clarification. The state promotes a generous summative assessment opt-out policy while simultaneously using that same assessment data to hold districts accountable. States leading in this work view assessments as essential tools for system improvement. Finally, summative assessment results should be released in the summer rather than the fall, as done in other leading states, to allow timely planning.

Workforce and Career Readiness

Including math in LPGTs addresses a prior accountability gap. Leading states (i.e., Maryland, Massachusetts, and Indiana) also incorporate workforce and career readiness indicators, such as Career and Technical Education (CTE) completion and industry certifications. While career readiness is absent from LPGTs, the bill's local option metrics allow districts to integrate these measures where applicable.

Conclusion

HB 2009 represents a significant step toward strengthening Oregon's accountability model and ensuring that all students have access to a high-quality education. Refinements and considerations for implementation as we move forward will further maximize its impact.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jill Vogt