

**Equity Committee Meeting
Eugene Public Schools District 4J
200 N. Monroe**

November 08, 2018
4:30 p.m.

PRESENT: David Abramowitz, Brenda Brainard, Laura Dahill, Julie Heffernan, Nicholas Kaasa, Judy Newman; Kevin Herington, Karen Pérez-Da Silva, Jeffry Johnson, Andy Dey, Cheryl Linder, Charis McGaughy.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Pérez called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. She noted that they would talk about a site visit as they discussed in the last meeting. She shared that she asked Brenda Brainard to attend the meeting to talk about Tribal History/Shared History.

The committee members in attendance introduced themselves.

II. Review of Purpose

Ms. Pérez reviewed the Committee's Purpose and Community Agreements. She stated that the purpose of the committee was to provide the district guidance on creating the conditions for every student to reach educational excellence with equitable access and outcomes. She reminded everyone about their community agreements, which included: start and end on time, respect the agenda, have clear meeting objectives and action items, be aware of confidentiality, and have multiple ways to provide feedback.

III. What is Career and Technical Education?

Ms. Pérez shared that the second goal in the 2020 Strategic Plan was Multiple Pathways to Student Success, and the third objective under that goal was to provide strong and varied Career and Technical Education (CTE) Programs.

Mr. Herington stated that the CTE programs were a microcosm of the district at large—not all programs were currently serving all students equally. He shared that the computer science, engineering design and construction technology programs tended to have mostly white males, while the early childhood education and culinary arts programs had more female students.

Mr. Herington said he wanted all students to have the opportunity to access these programs and figure out what they were (or were not) interested in at a young age.

Mr. Linder said historically they have had separate programs for students identified with special education needs. One of the questions they had been asking was how to embark on a process that

would open access to the CTE programs for all kids. She said they needed to identify the barriers that prevented access.

Mr. Herington clarified that CTE referred to a program of study—courses aligned with postsecondary study—not just a single, elective course. He added that it was not the same thing as vocational education, which relied on the expertise of whoever was in the room at the time. CTE, on the other hand, was aligned with the industry and postsecondary partners and the teacher needed to do continual professional development. The benefits to students included internships, job shadows, and tours of industry.

IV. Question and Equity Lens Discussion

How do we make CTE programs equitable and accessible for our traditionally underserved students?

Mr. Herington asked the committee to consider a student in a culinary program of study and a student in an engineering program of study, and think about what they thought those students might be like and what they would do post-high school. He then asked the committee to break into small groups and discuss their thoughts.

Mr. Dey noted that there was a stereotype trap that culinary suggested someone who would be a food and beverage worker who was less ambitious.

Mr. Abramowitz said he thought they should not treat CTE as a default program for students not going on to college, but that students in CTE should have their achievements recognized.

Ms. Newman stated that she thought the culinary field was starting to get more recognition.

Ms. McGaughy shared that she had thought of actual students in the CTE programs. She said her daughter was in the culinary program, and her daughter's current aspiration was to produce 30 for 30 Videos for ESPN.

Ms. Dahill shared that her son was in a 3D design class in middle school, and she was excited to hear from her son's teacher that the course lent itself well to CTE programs in high school.

Ms. McGaughy said that the other student she thought of was a junior at Churchill High School in the Engineering CTE track, and his goal was to get into the Air Force Academy.

Mr. Herington said people often assumed that students in CTE programs would end up finding a job in their area of study after they graduated, which was not necessarily the case. He clarified that the reason students were in CTE courses was because they were able to build and design something. He added that the feedback was immediate—there was a relevance that happened in CTE programming that did not always happen in content core areas. He stated that students often took multiple courses with the same CTE educator and built good relationships and learned to communicate effectively.

Mr. Herington let the committee know there were twenty-five official programs of study, including early childhood education and culinary. He stated that they were adding six new programs of study this year at multiple schools, including computer science, engineering, and graphic design.

Mr. Herington said the programming quality was highly dependent on the quality of the teachers, like any classroom. He shared that there were a couple ways to become a CTE teacher: come directly from industry and do additional coursework, or be a teacher who has some industry experience and be able to gain additional experience.

Mr. Abramowitz asked how they determine what programs to offer.

Mr. Herington said they worked with the Chamber of Commerce, which helped them determine what jobs were classified as high-demand, which meant the job paid a high hourly wage and had a particular amount of new job openings (not replacement openings).

Ms. Newman asked if there was a robust technology program.

Mr. Herington replied that they was, and it was included in the computer science program.

Ms. Newman asked how early childhood made the list because it did not fit the payment criteria.

Mr. Herington responded that they had the program for a while and said they also had to look at need within the local community.

Ms. Charis said they also saw the early education program as a way to grow their own teachers.

Mr. Herington said they had a new education program that instructed students on the process of becoming a licensed teacher.

Ms. Dahill asked if they had CTE healthcare industry programs.

Mr. Herington said they had two health occupations programs, one at Churchill and one at North Eugene.

Ms. Dahill shared that she had just toured CTE programs in Eastern Oregon where they had a former registered nurse and the students left with a Certified Nursing Assistant (CNA) license.

Mr. Herington responded that students could leave with a CNA in their program as well, but many choose not to because they had aspirations to go onto medical school.

Mr. Abramowitz shared about his experience in a previous health occupations program that was open to everyone, including students with disabilities. He said students were involved in varying levels of industry depending on what their career aspirations were.

Mr. Herington replied that their program was structured similarly.

Mr. Abramowitz asked if students could do programs that were at other schools.

Mr. Herington said it was not possible yet, but they were looking at how they could move teachers around to different buildings. He added that they were looking at building a regional hub that all schools in Lane County could access, and there were currently some virtual connectivity options.

Mr. Abramowitz wondered if a student would need to make a decision before ninth grade to determine which high school to attend.

Ms. Pérez said they had been talking about how to better get the word out to students in middle schools.

Mr. Herington said that one barrier he saw was that there were programs in middle schools that did not connect to the CTE programs in the connected high schools, and they were working on better aligning what was offered at middle schools and elementary schools.

Ms. Pérez re-iterated the focus question of how to make CTE programs more accessible for students who are traditionally underrepresented.

Ms. Heffernan said it was very predictable what students were going to self-identify into each track and asked what steps they were already taking to disrupt that pattern.

Mr. Herington said one of the things they were developing was a coding computer program in fourth and fifth grade classrooms (the age that research has shown girls tune out of computer science).

Ms. Heffernan asked if the programs were just for girls.

Mr. Herington said they were for everyone. He asked if the committee had ideas for how to improve their messaging and branding to recruit more students to the programs. He explained that the way the course codes were structured made it hard to gather data on the CTE programs.

Ms. Pérez posed a number of questions to the committee: what they thought was limiting the participation of their traditionally underserved students, what the adult community assumptions about CTE pathways were, how they promote the programs so they are inclusive (for traditionally underserved students), how they take the valuable components of CTE and embed them in everyday classes, and how they get professional development for adults to ensure they were not excluding students that were interested (including avoid micro-aggressions).

Mr. Herington expanded on the questions, suggesting they also think about micro-aggressions that came from peers, other adults, and what students heard at home. He wondered how they should address attitudes of peers, so that everyone would be treated appropriately in the CTE classroom.

Mr. Johnson said he believed students often made decisions based on the recommendations they had from their teachers and asked how well informed the high school system was about CTE pathways. He said he thought this was relevant to the data team that keep freshman on track and added that he thought it came down to a relationship between teachers and students.

Ms. Dahill said as a parent she did not know there were that many programs of study and suggested they have a day where parents and their children come and learn about different programs.

Ms. Heffernan suggested they go to the eighth graders when they do their transition visits. She added that she thought they should think closely about how they name the CTE programs as it could discourage students from clustering to particular programs.

Mr. Abramowitz said that schools tended to make things more academic than the jobs actually were. He added that they should have a trained eye to see what some of the barriers were to ensure the CTE programs could accommodate a wide variety of abilities.

Ms. Linder said they needed to spend more time marketing with students in middle school, so they had an idea about what they wanted to sample. She noted that there was a huge amount of social pressure on students to be able to state where they were going after graduation, and she emphasized that they needed to change that paradigm.

Ms. Dahill said she wanted to her son to do the CTE program, but he had an IEP.

Mr. Herington said students with IEPs were currently welcome in CTE programs.

Ms. Heffernan left at 5:30.

Mr. Abramowitz said the challenge was to make CTE programs work for everyone.

Ms. Linder said some teachers did that well, but it was teacher-dependent. She gave an example of a teacher who taught physics without math for kids who struggled with math. She said they needed to expand on the what was working well.

Ms. Newman suggested they have a CTE day that could give kids and parents a sample of what the programs were like.

Mr. Herington shared that the industry looks very different and most of what used to be manual labor is now done with coding.

Mr. Dey clarified that the coding they referred to was not complex—it was very learnable and students simply needed some experience with it. He added that Ms. Dahill's comment brought up an important misconception among parents that they needed to address.

Ms. Linder said they had a partnership with Professor Thomas Keating at the University of Oregon who is doing research around ways to assist some of their students with cognitive

challenges to excel in a post-school career. She added that the UO was invested in helping them grow.

Mr. Abramowitz said when he was teaching, they had an agreement between 4J and the University of Oregon HR Department to be able to set up different work experience opportunities for students. He stated that students were able to experience working in the mailroom, the print shop, health services, library, and the physical plant. They were able to explore the world of work, learn about what the requirements of work were, and have a sequence of skill training exercises.

Ms. Linder stated that they still did some of that with students, but employers were more worried about risk and were less likely to open their doors.

Mr. Herington added that for many internships, students needed to be eighteen. He shared a couple student success stories. He let the committee know about a young man who did an internship at a tech company and got hired right after graduation. Another student got into welding, took a tour of Johnson Crushers International Inc, asked to talk to HR, and got a job there after he graduated. A student who graduated out of the Project Success Program just started full time at Swanson's Welding.

Ms. Dahill asked if there was an auto program.

Mr. Herington said there used to be, but they did not have one any longer.

Ms. Linder said the state gave them grant to have special education students find employment.

Mr. Kaasa added that his office had placed someone at Voodoo Doughnuts who was then offered a part-time position after the summer. He added that they expanded the summer program into a full-time day program.

V. CTE Program Site Visit

Mr. Herington said the site visit was scheduled for November 19 at 1pm at Churchill High School. He said he would like to have them break into small groups to rotate around to see multiple programs as well as talk to students and the teachers.

Mr. Abramowitz asked if there was a 4J Committee that did CTE visits around the state.

Mr. Herington said there was a CTE leadership committee and when they had done tours, it was not as a committee, but was with certain partners, including the Lane Education Service District (ESD).

Mr. Abramowitz asked if they had visited the regional center in North Clackamas, which provided bussing transportation to students.

Ms. Dahill said the Eastern Oregon program worked the same way and some students were even bussed to Boise.

Mr. Herington shared that a model they liked was Clark County, which had a regional hub center run by the consortium of school superintendents. He said they also liked the model at Salem/Kaizer, which had an A/B schedule system and students were bussed from their home high school to the center. He said Lane ESD Superintendent Tony Scurto was very excited about developing something similar in Lane County and believed it would be happening soon.

Mr. Abramowitz said he thought there was a lot of opportunity for students to gain experience from professionals within the district and wondered if this was happening.

Mr. Herington replied it was not happening as much as it should be, but he saw opportunity as well.

Ms. Lind added that it was happening more in Special Education than in CTE programs at this point.

Ms. Lind and Mr. Herington left at 5:53.

VI. Follow-Up and Updates

History of Boarding School Policies and Impacts on Contemporary Education and Tribal History/Shared History Update.

Ms. Brainard arrived at 5:54.

Ms. Pérez explained that she thought it was important for the committee to hear the presentation from the last community forum. She shared that one of the things that impacted their Native American students was boarding school practices of the past, and introduced Natives Program Director for 4J, Ms. Brainard.

Ms. Brainard stated the history of boarding schools was very recent and shared that both her father and mother-in-law were in a boarding school. She then gave a brief history of boarding schools. Richard Henry Platt was the father of boarding schools, and his philosophy was “kill the Indian, save the man.” The first boarding school—Carlisle Indian Industrial School—was a shuttered army base. Children as young as three were taken, and often stayed until age twenty-three. It wasn’t until 1969 that it was illegal to send children to boarding schools. Children were sent to school in their finest clothes, but when they arrived, their clothes were burnt. Any behavior seen as being Indian or prohibited was met with severe physical punishment. In addition to physical and mental abuse, sexual abuse rampant in residential schools until the early 1980’s. History was taught with a white bias: Columbus Day, Thanksgiving, New Year’s Day (tracking time), George Washington’s birthday, Memorial Day to honor soldiers—many of who killed their relatives. Indian children were given white people’s names, were forced to punish their peers for not speaking English, and deprived of food. Every school had a jail and students were shackled when they tried to run away.

Ms. Dahill left at 6:05.

The oldest continually existing boarding school is the Chemewa Indian Training Institute in Oregon. In 1933 at the Chilocco Indian Agricultural Institute, students were fed on about eleven cents a day while the farm was earning \$220 a day. At this time, children could be rented out under the guise of training. Lasting effects of boarding schools included: inability to parent because there was no parent to teach the children, failure to thrive due to neglect or lack of food, failure to bond, and failure to embrace school. Between 1879 to the end of 1930's, 830,000 kids were sent to boarding schools

Prior to the Civil Rights Movement, The Bureau of Indian Affairs administered all the funding for the boarding schools. In 1969 the senate had a hearing and released a report, and the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) was given control of the boarding schools. The key report findings from 1969 brought to light systematic problems and how they contributed to widespread cultural abuse, national attitudes about prejudice, and educational failure.

Ms. Brainard clarified that Indians had to follow all federal law, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and the funding for some educational programing came from the Department of Education—rather than BIE.

Since 1972 Indian Education Act has remained in place and provided federal funding, but only fourteen states were large enough to access funds. Ms. Brainard said that 17% of Indian students were served by the Americans with Disabilities Act and have the highest dropout rate. Only 17% of Native Americans went on to earn a college education, and between 1992 and 2012 there were only 149 doctoral degrees earned.

Ms. Pérez said that she and Ms. Brainard had attended a conference last year to learn about Senate Bill 13 (Tribal History/Shared History). She stated that the nine tribes in Oregon had received funding to develop curriculum.

Ms. Brainard replied Senate Bill 13 required that local tribes be a focus. She added that the Oregon Education Department picked areas of studies that Native Americans would be represented in, which included: language arts, social studies, science and math. The tribes picked the final area of study, which was health. She noted that schools could choose to also work with local tribes to get accurate local history curriculum.

Ms. Pérez stated that the mandated curriculum was for fourth, eighth and tenth grade. She shared that this year there were professional development days where all fourth grade teachers would receive training. She added that there would also be a learning lab where teachers could work with other teachers, and said they were working with Lane County to see how they could share some of what they create with smaller rural districts.

Ms. Brainard shared that she gave this presentation 252 times last year, and she gave it 118 times this year in October alone.

VII. Public Comment

There was no one wishing to speak.

Ms. Pérez adjourned at 6:32 p.m. The next meeting is December 13, 2018.

Recorded by Erin Hagen