

**QPA Advisory Council**  
**Monday, June 13, 2011**  
9:00 a.m.  
Shawnee Public Library  
1515 SW 10th Ave  
Topeka, Kansas 66604-1374

**Present:** Julie Doyen, Lori Goodson, Ann Garvin, James Neihart, Nancy Bolz, Gregg Neilson, Peg Dunlap, Melinda Stanley, Brad Neuenswander, Julie Ford, Laura Kaiser, Jane Groff, Katherine Sprott, Kathy Taylor, Jerry Hamm, Ron Walker, Jerry Hamm, Tom Krebs (KSAB) for Paul Getto,

**Absent:** Robert Vinton, Khris Thexton, Rick Kraus, Terry McEwen, Mary Kay Lindh, Kathleen Getto, Cathy Brandt, Ken Jantz, Donna Sill, Tim Skinner, Ed West, Linda Wiley, Theresa Steinlage, Randy Oliver, Kelly Gillespie, Chuck Stockton,

**Guests:** Tony Moss, Pat Hill, Xuewen Sheng, Dave Bowman, Tom Foster

**Welcome:** Julie Doyen and Lori Goodson

**Brad Neuenswander – State Board Strategic Direction – Handout Advancing Kansas Education Strategic Agenda.** These are the new goals set forth by the State Board. From more than 100 recommendations by advisory committees the State Board has narrowed its direction to 15 or 16 objectives. These objectives outline where the department will be moving in the next two years. Your work will fall under objective 1.2. We are open to suggestions and are coming to this group to ask what do we want to accredit schools on? What should be driving schools? What would a new accreditation system look like if we were to change? What should be saved? What areas need to start over? What doesn't work? We don't want to make schools/districts that are doing well have to make major changes.

**Growth Model Presentation** – Tony Moss, Dave Bowman, Xuewen Sheng – Handout **Score Improvement Models**

Score improvement different term for growth model. State can use as we want but feds have specific guidelines we must follow if we want to use a growth model for AYP.

Model 1 favors low academic gainers.

Model 2 also favors lower-achieving gainers.

Model 3 uses past assessments to predict where students will perform in the future. This model is the most accurate.

Some models reward growth in score while others reward movement in status (meets standard etc.)

Disadvantages

- Emphasis on summative assessments
- No diagnostics for teachers to act upon.
- Misinterpretations are likely

- Common core assessments may force us to change much or all

How do these models impact teacher's pedagogy? Many possible explanations but it will take local conversations to determine what change(s) is needed.

### Questions/Discussion

- Will this require staff to interpret the data? Yes.
- Schools are spending too much time testing and interpreting scores and it eats into instructional time. We need to decrease time of staff spent on test results
- Concern – we don't know what is going to happen with common core assessments and these models seem to be adding to confusion in the field. If there is correlation between current and the new assessments it might not be bad but if the correlation is not good it will only burden staff. The structure of the common core assessment will be adaptive. We should anticipate that there would be differences with the common core assessments. Differences should be well delineated.
- When this was implemented in Colorado, it changed the conversations around assessment data. Conversations became richer and more focused. Got away from buildings and put more focus on the student.
- The federal level is placing a huge emphasis on sharing data with families. Simple data is important for this purpose. It shows parents where their child was before, where they are now, and how they compared to other students in the building.
- State Board has said that we are going to do a growth model. Will schools choose a type of growth model or will the state set the model? The state will set the model as these types of models are too complicated and expensive for each district to choose.
- (Brad) Board wants an update at December meeting. We want the field to see what we are thinking and provide input on the directions we go. We want to make this beneficial for the schools.
- Colorado has decided not to utilize the growth model for AYP at this time. I think it should be connected for teachers so that it is not just another thing for them to be doing. Colorado looked at it as a way to see how AYP would be affected by the growth model. It is used in their state accountability system.
- Common core, new assessments, and growth models from the field perspective this is too much. Let us learn common core and get good at it and then prove it on the new assessments. Then if the growth model is needed it can be added.
- State board is trying to respond to the field request to make the required growth of the AYP charts achievable and less painful. All of this emphasis on accountability is taking away from time to look for new ways to present material to students that will help them make "it".
- Need to have alignment of all these pieces so that we can utilize them effectively. It may not take place until later on. We don't want to get caught not meeting the needed goals. Give the model to us as soon as you can so we can work through it and figure out what we need to do.
- Are we out there getting and sharing information with other states? Yes, we are a governing state in ESSBACK and we are taking part in the national conversations. The Colorado model has been adopted by several states and is looked upon favorably at the federal level. There is also an agreement to share resources. Many places and levels of sharing nationally are in place. (Tom)
- We are early in this process and wanted to at least show you where we are at now in the process. We wanted you to be aware of what discussions are taking place.
- KSDE is hoping to be able to share some data with districts by December.

- Bandura comments on efficacy. It appears there is something to think about with how it is to be used. Perhaps we should come back to you with questions about how to use this and what purposes it should serve.
- Any thoughts on multiple assessment possibilities? It is being talked about.
- What questions will there be for districts to respond to if the state has chosen the model? The state has not yet chosen anything but the student percentile growth model appears to be the most useful as looked at by multiple states. We needed to get something out there for people to respond to. This model is the most flexible and gives us more possibilities to add or remove elements.
- Important factor for higher education is to view the models through the lens of the teacher matters most. They will impact how parents understand, how lessons are planned, etc.
- Biggest criticism we've had is that we currently only measure kids, one day, one time. We want to be able to show that the individual child is making progress toward the goal of gaining the knowledge they need.
- Common core and working between NAEP results. Is NAEP or other types of systems involved in these conversations? These tests look at trend data. Convergence of assessment systems is being looked at and will meet around the common core standards.
- An implementation timeline of these systems would be beneficial for schools connecting all three things together.

**Dream Session – Possibilities – Thinking Outside the Box (Presentation of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Accreditation Model Possibility)** Tom Foster Handout – Draft for Internal Discussion

Prezi Link: <https://prezi.com/secure/5180ab3607345e1e811249994ba14475f260bb9a/>

Julie asked me to talk about a new model for accreditation. We have started to think about other models. The question is what do we want 21st Century schools to look like? Schools are so much more than a single score on an assessment and AYP. We've created an environment where schools feel beat up by one single test. We're interested in how we can recapture the role and move school's forward in a transformative way in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

We started this process with a series of assumptions:

Accreditation may be

- Focused on a transition to 21<sup>st</sup> Century Standards.
- Aligned with the Profiles for 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner/21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Environment which have been endorsed by the KS State Board of Education. (Refer to Profiles of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Student.) Revisit graduation requirements as a result of these profiles. The Learner Component implies students, parents, teachers, community, etc.
- May have only two designations Accredited and Non-Accredited
- award points for implementing best practices to Schools/Districts. (Implementing, Transitioning, Modeling) The categories presented are only possibilities. Rubrics to describe categories would be created. There could be other categories to give districts/schools opportunities to think outside the box.

A Rubric Based Approach: Refer to PowerPoint slide showing an example of the categories and delineated points.

KSDE Role: Support for Accreditation becomes the responsibility of multiple teams within KSDE monitoring and providing assistance. Evidence to support priorities will need to be defined. Technical assistance an area of transition with a school will be directed by the team responsible for that priority.

Significant Shift: Test scores have been the driver to accreditation becoming a multidimensional system. Schools will be incentivized to innovate. The process will support flexibility and transformation.

21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning Continuum: Refer to Power Point to review the From...Towards chart. The left side represents the one-dimensional system (pacing guides, knowing the right answers) to the right side the multidimensional system.

Questions: Once we have determined an accreditation system, how do we share this with Institutions of Higher Education? Pam Coleman has included this information in the teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation committee meetings.

P20 Council was working toward cohesions and alignment of all the systems and work.

Components of the Rubric: Handout – Draft (Based on the Five Unifying Themes in the Profiles of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Student document.)

1. Relationships
2. Relevance
3. Rigor
4. Results
5. Responsive Culture

We are looking for the council to help us add the definitions to the rubric.

Districts will have opportunities to make choices and set up a plan that will work for individuals. Based on the rubric results, districts would be able to choose areas of focus (self-study) that would improve their opportunity to increase points and enhance their programs.

Under relationships a separate category should be family.

Quality Assurances Checklist – is one of them that the school district have a follow-up study of the graduates? Until a school or district is on improvement the state does not really know what they are doing. The state does not go in and look at what they have in place. District leadership is responsible for signing off and ensuring that all aspects necessary are in place.

Video of 21<sup>st</sup> century – “I think outside the box” Peter Reynolds - YouTube

#### Comments

- Any accreditation process that requires teams to go into a district I can't see that as being effective. The people who are there know what their kids need more than an outsider. Check on what kids need to know and that would be what is needed.
- Peer review process is a reflective process that allows others to look at what is happening and the staff to tell the story. There is more than data to a school.
- We do external teams that visit our schools. They report to us the findings of what they have seen via a rubric. Provides a menu of items to choose from. The pieces of the rubrics are where schools focus in.

- May need two phases, a rubric system, and an external team visit.
- Love pulling data because it represents kids and what they are doing as opposed to writing a report that requires staff time.
- Data system collects so much information; we could build in many components of the information. The Collaborative workspace on the accountability dashboard will be helpful.
- Sections for schools to provide input in addition to the data KSDE already has
- Compliance vs. opportunity to learn in a holistic review of the school setting. Adds perspective to empower continuous improvement cycle.
- Is compliance a piece of what KSDE does? Yes, it has to be one of the pieces.
- If you focus on continuous improvement the accreditation pieces just happen.
- Innovation category may be included in each rubric.
- Levels of accreditation such as accredited with distinction are possible.

#### Overview of Accreditation Research – PowerPoint Julie Ford (Handout Colorado)

- Colorado system flow chart – information looked at yearly and decision on accreditation is made.
- Themes of accreditation vary state to state.

### **Discussion**

Where would we like to see accreditation go? What is important and will affect how we look at accrediting schools. How should we hold schools accountable?

- AYP is not the way to do it but have not received any good alternatives.
- Simple process without a lot of bookwork and record keeping
- Based on how well each and every child progresses
- How is the district handling each individual child's progress
- What is the purpose of accreditation? Why do we do it? Should it drive instruction, pedagogy, etc.?
- We need to develop a purpose and let it drive what is happening in accreditation
- What is the SB motivation in wanting to review accreditation? For most of the board, I think they see that the current QPA system is not driving decision. It is making AYP. If this is not ideal, what should we be doing? If we are going to measure accountability lets be sure we are looking at the right things.
- What are good schools doing that all schools need to be doing?
- KLN process has really caused us to look at our schools. Are there best practices we should see that drive excellence? We need something to hold up to, to measure against. Marzano's 9 factors that impact school improvement.
- Define quality effective instruction to measure against
- What is it in Kansas that comprises a quality school district? Out of these qualities, what can/should we measure and what standard will we use to measure against. How do we collaborate between KSDE and each local district? There must be teeth to the system without being too cumbersome.
- Juvenile corrections schools – Kansas is really improving its education. Not long ago, kids coming in couldn't read. This situation has improved drastically. IEP's have also drastically improved. We struggle with the current accreditation system. Manpower is a concern to implement visiting teams. Accreditation status will not be maintained long term. Currently, the same rules apply to juvenile corrections schools that apply to any school.

- Time is a variable we have no control over. Would like to give scores back to the home school district. Wouldn't be detrimental to big districts but would really hurt small schools.
- Base system more on inputs than outputs. Need to look at what is being done for kids who are not performing as well as how they perform.
- Points for how you deal with your demographics in addition to the assessment scores. This would help districts overcome poor performance that is a result of mobility, or language barriers.
- Sometimes results of programs come later than the measurement window.
- Best practices – not the only practice but a collection of ideas to get the end result
- Innovative side – best practices waiting to be discovered. Credit for looking for new ideas in presenting, instruction.
- Kansas is trying to craft teaching skills that will meet common core
- Perhaps what we need to concentrate on is looking at the 4 State Board goals and go to the field and collect best practices and innovative practices – why did you try this? Collect them and group them under the goals and objectives.
- The board's job is to set direction. It is KSDE's job is to collect the strategies to move the direction forward.
- Set up a survey to find out the information on practices.
- Ultimate goal is to produce quality citizens. What does the world need us to produce? We cannot lesson our standards on teachers. We need quality teachers. Yes, we need counselors and library media specialists. Kansas is at the top of the list in quality practices. We need to streamline some practices without losing the quality components.
- AdvancEd is looking at the pieces of a quality system. They have embedded the relevance, rigor, etc. It will be linked to assessment and results. Comprehensive analysis in ASSIST, allows us to link the important information to our need.
- Add innovation and best practices to each section on the rubric
- District or school. Lean toward state looking at the district and the district looking at the school.
- Set realistic achievement levels. Leave it simple for districts to choose to just meet achievement goals or to add additional pieces to gain additional accreditation levels.
- District self-assessment in addition to as they monitor schools the schools have a self-assessment tool.
- District accreditation system would carry accreditation from the state for every building in that district.
- Feds are talking about a risk management system
- At what point does the state become a little more prescriptive ie...adopt and implement a system like or similar to MTSS?
- The districts that are doing it as well as they can should not have many changes to make. Sadly, until the state is required to come help, there isn't much in place.
- Who is going to access an annual report at the state level?
- External teams do not need to be KSDE staff
- If not for QPA, schools would not have progressed to where they are today. Balance of what state says we must do and what we think is important on the local level. Content and other areas are strong in our Kansas kids. We have a path let's focus it to make it work
- Focused, common sense, bar to meet, growth measurement, simple system

What tasks could I be doing to provide KSDE the most information, help? Have conversations with people

- What is the purpose of accreditation beyond the law (KSA 72-7513)?
  - Every kid to be successful
- The areas of the rubric need to apply to the QPA system as well as the schools
- Is it possible to get opinions of other groups to speak to us? KNEA, KASB, etc.
- Identify the indicators of success
- How close is ESEA reauthorization? Arne Duncan has said probably not by fall but feds will be looking at allowing some flexibility.

QPA system

- Shouldn't be based on one test
- Limited data collection
- Looking for strategies to move the State Board forward in meeting their goals.
- Bring back input on what communities want accreditation to stand for.
- Higher Ed is being updated on common core, Next month showing longitudinal data system.
- Evaluate each school's technology capabilities.

**Next year**

Members- roles to fill

Send form to council, put out on list serves, post on website

Provide state map

**Nominating committee to review nominees**

Julie Doyen

Nancy Bolz

Brad Neuenswander

Julie Ford

Elect Chair – Keep co-chairs for another year

- Lori will serve as chair with Julie as co-chair

Review of the council by-laws by the nominations review committee.

Dates for next year: Stay with dates presented at April Meeting

- September 6, 2011
- December 5, 2011
- April 9, 2012
- June 4, 2012

Meeting Adjourned.