Quality Accreditation Advisory Council
October 24, 2011

Mary Devin Education Center USD 475 Geary County
Board Room
Junction City

Present: Melinda Stanley, Julie Doyen, Lori Goodson, Gregg Nielson, Jackie Glasgow, Laura Kaiser, Jane Groff, Nancy Bolz, Nick Compagnone, Terry Forsyth for Peg Dunlap, Paul Getto, Chuck Stockton, Jill Dickerson, Katherine Sprott, Tim Skinner, Ann Garvin, Mandy Rohr, Cindy Barta, John Schifferdecker, Terry McEwen, Mary Kay Lindh, Katherine Sprott, Laurie Waters, Theresa Steinlage, Karla King, Ronald Walker, Cathy Brandt

Absent: Jerry Hamm, James Niehart, Laura Wiley, Ed West, Chuck Stockton,

KSDE: Brad Neuenswander, Howard Shuler,

Brad Neuenswander-
Thank you to Ron Walker and the Junction City staff for hosting us today. We thank all of you for being here today and adjusting schedules to be able to be here. The work we have to do is so important. We are pulling together several different groups so that we get different perspectives as we review our current accreditation system. Our goal today is to focus on the key things that must be in place to be an accredited school. What are the foundational pieces?

PowerPoint Presentation
21st Century Accreditation – The 5 R's
Relationships, Relevance, Responsive Culture, Results, and Rigor.

KSDE has already been presenting ideas across the state in Dodge, Topeka, and Colby. We will be in SE Kansas and Wichita this week. The current system has not kept up with where schools actually are. The quality checklist is not providing information and the driving force for accrediting has been what percent of our students are proficient or above. Performance will be a piece but it will not be the whole focus.

KSDE will be applying for a waiver from some ESEA requirements in mid-February. We are asking across the state what you as school leaders really want included in this request.
Assumptions - (to get thoughts going)

- New system for Kansas schools needs to reflect a broader approach to quality than AYP in reading and math.
- Focus will be on transition to 21st Century standards. The Milestones for Improving Learning and Education Guide (MILE) is an excellent resource that KSDE has some ownership in.
- Accreditation will be at the District level
    - Accrediting by district allows for accountability at all levels. From the student, to the teacher, to the building principal, to district administration, to KSDE.
    - If we accredit by the district, every building within the district will be accredited. There may still be a building that is not performing well but the lens will be around what is being done for that building to make improvement.

- Accredited and Non-Accredited, and perhaps some other distinctions within these categories, like:
    - Accredited through Growth or
    - Accredited with Distinction.

Process – Brad's PowerPoint

Points will be awarded by area on a rubric scale using predetermined factors that have been proven by use in successful schools. This provides a way to acknowledge great programs and will also expose weaknesses. It will provide a frame for planning improvement action.

Draft New Accreditation Model – Handout

Think about when you received your district report card. What is on it? Assessment scores and percentages. (Results) It doesn't give a picture of the district/school and what is happening to close the gaps.

Right now in Kansas you can only be marked as Accredited or below (on Improvement). What about new categories that acknowledge excellence? What about the growth/gains in student performance? This is the piece the state is working on for the waiver request. When a district/building is making improvement it is the work that is being done in the other four R's that is driving the improvement. (Results)

What is it in the regulations we want to keep and what just doesn't fit anymore?

Julie Doyen-
This is our opportunity to play with the stuff and have input that makes the difference.

The group was divided into work groups who were assigned specific regulations to review.

A Few thoughts:

- The State Board will not mandate much of anything but does want to assist in providing guidance to schools. What do we need to see schools doing and how can the state support the work?

Reporting Out – (Flip Charts)

First Group
Learning Environment Criteria. – Quality and Performance pieces will "go away". Growth of Learning Environment. Evidence Based as opposed to Research based.

Second Group
Data Submission – data submitted from each of the 5 R areas.
Local boards – would like to see required training for school boards by KASB/KSDE. Requirements need to be written according to the 5 R's and points based on number of members trained etc. Look at AdvancED's accreditation system and resources such as the parent and student survey as we are building our new accreditation system.

District provides data. Points are driven by the definition of the 5 R's. Define for each level of the rubric, how many points and based on the criteria. District verses school focus.

State Performance Plan – incorporated into accreditation and scoring system.

Third Group
Graduation Requirements –
Need to re-address the graduation requirements based on the Rubric and Accreditation needs that are developed.

Possibilities -
- Add Foreign Language
- Financial Literacy
- Readdress "Unit"
- Prefer local control beyond state minimum

Technical Assistance
District level team
Continuity between state accreditation team and technical assistance team
Affordability of state Accreditation Team and/or technical assistance teams

Fourth Group

37 & 38
Change timeline - 60 days to file appeal instead of 30
Accredited types change to growth labels
Change "ordered" to "scheduled" (by commissioner)
Status
Add - Accredited with distinction

Possibly remove 4 e, f, and g, Definitions that may not be applicable in new system.

Sanctions - Change….

Fifth Group

Sanction and Rewards need to be different

Public Disclosure – reported to local district and community.
More time in appeal process
Possibly since Department of Defense students in other countries don't have to meet AYP maybe it should apply to districts in the states as well that have large numbers of defense family children.

Instead of "Sanctions" maybe the word should be "Supports"

Federal waiver request asks states to develop a system of Accountability, with rewards and supports.

Comments on Definitions:

Discussion - What stands out?

- Performance criteria changed to accreditation levels
- Good practice to review improvement plan annually
- Resources available to sustain technical assistance teams
- All definitions will need to be revised based on the new model
- Change school to district
- Terms – conditionally accredited, external technical assistance and state assistance team, district plan as opposed to school plan, standard of excellence will need to be looked at.
- Consistence in terminally
- Move to approaching standard etc.
- Last definition – unit of credit, is it obsolete?
- Teams are important. Instead of accreditation team, advisory team.

From Notes

- Lots of changes – driven by definitions of the 5 R's. Change "school" to "district" throughout.
- Possible levels –
    - Accredited with Distinction
    - Accredited on Growth
    - Accredited
    - Non – Accredited
- Subgroups changed to demographic?
- External Technical assistance team-
    - Personally visit the school
    - School selects team – Biased?
    - Continue external team
    - Consider frequency/selection process
    - External Evaluation Council or External Advisory Team(possible names)
- (a) remove the word minimum, School should be replaced by district
- (b) do we need definitions for each accreditation status, not just Accredited on Improvement?
- (e) Minimum number of visits required(?); need more details, purpose and time frame
- (g) Definition of "not accredited" should be moved up to underneath "conditionally accredited".
- (j) School improvement plan change to School integrated improvement plan? Use same model? State model? Submit yearly to external team. Application at all levels.
- (k) Standards of excellence – may change if terms change
- Revise – "State assessments" means the assessments the state board administers to measure student learning. May want to list tested subjects.
- (n) Not happening, not needed?
- (o) Student "demographic" instead of "subgroup". Remove the following due to changes coming? "including economic disadvantage, race, ethnicity, disability, and limited English proficiency."
- (p) "Unit of Credit" Remove – possibly keep in "individual students may be awarded credit based upon demonstrated knowledge" What we are working toward.

Dots - What are the policy foundations we need? (concept levels)

Comments are in the color of the dots represented.

Red – get rid of it. Stop
Yellow – uncertain
Green – needs to happen
Black – comment with no dots

FLIP CHARTS

91-31-32 Performance and quality criteria (Change to Growth of Learning Environment Criteria)

- Rewrite section relative to 5 R's
- Needs to be researched and/or evidence based

91-31-33 Data Submission

- Data will be submitted on each of the 5 R's

91-31-34 Local board of education requirements

- Require training of local boards by KASB & KSDE on current accreditation model (entire board training)
- Requirements for local boards need to be written according to the 5 R's
- Criteria placed within the 5 R's system

91-31-35 Graduation requirements

- Changes to graduation requirements
- Re-address graduation requirements based on Rubric/accreditation needs

Possibilities

- Add foreign language
- Financial literacy (2 red and 2 green votes)
- Re-address "unit of credit"
- Prefer local control beyond state minimum

91-31-36 Technical Assistance Team

- District level team
- Continuity between state accreditation team and/or technical assistance team (7 green 5 yellow)
- Affordability of State Accreditation team and/or technical assistance team

91-31-37 Accreditation recommendation and appeal.

91-31-38 Accreditation Status

- Four levels
    - Accredited with Distinction
    - Accredited
    - Accredited through Growth
    - Not Accredited

- 4 b omit
- Eliminate term “conditionally accredited”
- 4 e f g, possible remove based on new system
- 4 h change the word “shall” to may

91-31-39 Rewards

- OK

91-31-40 Sanctions

- Not relevant for private schools
- Sanctions may be applied…
- Check on legal authority of A-F

91-31-41 Public Disclosure

- Keep the same
- Change performance/quality to learning environment

91-31-42 Waiver

- Change 3 b from 30 Days (working?, calendar?, or at next board of education meeting) to 60 days

Must include:

- Licensed staff
- Art, music, physical education
- Library media specialist each school for 21st century schools