# Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) Advisory Council Monday April 15, 2013 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. Kansas State Department of Education Board Room 120 SE 10<sup>th</sup> Ave. Topeka, KS

Present: Ann Garvin, Brian Jordan, Cathy Brandt, Cindi Barta, Don Potter, Gregg Nielson,

Jane Groff, Julie Doyen, Karla King, Katherine Sprott, Mike Ronen for Kelly

Gillespie, Mandy Rohr, Mark Farr, Melinda Stanley, Nancy Bolz, Nick

Compagnone, Pam Stranathan

KSDE Staff: Scott Myers, Bill Bagshaw, Jessica Noble, Pat Bone, Amanda Noll, Brad

Neuenswander

### Welcome

Julie welcomed everyone to the meeting. It is an exciting time to be part of this council as Kansas makes plans for a new accreditation system. Kansas is a leader in many areas nationally.

## **Approval of Agenda:**

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Brian Jordan. Don Potter seconded the motion.

Motion passed

## **Approval of December Minutes:**

Motion to approve the minutes as presented was made by Don Potter. Gregg Neilson seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

# **Open Positions:**

Some council member's terms will conclude at the end of this year. Members serve a 3 year term and may serve a second three year term. All members may submit nominations for open positions. If you have anyone that should be considered please let us know. Nomination forms will be finalized and sent out soon. Completing terms this year are: Lori Goodson, Laura Kaiser. Davis Laughlin has retired and Jim Neihart will step down from his position. Jackie Glasgow has changed positions and needs to be replaced so we have a member representing special education.

Ann Garvin will continue for a second term.

Melinda's position is appointed by KSDE. This seat will be determined by Scott Myers.

Our open representative positions for next year are:

Business Representative

- Certified Staff Secondary
- Parent
- Certified Staff Middle School
- Special Education

# **Election of Chair and Vice Chair** – will occur at next meeting.

Requirements of position: Help Scott and KSDE staff set agendas for the meetings via conference call. Usually serve on sub-committees.

Please be thinking about who you want in these positions for next year. Julie and Cindi have agreed to co-chair another year at the pleasure of the council.

# **QPA Quality Criterion Collection:**

The current accreditation system requires the completion of the Quality Criterion Checklist containing 11 items. These assurances are required annually by current regulation.

We need to provide advice to the State Board of how we treat the Quality portion of accreditation during the transition period. The Board acted to accredit all schools next year as we begin to transition to a new system. This year we will be figuring the AMO's for everyone but they will not affect the accreditation status.

What do we want to do regarding the Quality portion of accreditation? Do we have people continue with completing the criterion collection during the transition? The current system will remain in place for school years 12-13 and 13-14. The new system may be in place 14-15 or possibly 15-16.

- Perception in the field is you no longer are required to complete things, you have a misconception that it is no longer required.
- Will be no ramifications for not completing or not meeting the quality requirements? No.
- This would match with new assessments timeline
- Would provide some continuity during the transition.
- Condensed from 11 to 9 requirements for the new system but will not affect the transition period.
- Would create no conflict with the new system we are moving toward.
- Need to keep quality in place to assure parents we are building a quality education for students.
- Awareness is necessary.

Motion: Keep the Quality Criterion Collection in place for this year and continue to do so as approved by the board. Motion was made by Brian Jordan and seconded by Katherine Sprott.

Motion passed.

## **Accreditation System Validation:**

The Sub-committee formed at our December meeting met and discussed a validation system for the new accreditation model. The sub-committee definitely wants to move toward a collaborative education model and a system that will share successes as well as recognize accomplishments.

Schools may focus on one of the 5 R's and not all 5. A team visit would look at all areas but realize that one particular R may be the need and focus for a district. Team would provide reinforcement of things going well and areas where they could improve.

The Subcommittee recommends that the council advise KSDE to put in place a validation system for the new model. What the validation system will look like was not determined and is still open for discussion.

The Diocese is currently doing a protocol for higher education and suggests we might want to look at these procedures for best practices.

The Sub-committee felt that self-assessment was not enough. An outside validation committee that reviews and validates the self-scoring of the district and provides outside input is a critical component for a new accreditation system.

4 level rubrics allow for required steps or suggestions.

What it looks like is yet to be determined. The committee is only making a recommendation to have an outside review by a team.

Use of multiple measures will be discussed in a little while in terms of educator evaluation. It will be the same system.

Motion: Don Potter moved that the council recommends the use of an external evaluation as part of the new accreditation system. . Amanda Rohr seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

## **Utilization of Rubrics:**

Rubric of the 5 R's. How does it translate to accreditation? What we need to discuss today is "what a district must score or do in order to be accredited?" Are there levels of accreditation to meet?

Three possible approaches:

- Use of points for each of the 17 criteria. Do we go with a percentage?
- An API approach. This has the capacity to measure growth in any area. KSDE could do something similar to what is being done with the AMO calculations.
- Watermark system. Set a level (score) that must be met to determine accreditation level.

# Discussion:

- Keep it as simple as possible.
- Looking from a district perspective, results will always be there. What if a district wants to focus on only one area? Measuring relationships is much more subjective than results to look at showing growth in these areas.
- Everyone has to do results because of AMO's.
- We put these other areas on the rubrics to get away from having the results carry so much weight.
- Karla field test. Having three levels you kind of pick the middle level. Perhaps 4 levels would get people away from choosing the middle.

- Recommendations emerging from the field test districts indicate that the terms implementing and transitioning should be swapped. Transition occurs before implementation.
- Consider phasing in of all 5 areas. One new area each year until districts are working toward excellence in all areas. Easing the burden of trying to do everything at once.
- What occurs that moves you from step 2 to step 3? What is the critical difference?
- What are the four levels of the teacher evaluation model? Ineffective, developing, effective, and highly effective.
- How can we manage this system? What is comfortable and is still striving to the excellence bar?
- Through the pilot and the evaluation system, we have learned some things about phasing people in and easing stress.
- Are the bullets all equal in value? Do we have to assign a point to each subcategory? Score for the total R as opposed to every single bullet point of the rubrics.
- Need to set protocols for implementation
- One standard level didn't give districts enough information to know where to go to create improvement in each area. Ratings at each indicator level were requested by the field in the AdvanceEd process. Districts wanted more break down into smaller areas.
- Implementation based on a number of districts starting and then others following. The first group of volunteers can help develop the system.
- Strategic plans don't address every single thing. It develops a plan of what is most important first.
- District plan will be more general than building level.
- Manual is needed as well as staff development around how the system works.
- Don't want people to just look at this as paperwork.
- Must hear the voices of our students and families in this area. What this system means
  to educators and what it means to communities may be very different. Must have
  student level impact or it is irrelevant.
- Keep in mind stakeholders, challenging to move forward, collaborative nature help from neighboring districts. Impact at classroom level.

It Looks like there is a need to develop some sub-committees in a face to face setting to really develop these areas.

#### Possible Subcommittees:

- Levels of accreditation
- Scoring of rubrics
- Roll out of system phasing in

These will be set at the end of the day.

# Keep Update: Bill Bagshaw

### **PowerPoint**

The Regional Education Lab (REL) in Denver and also the Marzano Institute have been helping us answer questions and have provided these slides.

Components of KEEP are very similar to the R's. Kansas ESEA Waiver defines student growth as Impact on student learning Measuring growth

What counts as student's skill and knowledge

Sample Measure by KSDE from the Field

Multiple Measures working definition –
Went to 9 locations and collected input for what it should be.

Academic Measures – State Assessments
Others Act/SAT, Aimsweb, AP scores, DETE formative Assessment DIEBELS and others

College and Career Ready Measures

Other Non-Academic Measures Life Skills Occupational therapy skills 21<sup>st</sup> Century skills, etc.

Accreditation is just more detailed than what the evaluation model requires. People are already looking at the components.

KEEP multiple measures will be appropriate and applicable for accreditation

**Growth Measure Guidance Table** 

Multiple Measures slide

4 or 6 categories are better than 3 or 5 to keep people from just going to the middle. How many measures you hit could help determine overall rubric score. Apply this thought to self –assessing in each of the subcategories of the accreditation rubric. This would create parallel thinking between KEEP and the Accreditation System.

Teachers and building leader's evaluations must be connected. As an evaluator it is the leaders' responsibility to make sure the teacher is choosing appropriate strategies (measures) to increase effectiveness.

By the End of May we have to submit to the US Dept. of Ed what we mean by multiple measures and what is significant progress. We are suggesting significant means use of more than one measure that growth is occurring. Not a percentage.

Significant means you can demonstrate growth in more than one way.

What happens if you are teaching in non-tested areas? I would say that I can show significant growth in these three ways. Is that what you are saying? We have collected ideas from many of these nonacademic teachers are using to evaluate. There would be a list available to choose from as well as creating your own.

Multiple Measures slide

Inter-Rater Reliability – Reliability refers to the consistency of an assessment.

## KEEP Districts slide

Questions -

Family engagement in the process of KEEP - Have you seen the language KPIRC worked to include? No.

Within the constructs relative to the wording family engagement is a key component.

Family engagement is in part 2B of the flexibility waiver and not in 3 regarding evaluation. I would like to see it ratcheted up in importance in the KEEP process.

Jane will send the version she and Laura worked on to include the family engagement language.

### **Field Test Results:**

Handout – explained who participated in the field test.

Number indicates sizes of districts

We made a very consciences effort to include all areas of the state and all student populations. 35 districts participated

2 private schools

In February districts participated in a webinar or the recording of it which walked through the three different types of rubrics you have all seen. A Field test guidance document was also shared. This included who should be involved from each district and ways to approach the field test.

KSDE provided a feedback form. Each district looked at one rubric. We had at least one big and one small district participate in each rubric tested. We did provide all districts with all of the rubrics as some indicated they wanted to look at them all.

Of the 35 field test districts, 22 have responded.

Feedback from the 22 who have responded: 5 areas emerged (Handout)

- Background needed more information and more specific information.
- Levels of Performance
- Rubrics
- Scoring
- Process

Very little was shared about the sub-categories.

7 feedback areas were evaluated.

Not consistent between rubrics. Unclear between district and building levels Feels too much like a checklist but not really have to work toward continuous improvement. Does professional learning need to be included in multiple categories? Field found it to be redundant.

Some recommended removal of the 5 R's and just have the 17 categories? Look at the items in relationship to all of the R's.

Don't want the new system to have another checkbox feel. We want it to be something that helps districts move forward.

Needs to be motivational as well as a strategic planning tool. Maybe there is a way the districts can help determine the weight of each area based on the districts goals.

Need a balance between looking at the intended purpose and the intended design to cross-over between initiatives.

If we get too detail rich, it becomes a checklist. Need detail but don't want to provide too much.

## Scoring -

How do you reach a final score for a subcategory when the indicators are not all the same?

## Process -Key things

- Very time consuming. (only one school indicated how much time they actually spent)
- Each subcategory needs its own group of stakeholders Requires 17 different groups to complete the work
- How does building level scoring trickle up to district level
- Electronic system
- Favor a phase in approach over 4 years, one new "R" each year.

We are used to checkboxes and AYP for one year of data. It takes at least 3 years to change and grow a system. Once you establish where you are, you can concentrate on where you are going.

Address issue of connecting higher education into the process.

Our state is changing in its diversity and we need to keep those perspectives in mind, too.

A missing demographic includes our very largest districts: Topeka, KC, and Wichita. We need feedback from some of these districts because of their diverse populations. Since we asked for volunteers and we don't get the information from the most diverse populations, we don't have reliable data to work with.

It is disappointing when responses are not received. Our focus here at the agency is more technical assistance. We will bring it to their attention. These were not districts who volunteered to participate. After looking at the volunteers, the gap which existed to be filled was in our really small districts.

Maybe we can be sure they are included in the next pilot. The lens of including these voices is important to be sure we are getting valid and reliable information. We must have some information from these largest districts.

#### **Lunch Break**

This afternoon we need to discuss the current regulations and what will need to change. We must start talking about the work to do there. Technology Vision for a new system is our last topic today. What do we want, and what would we like to have in the new system.

We want to honor your time, but please ask any questions you have.

# Accreditation Pilot (2013-2014)

- When
- Who
- How

As we have been out presenting on multiple programs it feels we need to slow down this process. We are not ready to move forward with all districts. This is not a federal mandate to rework accreditation. Kansas has chosen to do this work. We were looking at a full pilot with all districts in the fall. Need to consider another field test before piloting.

There is never a good time, but it is ours to work through.

What do you think about the next step and when it should occur?

- Pilot or field test?
- What is the timeline of updating the rubrics based on the first field test? June meeting
  would be the next meeting of this group where the work could be reviewed. This
  committee needs to take part in that process
- Fall of next year, another field test. Use spring semester to evaluate the test and do the work of making changes.
- Shoot for 14-15 launch of pilot
- Does the field need time to focus on the things that have to be done in regard to curriculum and assessments? How stressed are school staff now?
- Be careful of postponing too long?
- School Improvement plans roll out August/September and doing another field test at the same time to direct districts focus in moving forward would seem logical.
- Is there something we could provide the schools to say we are still a couple of years out but here is some information for you to start working toward as we transition from one to another? Can we help them think about the 5 R's as they develop their plans for the year? Broaden their perspectives. Information to all even though many will not be participating in the field test.
- Schools are already talking about the 5 R's and wanting to know what they need to be doing.
- We have missed the principals in this process. Scott will be having a conversation with Gene Haydock from the Kansas Association of Secondary School Principals (KASSP) and asking what we need to be doing for principals to help them start seeing the direction of a new system?
- Need a roadmap, fact sheet for principals. To the point information. Definitions of the 5 R's.
- Content for professional learning.
- Gear toward second field test in the spring?
- I think we need a scoring tool before we field test the second time.
- Writing the 4<sup>th</sup> level and writing the wording will take time.
- Staff development is a key issue
- Diane's messages shared with administrators about data and direction. It helps to settle people's nerves. Video clips are quite helpful to spread the word.
- The piece that frustrates people is changing timelines. Only put out the pieces that are solid to keep anxiety down.

- Field needs to know this is a work in progress and change is to be expected. Feedback is being considered and is causing changes in the process. This helps stress the relevance of why are we doing this.
- Information is only as a good as the hearer. Great information with poor timing doesn't get the necessary attention.
- Field test was 2 month window
- May need committee work responses before we can determine

#### When:

- Next year, specifics to be determined
- Include timeline in August with talking points, field test to follow later in the year.

Who: New districts, same districts, or two groups, one of each? Represent all areas of the state as we did this year.

- Opportunity for both groups
- Builds on the information we are able to collect and a base of people who understand and can add voice to the system
- Adding new districts will help show the curve on implementation possibilities.
- Equal numbers of new and old

Why are we doing this? QPA was not helping us move forward and improve our education system.

Concepts out in the fall Field test in winter Who = new and old in equal numbers

How – Utilize technology as much as possible. Start with a repository for artifacts.

Katherine Sprott made a motion to inclusion of a technology component is an essential component of the new accreditation system." Amanda Rohr seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

Examples of possible technology pieces

- Repository
- Merging with kids
- · Check marks of scoring

#### Communication:

- One of the complications may be that we have taken KEEP and Teaching in Kansas II, on road trips and used ITV's to get the message out. The new accreditation system has not put anything out that we may have to resend. Tried to be sure that we don't have to take anything back and remove it from the conversation.
- Need one more bit of evidence to spread to the field and get it out there in an organized fashion
- KSDE will work on bullet points to move this conversation forward.
- As you work on your improvement plan here are 5 points for you to consider...

- What questions should you be asking your staff to determine your direction as we move forward?
- Give staff time to have meaningful conversations about the areas of the rubrics.
- Help districts start having conversations. Plant seeds for meaningful district conversations.
- Districts who participated in the field test will be asked to participate again knowing that some will not choose to participate.
- Next test may be more scripted in the responses requested.
- Must connect to something they already know. The next vehicle should help them move the process forward.
- Where do we start bringing in the idea of validation with the outside committee? This could be a value added piece for the repeating districts.

# **Regulations Work**

Handout – shows all the places where modification will need to occur. It may be easier to just start over

- School will need to be replaced by district
- Levels of accreditation
- Future for standard of excellence?
- Performance and quality criteria would need replaced. How do we write to these new ideas?
- Support for schools not meeting accreditation
- Sanctions for not meeting accreditation
- Appeal process
- Once a year report of accreditation status, how do we reflect multi-year system?

We have had some of these conversations and need to move into the specifics

We will need a regulations subcommittee but this work has been started in October of 2011.

# **Technology Vision**

Essential	Wouldn't It Be Neat
Place (System) to fill in the 5 R form	Vignette videos for training
Multiple staff access	Online collaboration (chat box) message
	boards
Repository for documents and definitions	Access for mobile phones?
(glossary)	
Linked to 5 R forms	
Webpage with link to glossary text linked to	
research (works cited) acronyms	
Secure site public and private	
Scoring (you fill it in and the system scores it)	
Would allow multiple buildings to complete and	
tied to district scoring.	
Required fields – things that cannot be left	
blank	
Report card showing district accreditation	
information reflective of the 5 R's – public	

piece to be formed later	
Authenticated application based on the rubric	
for district use on the model and scoring rubric	
Links to existing data reports on	
demographics, SO66, LPR, assessment data,	
graduation rate, attendance rates,	
Supporting data pre-pulled into their rubrics so	
they don't have to go find the information.	
Linked to required plans.	
Links to exemplars – way to collaborate	
Sample potential artifacts or best practices, or	
available resources	
(21 <sup>st</sup> century skills site might have some	
helpful visuals)	
FAQ	
System and Drill down views	

This is time consuming work but has great value. Shared rationale, built value. Time and support for doing the work. System will only be as good as the leaders doing the work.

Email any additional thoughts to Scott.

Assign rights as to who can access what data.

Can we do a June 3 and 4 meetings for subcommittees and full council? All 4 committees meet and then report out at the end of the day and to the full council

It was determined that the council would meet on June 3<sup>rd</sup> for an extended day, Committees will work in the morning. Meeting time is 8:30-5:00.

Preliminary work will be started via phone call. Dates for call are to be determined.

Need definitions of the 5 R's before the next meeting. Katherine Sprott wants to help work on the definitions.

# **Sub-Committees**

Number of levels-Scoring of rubrics-Brian Roll out of new system-Regulations-

Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.