Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) Advisory Council
Tuesday, September 4, 2012
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
SRS Learning Center
Room D
2600 SW East Circle Drive South
Topeka, KS

9:00 a.m. **Welcome, Introductions, Overview for New Members**
Julie Doyen –Chair, Cindy Barta Vice-Chair of QPA Advisory Council

Present: Scott Myers, Julie Doyen, Jeannine Pfannenstiel, Nancy Bolz, James Neihart, Suzan Patton, Michael King, Peg Dunlap, Laura Kaiser, Jane Groff, Jill Dickerson, Linda Wiley, Ronald Walker, Gregg Nielson, Pam Stranathan, Melinda Stanley, John Schifferdecker, Amanda Rohr, Don Potter, Karla King, Brian Jordan, Mary Kay Lindh, Cathy Brandt, Linda Wiley, Theresa Steinlage, Cindi Barta, Nick Compagnone, Katherine Sprott, Tammy Bartles (PTA), Jennifer Anderson (SWPRSC)

Introductions

The purpose of the QPA Advisory Council:
- Review and provide input to Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) staff
- Advise of field needs and issues
- Advocate for accreditation
- Advise Kansas State Board of Education (KSBOE) of field perspectives

We are each experts in our areas and KSDE is looking for our ideas and responses to initiatives it is working on. We are the direct lines from the trenches to KSDE and the State Board.

Please let us know if you have additional items for our agenda.

9:30 a.m. **Goals for year**
Scott Myers, Director, Title Programs and Services

KSDE really does want to hear from you.

Goals for the year (Bold items are first priority)
1. Field test rubric for accreditation (what does it look like for the field, what is right, doesn't work, or was forgotten)
2. Complete Rubric of the 5 R's
3. **Pull together representative field test Reps from large, small, rural, and urban**
4. **Create Specific actions we are asking the field to do in the field test.**
5. Following field test – Response (timeline Launch Dec-Jan complete April/May)
6. Build business rules (KSDE IT Dept.)
7. Create web application for the rubric
8. **Decide on the "weightings" of the three classifications within the rubric**
9. **Decide how results from testing will be used this year**
10. **How will results be used in the future**
11. **Outside validation of self-scoring**
12. Timeline and plan for communicating with the field
    In broad terms
    - Field test this year 2012-2013

- Next year pilot 2013-2014
- Following year launch 2014-2015

13. Do we want to identify exceptional results, good or bad?

Will accreditation in the new system be at district or building level?

- Current discussion is at district level

Which of the 13 areas above would you be most interested in adding to the discussion?

Last year this council spent a lot of time reviewing and looking at the quality criteria of the current system and what pieces are needed as we move forward. We discussed the importance of each part and the language included in the Quality Criteria.

We moved forward with some ideas which included the required pieces that are now in place and the need to be looking at the broader picture that includes responsive culture, rigor, relationships and relevance in addition to results.

Results are important but it will look different for different schools/districts.

We want to move the focus to the rubrics instead of the foundational pieces. We are not going to look at just results anymore.

From that work, we are moving to look at relevance, results, relationships, responsive culture, and rigor. This summer the rubrics for these other areas were developed. What does implementing, transitioning, and modeling look like for each area. It will allow us to look at more than how kids are scoring. How do we move forward from here as we help build this system?

9:45 a.m. **Update on ESEA Waiver**
Judi Miller, Assistant Director Title Programs and Services
PowerPoint Handout – Also posted on the QPA Advisory Webpage
http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=1696

We want the waiver pieces to be a part of a system but not to drive the accreditation system.

- Schools no longer have to reach 100% of kids at proficient or above. Moved away from the narrow focus.
- AYP is gone.
- Report cards released at the September board meeting will be the last time KSDE will publish AYP results. KSDE will send a reminder to the field that the information will be included this year.
- Federal rules will not label schools as on improvement anymore.
- What do we have now?
  - Principle 1: College-and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students
    - Adopt common core standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics
    - Smarter Balance Assessments
    - KAMM is now gone
    - ESOL standards being realigned and the assessment will be modified
    - 2014-15 new assessments will be in place
  - Principle 2: Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support
    - How could it be used in the new accreditation system

        - Still have to do assessments in reading and math
        - Looking at data in 4 different ways
            - Improving achievement
            - Increasing growth
            - Decreasing gap
            - Reducing non-proficient
        - Still have to meet participation rates
        - Annual Measureable Objectives (AMO's) are set around achievement
            - Assessment Performance Index (API)
            - Growth (student growth percentile model)
            - Gap – Compare lowest 30% of students within building to state benchmark (highest 30% in state). Reduce the gap by 50% in 6 years.
            - Reduce the base percentage of non-proficient students by half in annual increments spanning 6 years.

- Improvement requirements will be based on where your results fall the year before. KSDE will look at the growth of the whole building.
- Group size is still 30 students.
- KSDE is in the process of establishing computer programs to let you see your data in these ways. Graduation and participation are still a part of the requirements.
- All other provisions of NCLB are still in place.
- KSDE must label Focus, Priority, and Reward schools. The only schools receiving theses labels are Title I schools.
- Reward Schools are the top 10% of the highest achieving OR highest progress schools. API will be used with the all students group over 4 years. We must name 66 based on our number of title I schools.
- Priority Schools - API will be used with the all students group over 4 years. These are the lowest 5% of schools. Strategies and interventions must be put in place for these schools around the turnaround principles (33 schools). These are named every three years to allow time for interventions to be put in place and make a difference.
- Focus Schools - API will be used with the all students group over 4 years. These schools have the biggest gap. (66) Many of these schools were surprised as this was a new way to look at data.

Schools are listed on the ESEA Waiver webpage.
http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=5075

- Principle 3 Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership
    - Teacher and principal evaluation system. Guidelines have been submitted. We do have to include a percent of student growth to be included in evaluation systems. We must establish three levels.
    - No single system will be required in Kansas.
    - Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP) is available to all who want to use it.
    - Those who do not want to use it will submit plans to KSDE for peer review and approval.
    - This principle is part of the ESEA reauthorization discussions.

Districts do have the option to use components of KEEP without using the whole thing. Something will need to be ready for pilot by the end of this school year for every district.

A timeline and guidelines for requirements will be coming out soon. It will be a negotiations issue for districts.

The Timeline is on p 11 of handout.

There will be 30 Pilot districts for KEEP this year. These districts are not all piloting teacher, principal, and superintendents evaluations.

Please email your questions about the waiver to: waiver@ksde.org

10:30 Break

10:45 Accreditation Rubric's development update
Scott Myers, Director, Title Programs and Services

Key pieces for today's discussion

- Pulling together the field test
  - Volunteers of districts (30)
  - Representing all district sizes
  - Public/private
  - Urban/rural
  - High mobility
  - SES ranking and
  - Student performance
- Specifications for the field test
  - Representative of geographic regions
  - Locate gaps and define indicators
  - Each district work with one rubric so they can really dig deeply into it.
  - What kind of evidence would be needed and how much work is needed to pull it together
  - What kind of technology would be involved in providing the evidence
  - What about getting input from these districts on the weighting of these rubrics?
  - KSDE will be looking at creating a more common language between rubrics
  - Districts may be able to add some fine tuning to the language
- Decide on the weightings of the three classifications
  - Goal is to reach modeling stage
  - Some R's have more areas than others
  - Modeling should be weighted
  - Have some minimum requirements and then add weights for movement on the rubric
  - Who would be making the judgment as to where they scored?
  - District keeps documentation, 20% sent in on a rotation basis.
  - May start as self-marked but needs an outside review for consistency

Thoughts:

- How do we mark/show the value?
- Why do we need numbers if the goal is to move to modeling and show movement towards modeling over time?
- Adding a score makes it black and white and you could be in different places yet have the same score.
- Accreditation is the end game. What do we base the status on? You must have some benchmark to meet accreditation.

- If you've met the basics at the bottom, you should have the ability to choose which of the R's you are focusing on.
- Can they show growth after (3 years) in an individual area as long as other areas are not ignored.
- Is it only a continuous improvement model or is it an accreditation model? Community members are looking for accountability. Public accountability must be a part of the components for accreditation.
- AMO's fit in the Results area
- What does accreditation rest on? Is there a minimum in each of the 5 areas?
- Basement is the bottom part or minimum requirement. The top part 5 R's was the extra efforts made toward improvement.
- Need consistency of the rubrics for the number of elements, etc.
- Is one of the 5 R's more important than the others?
- Isn't the results part of the requirements? It's part of the basics.

Because of the timeline we would like to form a subcommittee to work on this before our next meeting. Guided discussion via a phone conference which will be set around October 8. Volunteers: Nancy Bolz, Cindi Barta, Melinda Stanley, Brian Jordan, Jill Dickerson, Cathy Brandt. (Peg Dunlap?)

- How will the results from testing be used this year
    - If the title of school improvement does not match anymore just take it away
    - Reward, priority and focus schools use their data to create match between systems (federal and state)
    - Schools still must report data to boards and site councils. We will need to report on subgroups. Subgroup is one student or more.
    - Current score should use the growth model somehow
    - Build in incentive for schools to perform well
    - Will only reward schools be recognized or will Standard of Excellence still exist? Must have something built in for recognition. Most of the council feels this is necessary to keep.
    - Levels of accreditation, accredited with distinction or something to recognize work.
- How will the results be used in the future
    - How to integrate with the other R's
    - Rubrics are not completely established yet
    - Results are the only ones that have measurable outcomes right now.
    - With all things being equal treat all 5 R's as equal in the system.
    - Make sure we are using data to promote growth

- Outside validation for rubric self-scoring
    - Some type of outside input is good
    - Cost and training, are issues
    - What would the visit look like
    - Should be consistent
    - How many on the team (2 or 3) Similar and different school settings
    - KSDE staff person?
    - Possibly a member from this committee could serve as visit chairs
    - Volunteers from the field
    - Training – online tutorials? Important to have most current information
    - Visit Criteria – how many, announced or unannounced?
    - Time to showcase as well as receive guidance for weak areas

- How to report back to the district (template)

Under relationships on the graphic change the word parents to families.

12:00 Lunch

12:45 2013 Assessments – How should results be used?
Group Discussion

We need to have a recommendation on this topic today. How will KSDE use the results of the assessments this year? If we don't do anything, the same system for calculations and labels will stay in place.

- Will any of the common core assessment questions count toward these results? No, they are separate.
- If we are not operating in this system, why not do away with labels?
- Current focus or priority schools will remain the same for three years. They can come off if data improves.
- Are we saying the labels are irrelevant? Why do we need to label things that are not required?
- As a teacher this is a very stressful year for me. I am to change to common core but also prepare for the current assessments.
- KSDE expects a dip to occur in results this year as transition to the common core standards occurs.
- Without the assessments, it is still hard to prepare students for new assessments when we don't know what they will look like?
- KSDE needs to have a thorough media blitz on the transition and its effects. It even affects parents and their reaction to their child's results.
- KSDE is not publishing a list of schools on improvement.
- Removal of all the labels would remove Standard of Excellence as well.

2012 was last official year of scores.
2013 will be measured but is a transition year.
2014 will be new assessments and new results.

- Keep Standard of Excellence for the transition years but not the other labels. If it is technically feasible. We are moving to district and these are building level labels.
- Removal of Standard of Excellence would relieve the competition of the buildings.
- Many schools are not fully switching to the common core until after assessments this year because of needing to make performance levels.
- Federal is only requiring that focus and priority schools be reported.
- Reporting move from building to district.
- Could we look at Reward districts and take away the building level?
- Perhaps doing away is best during the transition to relieve anxiety.
- New rewards in the new system need to be established.
- Call a time out this year. No labels this year!
- In the new system, create a label for all as opposed to Title I only schools. Create something for the common core that aligns with the accreditation process.
- Growth at every level needs to be rewarded. This creates buy-in for all stakeholders. Gives a foundation for the levels of accreditation.

- Publicize the change process and differences in scores and from building to district level. Explain the rationale of changing curriculums to common core.

We are transitioning in many areas to new ideas. The new methods are an improvement. We are moving in a positive direction. New curriculum, new assessments, new evaluations, and new accreditation system.

It is not that we are not doing anything, but that the new system can't be compared to the old.

Why can't you accredit a district on how well each individual student progresses? We have all this data, why can't we use it?

We need to recognize that what we are doing here requires time away from students' needs to complete.

Recommendation:

- Report results locally
- Drop all labels for this year
- Switch to district level
- Take a Time out for transition
- Rationale from KSDE needs to be strong and communicated to all stakeholders
- Common core and rigor needs to be stressed in the media blitz

Moved by Suzan Patton and seconded by Ron Walker.

Motion passed.

1:15 Levels of Accreditation – Discussion Groups
Tabled for today – will be on the agenda for the next meeting
1:45 Break

Pick one of the 4 R's to work on before the December meeting. Sign up on the charts.

2:00 p.m. Pre-pilot test groups: Purpose

- Who is willing to pilot?
- What demographics are represented, regions and sizes
- Who is missing and could fill in the gaps
- Timeline Jan-April

Who, how, when?

- Use map to locate regions, sizes of districts,
- Minimum of 16 districts (4 from each region)
- Create discussion opportunities between each district looking at the same rubric

Private schools will be working on accreditation as a school, not as a district. Many are currently dual accredited. Many are looking at AdvancED for accreditation. Could someone from here be part of the private school process?

What do we need in deliverables from the test group?

- Each district will look at one rubric
- What evidence is needed?
- How does Results fit in?
- Who will evaluate the whole picture?

Who would really like to be involved in the field test? It will be district wide test group.

Geary County – Ron Walker
Pratt – Suzan Patton
Gardner-Edgerton – Pam Stranathan (will talk to her district?)
Bonner Springs – Cindi will talk to district
Valley Heights –Don Potter will check with his district
West Franklin -Cathy Brandt (checking with district)
Special Purpose – Gregg Neilson (?)

Notify Scott by Friday if you would like to be one of the field test group to be first on the list to be involved.

Pat will Email all rubrics to everyone.

Volunteers for each rubric to review (from the sign-up sheets)

- **Relevance**
  Ron Walker, Jeannine Pfannenstiel, Cathy Brandt, John Schifferdecker, Mary Kay Lindh
- **Relationships**
  Karla King, Laura Kaiser, Cindi Barta
- **Responsive Culture**
  Don Potter, Brian Jordan, Nick Compagnone, Nancy Bolz
- **Rigor**
  Pam Stranathan, Jim Neihart, Suzan Patton, Jennifer Anderson, Mandy Rohr

When you have finished reviewing your rubric, email it to KSDE.
KSDE will update the master rubric from these suggestions.

2:45 p.m. **Wrap up**

- What is on the agenda for next meeting?
  - Levels of accreditation discussion groups
  - Rubric
  - If you have a topic you need information on, please let us know.

3:00 p.m. **Dismissal**

Next Meeting

December 3, 2012
Geary County – Board of Education Office
123 N. Eisenhower
Junction City, KS