

KESA RUBRIC ACTIVITY FOR STAFF

Definition:

A needs assessment is a systematic process for determining the gap(s) between current conditions and desired conditions.

Goal (Why?):

We value the input of everyone. The change in vision and accreditation is a fundamental shift that everyone needs to understand and contribute toward. (QPA vs KESA) KESA is focused on the whole system so, if the system contains multiple buildings, they will be reflected in the needs of the entire system.

The KESA model uses a 5-Step Growth Process:

<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Accreditation/Accreditation%20Model/GROWTH%20PROCESS%20GRAPHIC.pdf>

ACTIVITY TO DETERMINE SYSTEM NEEDS

[adapted from *A Road Map to Understanding the Kansas Education Systems Accreditation (KESA)*, Learning Forward Kansas, p. 33-34]

Purpose for the activity: To determine the two “R’s” for which a system will create goals for improvement over the accreditation cycle.

The following activity addresses the “Identify Needs” part of the process and guides the system toward determining which two of the four “R’s” (“Results” is excluded) have the most opportunities for improvement. If multiple buildings exist within the overall system, the activity should be done at each building, then at the overall system level. When the two “R’s” on which the system will concentrate for their accreditation cycle have been determined, they will be ready to move to the next part of the process: “Determine Goals.”

This system needs activity will take approximately 2.5-3 hours to complete. It can be done by assessing all four “R’s” at once (by different groups) in this time-frame or, if that length of time isn’t available, each “R” can be assessed separately and discussed when all are completed.

Note: Systems who have already completed a needs assessment and have specific goals established prior to 2016-17 do not have to conduct another

assessment. However, because all systems are required to determine two goal areas (“R’s”), the goals established prior to 2016-17 should be compared to the “R’s” and the appropriate two indicated as the system’s selected goal areas.

Preparation:

Materials/Supplies

- Copies of KESA rubrics
<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Accreditation/Accreditation%20Model/GROWTH%20PROCESS%20GRAPHIC.pdf>
<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Accreditation/Accreditation%20Model/Relevance%20RUBRIC.pdf>
<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Accreditation/Accreditation%20Model/Responsive%20Culture%20RUBRIC.pdf>
<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Accreditation/Accreditation%20Model/Rigor%20RUBRIC.pdf>
- Copy of the activity protocol, if needed
- Copy of KESA 5 R’s visual overview for everyone and one that has been enlarged to be posted on wall
<http://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Accreditation/Accreditation%20Model/FIVE%20Rs%205-24-2016.pdf>
- Highlighters/Pens/Pencils
- Graphic Organizer (one per group)
- Dot Stickers (two per person)

Time: 3 hours

Groupings: Divide participants into 4 groups of 3-5 members (one group per rubric). Larger systems may have multiple groups working on the same rubric.

Pre-work for Participants: Familiarity with the rubrics prior to the activity

Introduction to Entire Group:

- Describe the purpose for the day and, generally, the protocol being used to accomplish the purpose
- Each group receives copies of all four “R” rubrics but will be assigned only one to assess

Process:

- Divide participants into 4 groups of 3-5 or, for larger systems, into as many groups as needed. Ideally, the total number of groups will result in the same number of groups reviewing each “R.”
- Each group identifies a recorder (uses graphic organizer) and a reporter
- Assign each group a “R” to assess
- Advise groups there may be the need to reach consensus around the group’s overall decision. Describe the meaning of consensus and the protocol “Fist to Five.” The show of a fist means “I absolutely can’t accept that.” One finger means, “I can’t accept it now, but need additional clarification/conversation.” Three fingers means, “I don’t know that I totally agree, but will support the team decision.” All five fingers means, “I’m totally behind the decision.”
- Groups will first work individually to review the assigned rubric and individually rate each criteria under each component, noting what types of data might exist to support the ratings.
- Groups then share individual results for each criteria in a “Round Robin” manner. The recorder documents each individual’s result, then shares/reminds group. Each criteria should have one group rating, so if any conversation is needed in order to reach consensus, this is the time to do it. Once consensus is reached, the group shares suggested supporting data to support rating, including what is being done well and what could be improved. The recorder documents this information on the graphic organizer.
- Group decides a summative rating for the “R” based upon the ratings of the criteria.
- If there were multiple small groups assessing the same “R”, time for them to compare ratings should be added in here. The multiple groups also must reach consensus on the rating before being reported out to the entire group.

- Reporters from the small groups share with the entire group what criteria were assessed and the summative rating reached, along with rationale for the decision. Facilitator marks the summative information on the large “R” overview on the wall.
- Entire group dialogue about what they see/notice about the data as a whole.
- Each person has 2 dot stickers and places one on 2 different “R’s” to designate which ones should be focus areas. Ideally, there will be two receiving the most stickers and those would be the focus for that building/system.

Debriefing:

- Discuss final results, take-aways and next steps in the process, including how information will be shared with all stakeholders.

Additional Considerations:

- In a small system, this activity may determine the focus for that system. In larger systems with multiple buildings, each principal takes the building’s ratings to the system level, where the results are shared. Ideally, the same two “R’s” will be identified by all/most buildings so the system will have the areas for which goals will be set. Again, consensus may need to be reached at the system level.
- For systems so large that a meeting with the principals from each building with their results would result in a group too large for discussion, consider having secondary principals coming together to reach consensus and elementary principals coming together. A couple of principals from each of these groups could represent their levels at a district level meeting.

Activity Variations:

- Teams and “R’s” could be pre-assigned and individuals come with their rubrics already rated, thus shortening the time needed.
- Each “R” could be done separately by the whole group (still broken into smaller groups), thus resulting in everyone having the opportunity to participate in the rating of each “R”. This process could be done in a shorter time-frame.

- If system is mid-accreditation cycle and has existing goals, determine how those goals compare to the “R’s”. Facilitate small group dialogue regarding which “R’s” are the best goal area for the existing system goal(s). Each group can discuss what is going well with the current goals and what still needs improvement. Also, given the specific requirements of the components and underlying criteria, as well as the rubric’s description of a “modeling” system for each, does the wording of the goals need to be revised?