

Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) Advisory Council
Monday December 2, 2013
9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Mary Devin Center
123. N Eisenhower Drive
Junction City, KS

Present: Tom Armstrong, Nancy Bolz, Cathy Brandt, Nick Compagnone, Mary Cooper, Julie Doyen, Mark Farr, Sue Jenkins (proxy for Kelly Gillespie), Brian Jordan, Karla King, Bert Lewis, Sherri Rawlins, Mandy Rohr, Katherine Sprott, Melinda Stanley, Pam Stranathan, and Ronald Walker

KSDE Staff: Bill Bagshaw, Brad Neuenswander, Amanda Noll, Vicki Seeger

Welcome

Julie welcomed everyone to the meeting, and thanked them for traveling to Junction City.

Approval of Agenda:

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Sherri Rawlins. Bert Lewis seconded the motion asked that flexibility be given to cover content and make decisions about items on the agenda.

Motion passed.

Approval of June Minutes:

Motion to approve the June 3rd minutes was made by Ronald Walker. Pam Stranathan seconded the motion.

Motion passed.

Approval of September Minutes:

The September meeting minutes will be finalized and distributed at the April 2014 meeting.

Update on the Waiver; AMO's

Brad Neuenswander presented updates about the ESEA Waiver. All states must re-submit their waiver to be eligible for extending it for one more year (2015-16) or until ESEA is reauthorized. The deadline for resubmission is January 24, 2014. Changes or amendments to the waiver will be made during this process. We have two optional amendments: 1) no double testing during 2013-14 for students taking the SBAC field test, and 2) use of student growth measures to inform personnel decisions in 2016-17.

Mr. Neuenswander reported on the spring 2014 and 2015 assessment timelines.*

Spring 2014

Math & ELA; Transitional Assessment & SBAC Field Test
Dynamic Learning Map (DLM)

Science, Current State Assessment
History/Government; Pilot new items

Spring 2015

Math & ELA; New Assessment, and DLM
Science; Pilot new item and remove old items
History/Government; Pilot new items

Grades 3 through 8 will only take one state assessment for reading and one state assessment for math. There will be no double testing. High schools may also use optional assessments such as SAT, ACT, or CPASS.

*During the December 10, 2013 State Board of Education meeting, a decision was made not to utilize the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium in favor of The University of Kansas Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation creating new Kansas State Assessments for language arts and mathematics. These newly created assessments will align with the Kansas College and Career Standards. The decision extends the baseline year for new state assessments to the 2015-2016 academic year.

Teacher/Leader Evaluations

Work continues on the evaluation systems being used to evaluate teachers and leaders throughout the state. During 2013-14, all school districts are piloting their new evaluation instrument, and providing professional learning around the use of student growth measures as part of the evaluation process. Piloting the use of student growth measures will occur in 2014-2015. During 2016-17, using student growth measures to inform personnel decisions will begin.

Moving from Proficient to College & Career Ready

Neuenswander reviewed previous AYP proficiency levels and the need to establish benchmarks to demonstrate proficiency for Kansas College & Career Ready Standards.

Recommendation to Kansas State Board of Education to Accredite Kansas Schools:

As in the 2013-2014 academic year, the QPA Advisory Council was asked to make a recommendation to the State Board of Education about accrediting all Kansas schools before the new accreditation system is in place. Bert Lewis recommended that all Kansas schools receive an accredited designation for 2014-2015. Ronald Walker seconded the motion. Motion passed. Neuenswander stated he would review last year's recommendation to the State Board and present the QPA Advisory Council's recommendation in the same way.

21st Century Accreditation Model update:

Vicki Seeger presented updates to the 21st Century Accreditation Model. Seeger asked the council to please keep in mind the definition of Kansas College and Career Ready, and what it means to be a 21st Century Learner in a 21st Century Environment as they begin discussions during the meeting today. In the fall, Scott Myers and Seeger began working with two districts to conduct mock accreditation runs. The district superintendent in USD 333 Concordia and a leadership team from USD 345 Seaman used the rubrics as a needs assessment, considered the evidence a district could submit to demonstrate the rubric sub-Rs, and identified possible change goals that could be established by their districts. These mock runs were much like what we envision a district completing, although over a longer period of time (possibly one academic year). These leaders have now shared their thoughts about the experience and process with principals and other school leaders in workshops held in Olathe and Wichita. Other

presentations about this information have occurred in Sublette and at the AdvancED Conference in Wichita.

Seeger announced the KSDE website is undergoing major renovation and revision. The new site will be launched December 15th. Seeger would like to begin making some of the new accreditation model documents available to visitors to the website. Motion to start uploading documents to the QPA website for visitors to see was made by Ronald Walker. Seconded by Bert Lewis. Motion passed.

Discussion ensued about the rubrics and the inclusion of a “No Evidence” column to them. The QPA Advisory Council would like for the column to be designated as “Developing” and include language to define each of the criteria at the developing level. A motion was made to change the column “No Evidence” to “Developing” by Bert Lewis. Nancy Bolz seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Rubrics that were reviewed at the last QPA Advisory Council meeting on August 3rd were given to the Council to review. The Council reviewed the documents and Ronald Walker moved to post the Rubrics to the webpage. Cathy Brandt seconded. Motion passed. Vicki Seeger will post the rubrics to the QPA webpage after January 1, 2014. Nancy Bolz noted the need to indicate DRAFT across each page of posted documents.

At the last QPA Advisory Council meeting, we had large posters of the Rs and subRs and evidence for each that had been generated from the field tests. Based on feedback from the QPA Advisory Council, the documents or other forms of evidence demonstrating each of the criteria within the rubrics was pared down significantly. Additionally, we have been working closely with IT on creating a repository for evidence. We are asking a few districts to field test the repository for us in the spring of 2014.

Jessica Noble and Seeger have created a rough draft of glossary of terms associated with the new accreditation model. Several sources were used to create the glossary including old QPA documents, the teacher evaluation handbook, for example. Seeger asked the council to add to this document. It was moved and seconded to post the glossary with additions from the QAP Advisory Council, to the new website after January 1, 2014. Motion passed.

Seeger addressed concerns raised at the September 3, 2013 QPA Advisory Council meeting about the new accreditation model including:

- Allocating resources for change goals. In mock runs, districts have identified changes that would not be dependent upon heavy allocation of funding.
- Use of the word innovation. Because innovation implies something new, the word has been changed to “change” so that a district could improve upon an initiative they are already working on in their schools.
- Implementation of the new model. We would likely pilot the new model in a few districts during 2014-2015 with the interim year occurring in 2015-2016 for all districts.
- Cycling all districts into the accreditation system. There will need to be a way to cycle districts in over a period of time.
- Addressing best practices and research-based change goals. An accreditation review team would review the proposed change goals and question the district about their strategies and implementation methods.
- Continuing data-driven decisions. The new accreditation model seeks qualitative as well as quantitative data.

- Including all educators in the process. We believe that if a district is able to establish trust, then all stakeholders will be an integral part of accreditation.

The remainder of the meeting was spent in work sessions designed to help move forward with the new accreditation process. Small groups generated ways in which the new accreditation model can be unfolded to all Kansas districts and private schools. The results of these discussions are attached as an appendix to these minutes.

The QPA Advisory Council worked on adding to and revising the terms of the Accreditation Handbook Glossary. These suggestions will be incorporated into another draft of the document.

The challenges for accreditation of private schools are unique. Mr. Compagnone discussed what many of these concerns are and possible ways they can be addressed. Seeger will discuss these issues with Scott Myers and continued discussion will be necessary to think about ways of accrediting private schools in Kansas. Myers and Seeger have met with other private school representatives in the state.

The next QPA Advisory Council meeting will include two discussions surrounding the topics of change and trust. The majority of the next meeting will be spent proposing language to revise the QPA regulations so that the process can be undertaken with the Kansas State Board of Education in changing the regulations to fit the new accreditation model. Each attending member of the Advisory Council signed up for this work at the next meeting. Those members not in attendance will be assigned to a work group.

The QPA Advisory Council requested that an organizational chart be created clearly showing accreditation as the overarching umbrella for teacher/leader evaluation, completion of school improvement plans, etc. All elements that must be in place for a district to become accredited would be noted in this document.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Noll

Accrediting Kansas School Districts

Scenario One:

One-third of the Kansas school districts would begin the new accreditation process during the first year of implementation, for example, 2015-2016. Following the first year, another one-third of Kansas school districts would begin the accreditation process, for example, 2016-2017. During the final year of implementation, for example, 2017-2018, the last one-third of districts would begin accreditation.

What are the issues to be considered with this scenario?

- How would you accredit schools who did not start until 2017-18?
- Seems logical to pact visiting teams.
- How would districts be selected or divided into thirds?
- Have all districts and schools complete the needs assessments **now** for the sake of continuous improvement and strategic planning. For simple logistics, accreditation facilitated through peer review needs to be staged in.

Scenario Two:

All Kansas school districts would begin during the first year of accreditation by choosing one rubric (plus Results) to use as a needs assessment for the district. The district would identify the rubric they believe to be important for change goals, use the rubric as a needs assessment, and begin implementing two change goals. Each succeeding year, the districts would add an additional rubric. Change goals would only be in place for the first rubric.

What are the issues to be considered with this scenario?

- Look across all rubrics to determine an area of need for the district; development will then be working on that rubric based on need.
- Concern of one rubric: districts may choose the area they are the best at and then not look at growth. You might only write one or two goals, however, the **whole** rubric needs to be looked at and addressed.
- Using a cycle system for each district might work.
- Do the whole needs assessment, **then** choose a rubric relative to your findings.

Scenario Three:

Every Kansas school district would begin the new accreditation model at the same time.

What are the issues to be considered with this scenario?

- Discuss that occurred was that this scenario is not practical.

Other ideas from QPA Advisory Council:

- All districts begin in year one, but evaluation team select or have districts volunteer for site visits (1/3 of schools each year).
- All districts begin at the same time; external reviews are on a different cycle.
- Divide by regions.
- Divide by areas/leagues.
- Develop a “train the trainers” on external reviews.
- Combination of the above scenarios: 1/3 of districts complete all of the rubrics; 2/3 of districts choose one rubric.
- Every district must start with two rubrics.
- Start all schools with SIP (School Improvement Plan), then cycle (see Option #1).
- Communities of practice
- External evaluators – district teams