

Status Report to the State Board of Education

December 11, 2012

**Introduction**

The State Board of Education approved the formation of the Teaching in Kansas Commission II (TIKC II) during their June 2012 meeting. The Commission was formed to address the requirement of Principle 3 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Flexibility waiver. Principle 3 required the State Education Agency (SEA) to develop and adopt guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation systems which include student growth as a significant factor. Meeting the first part of the Principle 3 of "developing and adopting guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation" has been well underway with the Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP). The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) began the process of developing a statewide model evaluation system in 2010 with the assistance of Educational Testing Services (ETS). KEEP was piloted in 16 districts in the 2011-2012 school year. Pilot 2 began in August 2012 with a total of 23 districts.

The second part of Principle 3 required the evaluation system to include student growth as a significant factor. This has been the focus of the TIKC II. Multiple valid measures have been discussed including achievement on state assessments, observations, peer observations, professional growth, self-reflection, student voice, parent voice and others.

The Commission consists of educators from Pilots 1 and 2, board member appointees, representatives from educational organizations and representatives from higher education. The total number of members on the Commission was limited to no more than 30 to allow for rich dialogue. Membership was carefully selected to represent all constituencies. Members were encouraged to communicate to their respective groups as to the progress of the work of the Commission.

A status report will be given to the State Board of Education in December 2012 with a final recommendation in late spring/early summer of 2013.

**Members**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Mike | Berblinger | Principal | Buhler High School |
| Destry | Brown | Superintendent | Pittsburg - USD 250 |
| Kim | Clark | Principal | Garfield Elementary - USD 402 |
| Bob | Coleman | Director | ANW Special Education Interlocal 603 |
| Mary | Colvin | Middle School/Union Leader | Cherokee |
| Dan | Dakotas | Retired Art Teacher | Shawnee Mission |
| Peg | Dunlap | Director of Instructional Advocacy | KNEA |
| Steven | Dunn | Associate Dean/Associate Professor of Ed. | Newman University |
| Brent | Evans | Teacher (Physical Education) | Liberal - USD 480 |
| Kelly | Gentry | Curriculum/Instruction | Council Grove - USD 417 |
| Eileen | Hackley | Teacher (3rd grade) | Geary County - USD 475 |
| Bill | Hall | Superintendent | Salina - USD 305 |
| Randy | Heatherly | Principal | Girard Middle School - USD 248 |
| Debra | Hutton | Library Media Specialist | Lansing High School |
| Brian | Jordan | Director, Leadership Services | KASB |
| Rose | Kane | Superintendent | Belle Plaine - USD 357 |
| Scott | Kickhaefer | Teacher (Theater Arts) | Topeka |
| Mary | Matthew | Director, QPA | Olathe - USD 233 |
| Beverly | Mortimer | Superintendent | Concordia - USD 333 |
| Shelby | Muha | Teacher (FACS Grades 9-12) | Riley County High School - USD 378 |
| Scott | Myers | Director, Teacher Education & Licensure | KSDE |
| Duke | Palmer | Retired Principal | Topeka |
| Audrey | Pingel | Special Education Coop. Director | Concordia - USD 333 |
| Dayna | Richardson | Chair-Elect | KLFA |
| Jay | Super | Teacher (Science Grades 10-12) | Maize High School - USD 266 |
| Sheryl | Townson | Teacher (7th Grade) | Rose Hill - USD 394 |
| Ron | Vinduska | Principal | Seaman HS - USD 345 |
| Craig | Wilford | Superintendent | Derby - USD 260 |
| Karla | Wiscombe | Assistant Director of Academic Affairs | Kansas State Board of Regents (KSBOR) |

**The Work of the Commission**

The Teaching in Kansas Commission II was created to address the requirements of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver as outlined in Principle 3. Kansas received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education, in part, by proposing to include student performance measures in the professional educator evaluation system. The Commission’s deliverables will be reports to the Kansas State School Board and a waiver response to the Department of Education regarding the recommendations of the Commission by June 2013.

The Commission members were invited to participate in August 2012. The TIKC II met three times in full-day, face-to-face work sessions and individual and task group work assignments occurred between sessions. The meeting dates were September 14, October 19 and December 7. The work sessions were facilitated by Susan Toft Everson, an associate professor at Saint Louis University, who is familiar with the Kansas educational system. Dr. Everson was a senior director at McREL from 1978 to 1998, at which time she worked on numerous projects with Kansas educators. From the beginning of this initiative, Dr. Everson has worked with a planning team to review the Commission's progress, make adjustments as needed, and plan for each of the three sessions. The planning team members included Diane DeBacker, Peg Dunlap, Scott Myers, and Penny Rice.

**Work Objectives**

The work sessions were designed to accomplish the following objectives:

* Increase foundational knowledge regarding: the Kansas KEEP model, personnel evaluation of educators, personnel evaluation best practices, concepts related to the current evaluation process, state evaluation models that include student performance measures, federal requirements for educational personnel evaluation, and personnel contractual issues.
* Develop plans and recommendations in areas identified as essential to the Commission charge.
* Support Kansas’ tradition of collaborative, multi-level stakeholder involvement in state-wide educational initiatives.

**Design**

Three face-to-face sessions were designed to build from an introductory/orientation phase, to a work phase including the creation of work groups and assignments, to a production phase ending in the development of a draft model to satisfy the U.S. Department of Education waiver requirements.

The September meeting focused on:

* + introduction to the Commission's charge,
  + orientation to the work,
  + foundational knowledge,
  + identification of strengths and resources that could support the Commission's work,
  + identification of needs related to the work, including clarification of concepts and themes, and
  + overview of next steps.

Interim work between the September and October meetings included:

* developing a web system to communicate with and among Commission members,
  + sharing documents (for example, the Kansas waiver proposal) with Commission members,
  + distributing a report about the September session work,
  + identifying work group themes and task descriptions, and
  + planning for the October session.

The October meeting focused on:

* + reviews of other state models that can be resources for the Commission members,
  + a synthesis of the literature focusing of education personnel evaluation and the use of student performance measures in evaluation,
  + work group selection and assignments (to develop reports focusing on the group's theme that will be part of the overall response to DOE), and
  + work group planning for completion of tasks before the December face-to-face session.

Interim work between the October and December meetings included:

* + sharing information via the web (e.g., articles, references, draft materials),
  + developing work group reports focusing on the theme for which each group was responsible,
  + completing a draft of the status report for the State Board, and
  + planning for the December session.

The December meeting focused on:

* + a review of the Commission's progress (accomplishments, "still to do")
  + analysis and discussion of the report draft, including all work group sections,
  + recommendations for revisions to and improvements of the draft, and
  + planning for the Commission's next steps.

**Work Groups**

To accomplish the work of the Commission, four work groups were formed including: 1) Assessment; 2) Performance Measures; 3) Contractual/Professional/Negotiations; and 4) Human Resources. Commission members self-selected as to which work group they would be on. The specific charge of each work group is shown below.

Assessment

The assessment work group focused on the foundation of the work.  The members addressed: foundational literature regarding professional performance evaluation; the meaning of assessment in the context of the Commission's task; and using the foundational knowledge to enhance the waiver response and report to the board.

 Contractual/Professional/Negotiations

The contractual/professional/negotiations workgroup focused on contractual issues for professional educators related to the waiver.  The members addressed: the identification of educators who are affected by the inclusion of student performance measures in professional evaluation; the management of contractual changes at the local, regional, and state levels; and, the contractual models used to satisfy the waiver requirements.

Human Resources

The human resources work group focused on the development of human resources to support the changes that the waiver will require.  The members addressed:  current human resources support to educators in Kansas that may support the requirements of the waiver; the needs that emerge from the waiver requirements; and, the additions and changes that are needed in human resources support to build educator capacity to implement the waiver requirements.

Performance Measures

The performance measures workgroup focused on assessment strategies.  The members addressed:  the meaning of multiple measures and examples of multiple measures; what the measures assess; the current status of the use of multiple measures for assessing student performance in Kansas; and, the current practices' contribution to the response to the waiver.

Data Management

The data management work group will focus on providing the data management system needed to support the evaluation/accountability model required by the waiver.  The members will address:  the current capacity of the data system; the use of data for accountability purposes; and, the organization, management, and application of data to evaluate personnel, including student performance measures. This work group is internal to the Kansas State Department of Education and will meet once a decision has been made as to how multiple measures of student achievement factor into teacher and leader evaluations.

  The findings of the work groups are found in the remainder of this report.

***For the purposes of this status report, the terms “educator”, “teacher”, “principal” and “leader” are used to describe the numerous categories of licensed personnel in K-12 public schools. It is expected that all individuals requiring a license issued by the Kansas State Department of Education will be included in the requirement to include student growth as part of their evaluation.***

**Assessment**

**Work Group**

**Report**

**Assessment Work Group Report**

Members: Mike Berblinger, Kelly Gentry, Eileen Hackley, Mary Matthew, Ron Vinduska

**What does assessment mean in the context of this work?**

Assessment is a central element of the teaching process. Assessment is an important and essential element in effective instruction. Learning involves both teaching/instruction and assessing to determine what learning has occurred. Every educator recognizes that a student may show evidence of his/her growth in a variety of ways. To obtain an accurate and valid picture of the whole child, teachers must use a variety of measurement tools. Examples include, but are not limited to: criterion-references tests; i.e. end of course assessments, benchmark assessments, common assessments scored by multiple educators; teacher observations; performance assessment tasks; portfolios; surveys; and standardized tests.

**How does Kansas address assessment now?**

 According to the 2012-2013 Kansas Examiner’s Assessment Manual, the Kansas Assessment program is a program of the Kansas State Board of Education and mandated by the Kansas State Legislature. In addition, the reading, mathematics, and science assessments are a part of the federal No Child Left Behind legislation. The assessment program is designed to:

1. Measure specific indicators within the Kansas Curricular Standards.
2. Provide information for calculating Annual Measureable Objectives (AMO’s) for Title I schools and to provide information for quality performance accreditation (QPA).
3. Report individual student scores along with the student’s performance level.
4. Provide subscale and total scores that can be used in conjunction with local assessment scores to assist in improving a building or district’s reading, mathematics, science, social studies, and writing programs as currently required by the State.

**How does assessment contribute to the Kansas accountability process?**

Scores from the Kansas Reading and Math assessments have been used to determine Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as defined by No Child Left Behind.  Originally, scores were defined by performance level categories (Academic Warning, Approaching Standard, Meets Standard, Exceeds Standard and Exemplary) and then the top three performance level categories were combined to determine the number and percent of students who scored at the proficient level (Meets Standard) or higher.  Scores were then matched to the state expected target score and AYP was determined based on meeting that target score.  Many factors were considered, including student subgroup performance, attendance, and graduation rate.  This approach to accountability was very narrow and has since been redefined in the state’s waiver.

**How will this information be incorporated into a Board Report and the waiver process?**

As part of the waiver, assessments continue to play an important role in our accountability process.  However, schools now have the opportunity to demonstrate accountability by:  improving student achievement, showing growth in achievement, reducing the achievement gap, and reducing the number of students scoring in the non-proficient categories. This process allows for multiple years to be represented and multiple ways to represent progress.

Our state assessment program should be part of the evaluation process. If we truly believe that to obtain an accurate and valid picture of the whole child, teachers must use a variety of measurement tools. This statement would also be true if stated, “To obtain an accurate and valid picture of the teacher/leader, the teacher/leader must be allowed the opportunity to use a variety of measurement tools.”

In closing, we agree with the following statement, “A majority of educators agree with the fact that holding teachers accountable is imperative for student learning to take place” (Ballard and Bates 2008). For this group, the most difficult struggle is deciding what data sourcesdetermine the accountability of all educators/leaders as well as guide improved instruction in Kansas classrooms.

We believe and recommend that no single assessment measure adequately defines teacher/leader performance. We believe that multiple measures should be used in educator/leader evaluation and that districts should determine those measures. The state should provide access to resources that enhance educators/leaders knowledge and skills to implement this work effectively.

**Performance Measures**

**Work Group**

**ReportPerformance Measures Work Group Report**

Members: Randy Heatherly, Beverly Mortimer, Peg Dunlap, Kim Clark, Shelby Muha, Mary Colvin, Destry Brown, Dan Dakotas

**What are multiple performance measures?**

Multiple performance measures of student learning can be defined in two ways.  One way is to measure the same thing using multiple tools/strategies.  Another way is to triangulate multiple tools/strategies to achieve a holistic view of what is being measured (Brookhart 2009).

**What is the current profile of student assessment (multiple measures) in Kansas?**

Kansas has had a long history in the use of multiple measures as it relates to student learning dating back to the early iterations of Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) when schools were required to triangulate data to provide evidence of student learning.  While most of these related to core content areas, many schools also developed goals related to other kinds of student growth.  These other areas often times included affective learning goals.   
Some examples of multiple measures currently used in Kansas schools to measure student learning growth include:

* Criterion-referenced tests
* Teacher observation
* Performance assessments
* Standardized assessments
* Checklists
* Portfolios
* Self-reflection tools

The State should utilize a statewide survey that includes input from all educators to determine multiple measures that currently exist for all content areas and grade levels. The Holyoke Public School district in Massachusetts conducted a similar survey in order to gather additional information. The survey can be found at the following link: <http://www.mtasurveys.org/se.ashx?s=0B87CA7D04817A3D>.

We believe that multiple measures exist for all content areas and grade levels.  It will be important for schools and districts to inventory the measures currently being used to ensure that all employee categories are represented.

**On whom do these measures focus (in Kansas?)**

Currently, most measures focus on reading and math in grades 3-8 as measured at one point in time, typically at the end of a school year.  Within the ESEA Flexibility Waiver system, we have an opportunity to extend our view of student learning to incorporate a holistic, composite view of student learning growth Pre-K through Grade 12.  This student growth should be viewed in a way that honors the complexity of teaching and learning and that does not oversimplify the process of assessment.  
  
**How will this information be incorporated into the Board Report and the waiver response?**

Carefully!  We want a menu of acceptable student assessments, generated from the survey mentioned in above, some of which are locally determined, along with other measures that could be provided by the State.  We need to be sure that our teachers are trained to make decisions on the best assessments to use in their areas and at their levels.  Teacher preparation programs need to be on board with “student growth and multiple measures.” This is also difficult because when you ask kids to collaborate and think critically then you are working with a more open-ended process, using multiple skills to be measured (working in a group, problem solving with a variety of strategies, and the mastery of the content).  
    This is consistent with Bob Marzano’s message to the KSDE Effective Schools Conference in November 2012.  In short, he encouraged us/Kansas to not fall victim to the "easy" answers and instead think about measures of student learning that are closest to the classroom.  He identified these:

* end of course tests
* benchmark assessments
* common assessments scored by multiple teachers
* Student Learning Objectives [see the work done by Scott Marion with NCIEA - reference below]
* student surveys, like Tripod, administered multiple times during the year

How do we recognize the contributions of teams of teachers who work with students?  How do we honor the work of educators who have caseloads, not classrooms (library media, counselors, principals, etc?)  What about those who work with special populations:  students with IEPs, students who are English Language Learners, etc.?  How do we help schools think about assessments that truly inform instruction AND provide information that can help with evaluations?

A source that can provide Kansas with some direction and guidance is a paper by Scott Marion, "Considerations for analyzing educators' contributions..." at [www.nciea.org](http://www.nciea.org/). His paper is featured on their home page at the following link: <http://www.nciea.org/publication_PDFs/Measurement%20Considerations%20for%20NTSG_052212.pdf>

**Contractual/**

**Professional**

**Work Group**

**Report**

**Contractual Professional Negotiations Work Group Report**

Members: Bob Coleman, Dan Dakotas, Brent Evans, Bill Hall, Debra Hutton, Scott Kickhaefer, Duke Palmer, Jay Super, Sheryl Townson, with Bob Palaich as special advisor from REL Central

**Who is included in the performance measures in the Kansas accountability system?**

We are told that only by using multiple measures can we truly see student growth (or lack of). Students are evaluated based on multiple measures. An effective evaluation process for educators licensed by the KSDE who are subject to the ESEA waiver must be compatible with what we do for students; otherwise, it invalidates the student evaluation process.

“Specials” or “support staff” such as librarians, counselors, and other non-classroom teachers may not have day-to-day classroom access or responsibilities to students, but their impact is just as vital to student growth. To use a model for these support personnel that is the same as a classroom teacher is forcing them to be evaluated in an artificial fashion that does not aid in their growth as educators. This is the same for building and district leaders. Many of the facets of these are crucial to making the classroom teacher effective in the classroom. Currently the KEEP process is recommending differentiated evaluations for these staff members. It can be argued that, just as with building and district leaders, the overall performance of students in any building can be a data point to be used to shape the duties and, thus, performance evaluation of the staff member. Their role in the school is not primarily as a source of direct instruction for students. Their function is to fill the voids created by changes in today’s educational system. The resources provided, as well as the emotional and academic support, should be considered as well as the direct instruction piece of the support personnel. Frequent feedback from students including observations from both peers and administrators is probably the most time consuming way to help a teacher grow. These conversations, coupled with self-reflection, allow the teacher to have ownership of the evaluation process. For those educators in these support roles, feedback from students, teachers and administrators is perhaps the most useful for encouraging student growth.

**What are current practices regarding professional contracts?**

Currently local boards of education reserve the right to establish the performance criteria for all licensed educators. Many local school boards work collaboratively with local educators to assist in determining these criteria. Evaluating processes are mandatorily negotiable between collecting bargaining units and local boards of education according to the professional negotiations act. Although building and district leaders are not subject to this act, local school boards frequently collaborate with these stakeholders in the development of educator and leader evaluations.

**How can the changes be addressed contractually (local issues, regional issues, state issues)?**

Working within the framework established by the KSDE based on the six points of the ESEA waiver, local boards of educators will work collaboratively with their respective educators to develop multiple measures of student growth. Using state assessments as the sole measure of the educator evaluation process is flawed. To do so is using it in a fashion that perverts the intent of these assessments. For the student, the state assessment can be one measure of student growth. Although given at the end of the year, the state assessment should be viewed as a roadmap *for* growth rather than *of* growth for both the individual student and the teacher. That said, the state assessments can be used as a data point to know if students are learning the specified indicators in the teacher’s classroom. Districts should also utilize additional district/building/classroom assessments that will provide data on student performance in the teacher’s classroom as a part of the evaluation process.

In line with the professional negotiations act, the criteria for these multiple measures will continue to be approved by the local board of education but the process will continue to be mandatorily negotiable. Keeping with the spirit of past practice, it is entirely expected that local boards of education will continue to collaborate with local educators in development of the criteria of these multiple measures.

Although important information can be gleaned from a state assessment, the fact that the window for testing set by the state occurs after the deadline set by KSA 72-9003 means that these results should then also be considered the beginning of the growth process for a teacher. To give state assessments more than a consequential weight in a teacher’s evaluation is to, therefore, demonstrate that the evaluation process being used is not about measuring a teacher’s growth.

Teachers use state assessments to analyze their effectiveness in teaching standards. They cannot use them to improve an individual student’s growth in a significant way since they will not have that student’s results in time. The individual student scores give the next teacher valuable information that can be combined with information from the former teacher.

Many teachers and licensed personnel are not in tested core areas. To use state assessment scores in a significant fashion is minimizing the impact of these people on student growth. Those in non-core /non-tested areas may have some impact on students’ state assessments, but it is obvious that the core area teacher not only has the most impact but also has the most use for the information garnered by the state assessment. Therefore, state assessments should not be used for non-core/non-tested teachers.

Gone are the days of the one room schoolhouse where a classroom teacher can be all things to all students. Today’s student is expected to exist in a global society. Although we expect teachers to prepare our students, we also cling to the emotional as well as the intellectual support we count on our educators to supply. The effective implementation of an educator evaluation system that relies on multiple measures will better ensure student growth.

**Human Resources**

**Work Group**

**Report**

**Human Resources Work Group Report**

Members: Steven Dunn, Brian Jordan, Rose Kane, Scott Myers, Dayna Richardson, Craig Wilford, Karla Wiscombe

**What Human Resources and system supports, related to assessment and accountability, currently exist in Kansas?**

A variety of professional learning opportunities are currently provided by service centers and other organizations across the state.

**What new supports or changes can enhance the system?**

A state-lead professional learning initiative involving educational partners from across the state will establish annual learning opportunities for school districts to gain the essential skills required to ensure inter-rater reliability and other fidelity concepts. These learning opportunities will set standards focusing on the following:

* Clear expectations
* Reasonable outcomes
* Job-embedded learning
* Quality people
* Accountability
* Mentoring and technical assistance
* Adequate resources
* Empowerment
* Active engagement

Regional learning opportunities will be led by practitioners who complete a standard-based certification workshop. These certified practitioners will assist districts with their assessment systems.

**How can evaluation/assessment capacity be increased and sustained?**

By creating a statewide evaluation system and implementation model, KSDE will ensure that district administrators receive essential professional learning, guaranteeing inter-rater reliability. These learning sessions will focus on current research for guiding the evaluation process. Similarly, these ongoing sessions will focus on the areas mentioned above.

**How can this information be incorporated into the Board Report and the waiver response?**

We recommend that this locally based, state-lead professional learning approach be established in order to improve educator practices and increase student learning. Collaborating with the statewide educational community will result in a P-20 collaborative system.

**Next**

**Steps**

**Next Steps**

The Teaching in Kansas Commission II has completed its work as set out in the original charge from the State Board of Education in June 2012. The Commission members have put forth, in this status report, their best thinking on the issues related to student growth as a significant factor in teacher and leader evaluations. The Commission accomplished much over four months of work. From the beginning meeting in September where the members identified resources needed to support the work, to reviewing other state models for including student growth in evaluations, to diving deep into the areas of assessment, contractual issues, human resource needs and performance measures, the Commission has worked diligently to produce this status report. The members’ dedication to this work is to be commended. Not only did they attend three face-to-face meetings, but each member collaborated with their work groups electronically throughout the past few months. Hundreds of hours have contributed to this report.

Next steps for this project will be a series of focus group meetings in each of the ten State Board districts in January, February and March 2013. Findings from the status report will be shared with participants and activities designed to gather input and feedback will be incorporated into the meetings. Information gathered from the focus group meetings will be examined and considered by the original members of the TIKC II. A final recommendation to the State Board will be made in April 2013 with action expected in May 2013. KSDE will then communicate the State’s decision to the US Department of Education as fulfillment of the conditional approval of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.
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