

Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) Advisory Council
Monday December 3, 2012
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Mary Devin Education Center USD 475 Geary County
Board Room
123 N Eisenhower
Junction City, KS

Present: Scott Myers, Julie Doyen, Jeannine Pfannenstiel, Nancy Bolz, Suzan Patton, Michael King, Terry Forsyth for Peg Dunlap, Laura Kaiser, Jill Dickerson, Ronald Walker, Gregg Nielson, Pam Stranathan, Karla King, Brian Jordan, Mary Kay Lindh, Cathy Brandt, Cindi Barta, Nick Compagnone, Katherine Sprott, Kelly Gillespie, Bill Bagshaw, Jessica Noble, Brad Neuenswander, Jackie Glasgow, Terry McEwen, Cathy Brandt , Terry McEwen,

Welcome,

Julie Doyen –Chair, Cindy Barta Vice-Chair of QPA Advisory Council

Welcome, we have a full exciting day planned for today as we look at continuing the work of developing a new accreditation system.

Approval of Agenda:

- Addition to agenda at 9:45 – Step back and re-examine the movement

Motion made by Jill Dickerson to approve the agenda as amended. Motion was seconded by Brian Jordan.
Motion passed

Approval of September Minutes:

Motion:
Laura Kaiser moved to accept the notes as presented. Motion was seconded by Karla King.
Motion passed

Thank you to Cindi, Scott, and Brad for their work and help setting the agenda for today and moving the work of the council forward.

Julie introduced Bill Bagshaw and Jessica Noble who are from KSDE and spend ½ of their time now working with accreditation.

Brad – We have restructured at KSDE due to the direction of our work now that the waiver has been approved and with the resignation of Pam Coleman director of Teacher Education and Licensure (TEAL). This gave us an opportunity to restructure and change from 4 teams to 3. Scott is now the director of Teacher Licensure and Accreditation (TLA) and Colleen Riley's team has been expanded to include Title Services. Colleen's new team is named Early Childhood, Special Education & Title Services (ECSETS). We wanted to expand our work and move out of our silos. We will be adding an assistant director on the TLA team who will be overseeing accreditation. We are currently accepting applications.

Pre-K-12 and higher education were formerly housed on two different teams. They are now on one team. We are currently the only state working toward this model.

We have four deliverables we must take care of today. These are items we will need decision on before the end of the day.

1. The Field Test and its deliverables
2. Use of individual school scores in determining district accreditation
3. Watermark for scoring the rubric
4. Validation of scoring

Definition of “P” for performance (Handout)

In QPA “P” has equaled the assessment scores as figured with AYP since 2005. KSDE needs a recommendation for the state board on what the “P” will mean now that AYP is gone and until a new accreditation system can be finalized.

The sub-committee formed at the September meeting met twice and is bringing this recommendation to the full council. Recommendation: districts must meet one of the Annual Measureable Objectives (AMO's) (1 for reading and 1 for math) + Attendance, Participation, and Graduation Rate.

If not met, schools must develop a Plan of Focus. Each district may choose an area of concentration for this Plan of Focus. Suggested areas of concentration might include plans centered on one or more of the following ideas or any other concern of local merit:

- Implementation of Common Core
- Implementation of an evaluation system meeting the six guiding principles of the waiver
- Implementation of MTSS
- Focus on one of the Four “R’s”

Only 650 buildings of our 1400 are Title I buildings. The waiver took away the AYP requirements title schools were using. This is driving the need for changing the requirements of accreditation to not have two systems going at the same time. We want to use the same four measures of the AMO's to replace AYP in QPA and also remove the labels that were attached to AYP scores.

What do we want from those schools/districts who do not meet one of the four AMO's? We need to focus on the requirements of the new accreditation model being developed by using the four initiatives above.

The State Board will have to vote on what to do with the “P” in the spring of 2013. KSDE wants the recommendation for the State Board's action to come from this council.

Discussion:

- In the new system we are talking about districts as opposed to building level. What will we do in the meantime building or districts? We can allow districts to respond on behalf of struggling schools with one plan for all. This would start the transition between old and new accreditation systems. KSDE is also considering asking all districts to be labeled as accredited and develop a one page plan for the directions they plan to work for the next year. KSDE does not want schools to be trying to ~~improvement~~ **improve** assessment scores on the old assessment with new assessments to accompany the

new standards coming the following year. KSDE wants educators to focus on how to improve their system for all students to reach success.

- Do we want 1400 plans or 286 as we finish developing this new system?
- Data from the assessments will still be important in determining what districts need to do to help students move forward?
- KSDE must still meet the QPA regulations but wants to allow schools to use the new AMO's as a measurement.
- Must let the public know that we are in a transition year, with standards, assessments, and the accreditation system.
- Do the current regulations require accreditation at the school level or can we go to the district? Districts can put in a plan on behalf of all of their schools and still meet the requirement.
- Support the idea of the district plans because it forces the development of the systemic plan.
- There will still be a report card at the building level. This will help hold struggling schools accountable in successful districts.
- Results will be public in Oct of 2013 and that will be the last year of the current system.
- Could we add a focus on teacher development in the area of instruction?
- What if we created a statewide document that included big area bullets and then added one an "other" choice with the availability to expand on what that "other" entails. Every district would submit a plan for the 13-14 school year. This would be the final plan for old accreditation system
- This teacher development item would be under one of the Four "R's"
- Teacher evaluation models will fit right into this system and will not be an addition. It does not add additional work for schools/districts.
- If you hit one AMO for reading and one for math, you should be done. You should only have to do a planned focus if you are not meeting results.
- Concern that we don't know what the results of figuring the four AMO's will be. Fear is that many districts will have a building who will not meet one of the four. This is why our thought was asking every district to submit a plan of focus. We would be using old system data and only those not meeting the past requirements are being held accountable. Requiring a plan from every district also allows for transitioning into the new system and directing districts thinking toward the other four "R's". Everyone should have a plan anyway, so this selection and brief description should be a short process anyway.
- First step is a recommendation for the State Board, and second step will be the development of the specific form for the plan.
- Will the 5 "R's" information be available to show the State Board with the recommendation? Yes, by the time the board receives the recommendation it should be ready.
- The additional bullets will help districts which are not yet familiar with the "R's" yet.
- Professional learning – add to that how they are addressing the item.
- Once we make the recommendation to the board we can get to the specifics of the plan that will be submitted.
- Clarification on the requirements. It is meeting one AMO in reading and math + meeting attendance, graduation, and participation rates.
- Regulations specifically state schools must be labeled as accredited, accredited on improvement etc. We will need to continue these labels?
- State board could waive the requirements that go with the labels as they did this last year.

- Need to educate communities on the transition process to take away the drive of the assessment scores as we transition to new standards and assessments.
- Teachers are under pressure from parents and community to have students do better than just “meets standards”. How can we provide supports to teachers to relieve this pressure?
 - Share with them that scores are a tool to gauge progress, but know that the focus is moving away from the current standards and assessments. During transition the data is not as clearly obvious in relation to student success.
- Vagueness of direction is causing pressure too. School staff needs to be able to let something go. Diane DeBacker is currently working on a video to explain the process which will be put out on the website and can be used by districts with teachers and parents.
- Taking any data from this year’s assessments and comparing it to new assessments has to be explained. This comparison will not give any reliable information.
- 2014-2015 data will all be new. It cannot be compared.
- Two year plan in transition instead of a one year plan?
- KSDE will ask the feds if we can give the new assessment in 2014 as a pilot and not count scores but use the data to set baselines. This will only occur if the assessment is developed and ready for a full blown pilot.

Recommendations

- Submitting a plan of focus for some (those not meeting an AMO or other criteria) or all districts
- Pinpoint an “R” or use one of the specific initiatives
- Single or multiyear plan

Motion:

Nancy Bolz moved that all districts submit a plan. Seconded by Ron Walker

Discussion:

- Define district?
For diocese schools, the sub-committee could work on the how. If we said district, the development and breakdown could be at the local level. Support from Brad what makes the most sense for these schools

Motion passed

Motion:

Brian Jordan moved to go with the Four “R’s” as the areas districts could select and label where the bullets fit within the “R’s”.
Jeannine Pfannensteil seconded the motion.

No discussion.
Motion passed.

Motion:

Nancy Bolz moved that the plan be a multi-year plan. Ron Walker seconded.

No discussion.
Motion passed.

Along with these recommendations, AYP comes out of QPA and will be replaced by the 4 AMO's.

Motion:

Ron Walker moved to remove AYP and replace it with the 4 AMO's. Seconded by Suzanne Patton

No discussion.
Motion passed.

Historical Perspective: Scott Myers

Handout – school bus

As we reflect on the old system, it put all the weight on results. As we began developing the new system, we wanted to look at the bigger picture of what is needed to educate all children. As the bus picture shows, we took the quality criteria of the current system and put those items at the bottom depicting the things all districts must have in their buildings. While these items exist in all districts, KSDE would not go out and monitor on these items unless progress is not occurring.

We want a system that continues to evolve with the needs of our children. It is defined by the 5 "R's" in the bus windows. How can we use these to catapult our kids forward?

At this time we have a basic foundation and we want to give districts the power to develop in these other areas. The rubrics were developed and we will more deeply discuss these later today.

What do you think about where we are now in this development? What have we missed or what do we need to add?

Discussion:

- Brad - Does everyone understand the arrow on the left side of the graphic? If you are doing well in the 5 "R's" the state doesn't need to look at your foundational elements. If you are not growing in the 5 "R's" then the state needs to know what your plan and curriculum etc. look like. By putting the focus on the meaningful things of the 5 "R's" we can be less prescriptive about the basics.
- We also needed accountability and that is where the accountability of the foundation comes into the new system.
- The 5 "R's" have subcategories defined in each. These 5 terms can be interpreted in different ways. Do we need definitions to guide people in the right direction? It will be part of our discussion later today.
- We want people to work in the 4 "R's" other than results. That's why performance is also listed down in the bottom area.
- Do we score each of the 5 "R's" as an equal percentage?

- On the school improvement plan, will the document we have been discussing be the new school improvement plan? It could be instrumental in the development of the new plans but is just intended as a document for the transition time.
- The school improvement plan in the foundational elements is what all schools should already have.

Rubrics – Jessica Noble and Bill Bagshaw

- Chart of rubrics and also single page chart for each “R”
- Jessica and Bill took the full blown big rubrics and worked to condense it down to a one page document for each “R”.
- The intent was not to change the rubric but to interpret them and pull out the big ideas to get to the heart of the “R”.
- We used the new Blooms as the definition to provide consistency between areas.
- Some questions:
 - Did we capture the essence of the detailed rubric?
 - Is there redundancy in the rubrics between “R’s”?
 - How will this be presented ultimately?
- This new document is intended to give a quick look at the big picture of where do we think we are as a district.
- Scoring of the rubric is still on the table. There is work to be done before the development of scoring.
- Part of this discussion will come through the field test. Is this enough information for districts or do we need more information?
- We still have variance in the number of items between the different rubrics.
- Summary page will be helpful for the field test and also could be used for talking points in discussions. It was also helpful to go through and make the language clear between what implementing and transitioning mean.
- College and Career Ready may need to be an umbrella for the “R’s” instead of a sub point.
- Please take a look at these and send Bill and/or Jessica any thoughts on the refined rubrics. The internal groups will also be going back and reviewing these as we clean them up for the field test. Bill Bagshaw email bbagshaw@ksde.org. Jessica Noble jnoble@ksde.org.
- Will there be artifacts for validation? At some point they will be developed. The field test should help with this development.

Field test (Handout)

- 35 districts of varied sizes and areas of the state have been selected and agreed to field test.
- Still need to nail down the deliverables of what we want from the field test districts.
- Field test districts will have all three of the documents we have been reviewing.
- We will suggest a process for working through the rubrics but it will ultimately be their decision on how they work through it.
- Steps?
 - self-reflection on where we are now,
 - then begin thinking about where do we want to be,
 - and lastly how do I get there.
- Things we need to learn from the field test
 - Do districts understand the rubrics and can they use it?
 - Can they measure where they currently are?

- What are we missing?
- Generate a list of artifacts they used to determine scoring?
- Is the rubric sequential from implementing to modeling in nature?
- Districts thoughts on scoring. What do they feel is important?
- Provide a list of questions for things they need to look for. Training will be provided in January with a guiding document.
- Work specifically with one R but provide all of them so they can see the whole picture and where it fits with their strategic plan.

Part of our discussion was about scoring, at what point do we bring scoring into the process? Not for the field test. We just want to be sure it is clear enough to determine where your district lands. Scoring will be in the next step.

- Need to clarify that this is a DRAFT and we need feedback to make it more meaningful.

Earliest implementation of the new system is 2014-2015. With all the movement in common core and assessments KSDE is trying to gear implementation to coordinate with the plan for common core standards and new assessments. It is possible, we may need to delay this a year to keep these new initiatives from becoming too overwhelming. Another consideration of timing is the need to develop and/or revise accreditation regulations and have them approved before implementation can begin. This can also be a time consuming process.

Results of Subcommittee Work

- Looked specifically at rubrics
- Are all “R’s” equal? We did discuss making results more weighted but that would put us back to resembling the old system making results the key factor. Also discussed results being one of the areas where improvement was a requirement.

Subcommittee recommendation was to make all 5 “R’s” of equal weight.

Discussion

- All components equal not one day with one test result
- Ties well with college and career readiness overarching the new system.
- Do we all believe that if a district was struggling in results they work in the other areas. Where would you go to improve scores? The other 4 “R’s”.
- This system would balance our highly transient district out and help us meet requirements.

Motion:

Ron Walker moved to make the 5 “R’s” scoring equal. Gregg Neilson seconded.

Motion passed.

KSDE will need support from this group and from across the state to advocate for this. Some will feel that the R of results is all that matters.

A possible response to those advocating for the results being all that matters may be to ask, “are ALL kids achieving results or are they masked by the “good” kids?”.

Single or multi-year approach for new system of accreditation

Research and experience show that results from making changes takes more than one year.

It will also play into the implementation of the new system. A multi-year plan gives time for reflection and implementation of a new plan.

- Accountability at the state was a three year cycle but the district I worked in looked at it every year with supporting evidence for changing the plan. Could that be added as a best practice, guideline for district review annually?
- Don't want the old visitation schedule that turns into a production.
- Multiyear process with yearly checks.
- Do you walk out of the process with recommendations for future monitoring? For example, if it is set at 3 years, and my district chose to develop a team to come and validate my rubric, and I have to present to them evidence for my scoring. The team could then give recommendations on what next steps would be. Other districts could use a service center, or other organization. There could be multiple routes used to achieve the validation of scoring.
- 3-5 year plan with validation and flexibility on how it happens. Reviewers get training so that those reviewing have common ground rules which are acceptable to the state for validation.
- The annual report card that shows only results will keep us where we are with the weight on results. The other "R's" could be added in the future but it will not be possible at the beginning for KSDE to pull data on the other 4 "R's".
- As we add information will we do away with levels?
- Could the system be designed to insert the results of the AMO's and the district adds data (Information) on the other 4 "R's" and as validated by whatever system they are using?

AMO's at building level.

Motion:

Michael King moved that accreditation be a multi-year approach (not annual). Seconded by Nancy Bolz.

Discussion:

- Multi-year definition to be determined later
- Annual progression report to show focus on their goals

Motion passed

Is it enough for a district to assess themselves or should there be a validation process which is yet to be determined?

Discussion:

- Do we have manpower available to do a validation process? Not if we use KSDE only but if we involve other groups or systems then yes we could.
- Outside perspectives provide valuable information to the process
- Internal review process, if used correctly, also has a lot of merit. Large districts may be able to use this where it may not be effective for small districts. Self-reflection is an important part of the process.
- Why couldn't we use something similar to KEEP with artifacts and self-assessments? It would be easier than what we are thinking.
- At some point, an outside lens is important. After the original assessment, you are looking at growth and change, not doing the whole process over.

- Could neighboring schools be part of the validation process?
- If validation is determined to be important, then we can determine the choices to achieve the validation process.
- Accreditation is about accountability. Ranking in some fashion is important. Continuous improvement is a part of the process to develop the holistic model.
- When NCA removed their every year piece they saw some let up on movement toward the goal.

Motion:

Brian Jordan moved for a validation process to be defined and used in the accreditation process. Seconded by Jackie Glasgow.

Motion passed.

Do we need to have a discussion on the validation process?

- Do not want a process that will cause expense to the district.
- Need multiple means to the validation process that provide value to the district.
- Potential use of colleagues shared between districts.
- Coordination of visits is cumbersome in large districts.
- Use of artifacts could promote virtual visits for validation and may eliminate onsite visits.
- AVID has a process that is in-house that receives training and certification and that person gives the stamp of approval for the district. Use of that type of system on a yearly basis with an outside evaluation on a 3 to 5 year process.
- Combination of live and in person and artifact reviews.
- NCATE example of process
- Year one should be a needs assessment of the 5 “R’s” following a pre-determined system.
- In-district is valuable for monitoring progress. External team is needed for outside view.

Let’s put a subcommittee together to discuss what multiple means validation could take. What are the external options available?

- Volunteers – Nancy Bolz, Brian Jordan, Kelly Gillespie, Terry McEwen, Cindi Barta, Julie Doyen, and Michael King,
- If you would like to serve contact Julie Doyen or Cindi Barta

Who will cover all those other costs? In the SPED system, the district is responsible and uses that funding source to meet the needs.

Use of individual school scores in district accreditation system

Schools would individually score themselves (after values for all items have been determined) on the rubrics and the districts would combine the scores. Possibilities include banding (grouping district school by elementary, middle, and high) and creating an average for each category, averaging all schools in the district, or using a holistic approach, where all schools are equal using and API type system.

How do we define compilation of the scores?

- Would field study input be helpful?

- Do we need to assign value to the rubrics? If we don't add value to the other 4 "R's" we may end up with the problems we have today of results being all that matters.
- What about use of something similar to the assessment API scoring?
- Show growth in all 4 "R's" that are not results
- How do we determine when accreditation is met for each district reflecting every school building?
- What will the report card look like to reflect the 4 AMO's? A model is currently being worked on and a draft will be available soon. It may be in layers that can be drilled down into for specificity.

Do you want the 5"R's" on the report card for every building? Yes

Accredit at district level.

Buildings need to have input to stay involved but do we need to display it?

You may have high and low areas but where does the district live the most to be able to make a valuable measurement.

- Average all buildings
- Band it (elementary, middle, high)
- holistically, API type system

In one system school scoring was used only as evidence for the district. There needs to be a tool for the schools to provide information back to the district. Some questions on the rubric are district level answers as the buildings are not involved in the decisions for all areas of operation.

Could ideas for the approach for scoring come from the field test?

Yes, add this item to field test deliverables.

As you continue to consider this information please share with us what you think would be beneficial.

- What sort of tools would be used by the schools?
- How will they be usefully compiled at the district level?

Discussion of the regulations will be moved to a future meeting to allow more time.

Providing Definition of College & Career Ready

College and Career Ready – Brad - Handout Circular graphic

This diagram places College Career Ready in the center with the 5 "R's" surrounding it. This symbolizes the focus of the work in the "R's" is to promote college/career readiness.

Handout from Buhler School District – This handout was provided at the annual conference by Buhler teachers. At the bottom are the 5 "R's". As they are transitioning, they are looking at what they are doing in all areas and how it fits in the "R's". This is a perfect example of what the future could look like and how people are already starting to look at their work differently.

At the State Board meeting in December, the Board will receive this Kansas College and Career Ready Handout. It includes a definition of College and Career Ready as well as describing the

details. The Board will be working to create a common definition of what College & Career Ready means for Kansas students.

How do you know if you are a system that is truly preparing kids to be college and career ready if you don't have a definition?

This is a DRAFT document. Current Draft Definition:

"Being College AND Career Ready means that an individual has the academic/cognitive preparation, technical skills, employability/workforce skills and career interest development to be successful, without remediation, in postsecondary institutions, and/or the attainment of a technical credential or industry recognized certification."

Is it understandable? What is missing?

- Still need to define post-secondary - Any education beyond grade 12.
- Military needs to be added as a part of post-secondary.
- Do we need to add to the workforce?
- Industry recognized certifications. (Which can be obtained in high school)
- Put the words "without remediation" at the end of the list.

Wording for this draft definition was pulled from ACT/ Smarter Balanced/ and others and they all included the four 4 themes.

Two other outlining themes were:

- Entry level without remediation
- Industry recognized certification

After standards transition we can refer to all standards areas as college and career ready math, science, etc.

Do we need to include workforce training programs? This is more inclusive. Bullet what is included in work-force training programs.

Add the words "successful in" before the list and move "without remediation" to the end.

Bullet C - workforce training – technical skills
Technical/workforce skills

Need words the chamber will understand.

This is why the definition is critical so everyone understands the intended outcome.

Don't want different words for different things, standards, assessments, accreditation, etc.

KLFA is trying to get out and talk with superintendents and chambers to spread the word. They are also working on a video. Contact Nancy Bolz for more information.

Under technical skills add apprenticeships.

ON the CTE website, we have explanations of rigor, responsive culture, etc. The rubrics provide the elements of definition. They will look different at different grade levels. Information needs to be included somewhere. Delivery will change based on context of the environment.

- Add to the field test group deliverables, adding some definitions. How did you determine what the rubric meant? Also make clear they are to let KSDE know about anything they have a question about as they work through the process.

How does this fit with Accreditation?

Once the board approves the definition we can look at naming the system.

Wrap-up

- Definition for performance established
- We will develop validation system
- Defined the field study
- Reviewed rubrics
- Share with the field your knowledge of the transition period.
- Tabled looking at the regulations until the next meeting
- Created a subcommittee to look into validation process

Thank you for all your input here today and in the sub-committee's work.

Our next meeting is April 15, 2013 in Topeka at KSDE.

How much do you want us talking about what goes on in this committee? Anywhere and everywhere you have the opportunity, in your local districts, at meetings with other districts, wherever you can.

- Can KSDE put out talking points from our meetings on listserv messages so the direction is clear to a broader group?

We have lots going on and may need to have a brief meeting before April. We will notify you if this comes about.