

**QPA Advisory Council Agenda
Wednesday June 6, 2012**

9:00 a.m.

SRS Training Center
Room B

2600 SW East Circle Drive South
Topeka, KS 66606

Present: Julie Doyen, Ron Walker, John Schifferdecker, Ann Garvin, Melinda Stanley, Laura Kaiser, Donna Sill, Mandy Rohr, Cathy Brandt, Cindy Barta, Peg Dunlap, Katherine Sprott, Mike Ronen for SWPRSC, Jane Groff, Karla King, Gregg Neilson, Terry McEwen

Absent: Nancy Bolz, Nick Compagnone, Jill Dickerson, Jackie Glasgow, Jerry Hamm, Theresa Steinlage, Mark Kay Lindh, Jim Neihart, Khris Thexton, Davis Laughlin, Lori Goodson, Ed West, Tim Skinner, Linda Wiley, Paul Getto, Jackie Waters, Chuck Stockton

KSDE: Brad Neuenswander, Howard Shuler,

9:00 a.m. Introductions/Welcome -- Julie Doyen

Welcome. Today we are going to continue our work on the new accreditation model. As we work with our students we want to be sure the model will serve Kansas and its students.

On the agenda for after lunch we will have a discussion about accrediting schools versus accrediting districts. What are the pros and cons of either system?

9:15 a.m. Conceptual Accreditation Model Graphic – Brad Neuenswander

The waiver application is consuming much of the departments time. It is nice to come back together with you and continue our discussion on accreditation.

KSDE has an internal committee that is also working on accreditation. Staff were also having trouble grasping the concepts around a new system. Please refer to the handout of the school building as a guide.

Imagine the 5 R's as the building. The subgroup of the QPA Advisory Council that got together recently helped solidify the foundation elements of accreditation. The desire is that the new model not look like the old model. It should focus attention on the 5 R's. If you are scoring well on the 5R's rubric, does the state really need to look at the information contained in the basement (foundation)? Maybe all the state should care about is that districts have licensed educators and are following the laws.

If a district is not scoring well on the 5R's rubric, the state would then need to be looking at the foundation pieces to know what you are doing in those areas. Most, if not all districts, will score fairly well on the rubric but the foundation will provide a place to start looking for any that are not. If the foundation pieces are not in place a plan would need to be written, submitted, and implemented within a preset timeframe or accreditation would be taken away.

The rubric will give the state a chance to see what districts are really doing as opposed to just how well the students are scoring.

Next year, 2012-13 we hope to field test with maybe 30 districts to see what works, what is unclear, and where we need to add or take away items.

2013-14 would then be a pilot year. State department IT staff will begin working on the technology needed to support the new system.

If a district falls below a certain point, then there will be requirements to fulfill for the state. These are yet to be determined.

The subgroup that met in May at KNEA decided on the basic foundational elements that are necessary for success. Time for discussion on those items is coming up soon.

Districts would have access to update the 5r's rubric as they move from implementing to transitioning or modeling.

KSDE does not want to re-establish a system that just requires check boxes.

The Leadership Institute at K-State is excited to see the opportunities this system can create and to find districts who are modeling that can provide resources for those who may be struggling in a given area.

This new model will give leaders a place to go look and see who is modeling in the areas they need to improve.

9:50 a.m. **Report of Sub-Group – Julie Doyen**

The council has spent much time the last year discussing what we want to see in the new model. The sub-group took our discussions into consideration while making decisions on the non-negotiable accreditation items. We started with the Quality Assurances pieces and simply decided yes or no we need this element.

1. School improvement plan – yes
2. External team – yes, schools would have choices in the make-up of the team. All groups who have been involved in discussion on accreditation have indicated they want to see accountability in the new system. This is one way to have a process in place. It would also allow for balancing the process at the local level to fit individual needs.

Accreditation visits – do you have any feelings or thoughts about the external team and its visits? How many? How frequent?

- One element of the process needs to look at what does the disaggregated data look like at the teacher, grade, school, district level. The R of results will cover these items. More achievement data will be available to schools

and districts as we move toward implementing achievement, growth, and gap.

- What about the data in the foundational piece? If the district is not scoring any value in the results then at some point accreditation is pulled. Data analysis needs to be part of the foundation.
 - Data analysis should be ingrained in our culture but do we need to capture it so that it doesn't slip from the radar?
 - If we load the foundation with requirements, then we move back to something that looks like what we already have. We want a system that lays out how to get better and what elements a higher score requires of the district. Putting it in the 5 R's focuses districts on improvement.
 - KLN visits with their regularity have proven to be very beneficial for our growth. When visits only occur at the end of the cycle they do not lead to improvement.
 - Score and where we determine more is needed from a district has not been developed yet.
 - Teams are critical. These team conversations have really helped our growth.
 - Frequency of contact is important in the improvement process. How it is implemented should be a local decision based on need.
 - Decisions on what the team looks like and how it functions are yet to be determined.
 - Like the idea of the bonus points in that it would not be a negative thing to voluntarily have a team come in and evaluate where they are. If a check-up can be built into the system it would be good.
 - In the wording of the rubric, it will include how you evaluate where you are and get ideas to move forward. The state just doesn't tell you what to call it or how often you have to do it.
 - This foundation is just a way for the state to say, you are not meeting standards and we will not accredit your school.
 - Looking at things through a tiered system, Tier I you are doing fine and meeting needs, Tier II you need help in some areas, Tier III you need interventions.
 - New system empowers districts to get to the things they need to focus on for improving their systems.
 - While reviewing information contained in school plans being submitted it is exciting to see ones that are modeling and with the new system know how they could show that for others to see instead of the plan being put in a drawer after approved and no one benefits from it.
 - Need the information available for all to see who is modeling so that others can go to them to learn.
3. Local assessments – Triangulation of data – we know we are going to be judged on state assessments. No, we do not need this in the list. State will not dictate what or when local assessments are used.

4. Formal Training for teachers – NO, if you are scoring well you are obviously doing this.
5. Licensed teachers – Yes
6. Policies and laws Yes
7. Local graduation requirements - Yes
8. Curricula for Regents qualification - Yes
9. Elementary and secondary programs – Yes
10. Secondary programs and services – Yes
11. Local policies – Yes

These are the foundations. These are the pieces you must have. Now, go build your system.

The items removed we felt were already covered in other items or are in the rubric for the new system. Nothing we did is set at this point.

Concerns:

Preliminary data is going to show some surprises with the calculations of growth and gap. Some schools have not shown up before because the student groups were not large enough to count. Now that we are using 4 years of data for the calculation they will appear. Some schools may have gotten by because they had good students not because they were meeting students need.

Accountability is still a concern. This system will hopefully build in a way to show a district what they need to do to improve.

When schools/districts go to replace leadership they are not getting a large pool of qualified/experienced applicants. The newly hired leaders need resources to help them lead their districts where they need to go.

10:25 a.m. **Break**

10:35 a.m. **Draft Manual** – *Brad Neuenswander/Howard Shuler*

- Discussion:
 - Language – what to keep, change, add

Small group discussions on foundational elements. Three groups were formed.

Group one – Graduation Policy and External Assistance Team

Please keep the “Guidance, Verification, and Question-Answer sections as part of the new document. This will need to be updated to match new requirements language. Make it clear that you only send verification if you don’t meet certain scores.

- Foundation Two – External Assistance Team
 - Last bullet – change to read, “The school determines the frequency and schedule of onsite visits made by the ETAT.
- Foundation Five – Local Graduation Requirements
 - 1st bullet – delete- following the effective date July 1, 2005...(date is obsolete)
 - Again add verification, guidance, and FAQ’s.
 - What would the verification look like?

Group Two – School Improvement Plan and Curricula

- Foundation One- School Improvement Plan
 - First bullet – change to read, “Each school is to analyze multiple sources of data to inform the development/implementation/revision of the school improvement plan”
 - Second bullet – change to read, “Each school has a three year school improvement plan (SIP) that includes a Results-Based Staff Development (RBSD) plan which is reviewed yearly, if not more frequently.”
 - Third bullet – Change to read, “The Kansas Professional Development Program Guidelines are to be used to develop/implement/revise the Results-Based Staff Development Plan. Show evidence of use of the KPDP guidelines.”
 - 4th bullet - change to read, “The SIP includes specific actions (smart goals, interventions, strategies, and evidence) for achieving continuous improvement in student performance.”
 - Add 5th bullet – “Provide evidence of communication of SI plan to stakeholders.”

Language in this foundational element will need to be updated based on language included in the documents mentioned above following the revision process.

- Foundation Six – Change Title to include “Curriculum”
 - First bullet same
 - Add bullet – shows alignment of curricula to common core standards
 - Add bullet - provide curriculum that ensures students are college and career ready

Group Three - Secondary Programs and Services; and Programs and Services

- Foundation Seven – Programs and Services to Support Student Learning (K-12)
 - Included in the foundational element ...district required programs and services to support student learning and growth at both the elementary and secondary levels, including the following:
 - ❖ Counseling services needs clarity

- ❖ Item j. History and government, change to include economics, and financial literacy. Is this redundant with KBOR requirements? (this has to do with meeting competencies in these areas not additional courses)
 - ❖ Possibly reword order to put all curricula pieces together
- Foundation Eight – Programs and Services to Support Student Learning (9-12) Group was not able to finish discussion on this element.

Be sure it is clear that evidence will only be submitted to the state if you fall below a set score in the rubric.

People at the state department have been assigned each area of the rubric to start defining what modeling, implementing and transitioning look like. Addition of points for those defining elements will come later.

Noon **Lunch**

12:45 p.m. **Continue Manual Discussion**

In the Foundational Elements we also had the performance piece. If we receive the waiver Kansas will move toward the use of measures of achievement, growth, and gap.

These additions include:

- A minimum of one of the three areas, achievement, growth, or gaps.
- 95% of students tested
- Graduation requirements
- Attendance rates

Could you be accredited with three “No” answers for achievement, growth, and gap? Yes, if your scores in the other R areas are doing well. We will at some point have to determine what the minimum scores must be to receive accreditation.

Thank you for spending the time on this small percent of the population of Kansas Schools. There is still work to do to clarify but we have the focus developed.

Pros and Cons of District vs. School Accreditation

School (1380 public)		District (286)	
Pro’s	Con’s	Pro’s	Con’s
Districts free to recognize schools individually	More entities to monitor	(system analysis) Looking at system components	(system analysis) Some district’s system will have a great variance and

			would have to be broken down to building level
		Control of resources/equitable distribution of resources	
		Rubric developed for district system	Establishes system that uses averages
		Change Agent - Flexibility to assist a school in growth needed (autonomy to act on all types of change)	Every school understands "district team idea and buys in to it.
		Fewer to monitor	
		Shifts the focus from buildings being competitive to cooperative	
		Pulls Board of Education and district office into the process.	
		Puts more accountability on the district's leadership to know what building are doing and where they are moving	

Do we want district or building level accreditation?

- District seems to be a good direction

Rubric guidelines handout – considers a district system as it is being defined. We don't want to define average. We want to define exceptional practices for modeling and then what are the stepping stones to get there. The work to develop this is happening this summer.

Why is it not advantageous to stay at the building level? If you do it right at the district level, it will help and define all buildings. It also builds a team concept. Removes competition and builds collaboration between buildings.

Will there be a “toolkit” to assist schools and districts transitioning to the new system? Yes the field test next year will help us define and explain each step. The following year we can pilot with some more districts. We will need district inputs to fill in the steps. Professional development will be needed.

- Does it have to be school or district or can the community choose which is best for them? This would require building two different accreditation rubrics because school control is different than district control.

ESEA Requirements

Federal accountability is at the school level. We don't want two parallel systems. State Accreditation does not have to be the same.

Every building will still have a report card for Title I and will earn status accordingly. Priority, Focus, and Reward will be established based on federal rules. Kansas has approximately 740 Title I schools

Lowest 5% achieving will be defined as Priority Schools (33) (currently represents 4 districts)

Calculations Use four years of data

Widest Gaps will be used to determine Focus Schools (66)

Preliminary data shows that of the 35 current KLN schools about 15 will stay identified and 20 of them will not be identified in these new categories.

Highest Performing Schools - Reward – 66 Schools

Kansas is receiving some push back from feds on our waiver - This waiver only lasts until reauthorization occurs.

1. Computing achievement – index scores with 5 performance levels. Right now you only get credit for moving kids to meets standards, not for moving them into higher categories. Our proposal gives more points to higher achievement levels. We have not given up on this yet.
2. We have not identified a % of a teacher's and leader's evaluations that tie to student achievement. We plan to have it but not by June 30th which is the current requirement.

Do we hold strong on these two issues and keep pushing for it?

Do we move forward with the current system and select Cohort 6?

What do you think? Do we stop and just accept the portion of the waiver that sets AYP targets at the 2011 mark?

- Stick with it

- 2:30 p.m. **Recognize Outgoing Members** – Brad Neuenswander/Howard Shuler
- Nomination forms are currently available for new members through June 15, 2012. Please submit forms of any candidates you feel would help move us forward with our work.

Leaving us this year are Ed West, Tim Skinner, Khris Thexton, Chuck Stockton 2009-2012.

Donna Sill has completed her second term on the advisory council. Thank you for traveling to be here with us and give us your perspective as a western Kansas school.

Thank you to Howard Shuler for his work this past year and his service to our profession. Howard has gone above and beyond during his career and came back following retirement to continue his service to Kansas education.

- 2:40 p.m. **Elect Chair and Vice Chair for 2012-13** – Julie

Nominations for Chair

Julie was nominated to be re-elected as chair.
Council agreed

Vice-Chair – This person sits in on agenda planning call, runs meeting in absence of chair, and is training for following year as chair.

- Cindy Barta was nominated
Council agreed

Dr. Scott Myers will join KSDE on June 18th, 2012 as Director of Title Programs and Services and will work with this committee after he begins.

- 2:50 p.m. Set dates for 2012-13 Meetings
- September, December, April, June?
 - Day of Week?
Coinciding dates would be September 4 (Tuesday after Labor Day),
December 3, April 15, June 3

Alternate sites are always possible. Welcome at Geary County anytime.

Brad –Thank you to everyone for your work this year on developing a new system. Your input has been essential and will be critical as we continue to move forward the next couple of years.

3:00 p.m. **Adjourn/Dismiss**