

## **QPA Advisory Council Agenda**

**Monday, December 5, 2011**

9:30 a.m.- 3:00 p.m.

Topeka Shawnee County Public Library

1515 SW 10th Ave

Topeka, Kansas 66604

**Present:** Julie Doyen, Paul Getto, Jill Dickerson, Donna Sill, John Schifferdecker, Melinda Stanley, Mary Kay Lindh, Mandy Rohr, Peg Dunlap, Laura Kaiser, Cindy Barta, Ann Garvin, Jane Groff, Mike Ronen for Kelly Gillespie, Gregg Nielson, James Neihart, Karla King, Jackie Glasgow, Chuck Stockton, Nancy Bolz, Nick Compagnone, Theresa Steinlage, Katherine Sprott, Linda Wiley

**Absent:** Lori Goodson, Jerry Hamm, Tim Skinner, Khris Texton, Terry McEwen, Davis Laughlin, Ed West,

**KSDE Staff:** Brad Neuenswander, Howard Shuler,

**9:30 a.m.                      Welcome**  
Julie Doyen

Today's agenda is exciting in that we will be rolling up our sleeves and really working on where we accreditation to go. The good, bad, and ugly is needed as we work through this process. Please share your thoughts, the state needs to hear them now.

**9:35 a.m.                      Foundational Elements of the 5 R's**  
Brad Neuenswander  
Whole Group Discussion

Three goals for today

1. What are the foundational things a district just has to have?
  - a. Example: licensed teachers
2. Column headings – State Accreditation team has taken a first look at these, now we need your ideas and input

State board and Kansas Leadership Commission recommended we look at the Accreditation process and requirements.

The performance part of QPA will change with the submission of the waiver to the feds on NCLB. In the new 5 R model the P of QPA become the Results of the 5 R's. The other 4 R's address the items currently in the quality checklist. Waiver has to be submitted by Feb. 20. The rest of accreditation has time to be developed. Four pieces of what must be addressed in the waiver will effect accreditation. Results have been driving accreditation while quality has hardly been a factor. The waiver request will

change this focus. We must set ambitious and attainable measures. The waiver requires us to look at focus schools (lowest 5%), priority schools (next 10%) and reward schools (doing great, top 5%).

3.

Questions:

- What responses have you had from the meetings you have had with administrators?
  - 90+% love the idea of taking the focus off of scores. Still using them but looking at the other quality pieces. These other factors tell a much bigger and more accurate story of what is occurring and impacting students. It acknowledges the things that are being instituted to improve. Allows us to start looking at positive impacts, and growth.
- If you don't put teeth in it, then you are back to checkmarks. How do we put teeth in it and still provide flexibility in how districts meet the requirements?
- I want this to be a meaningful experience for schools. There must be a reason to do what is required. The current system is not meaningful. This is an opportunity to make it meaningful. This system has the potential to help provide direction for district movement to improve.
- Levels of the rubric will allow districts to find out where they are and where they can go. Helps a district see how to plan to move toward modeling quality practices
- It's not just the "what" it's also the "how". How do you translate it down so that it impacts students?
- Needs to provide enough information but not restrict local decision making.
- Service centers are asking what they need to focus on and provide to schools/districts.
- At what point do we as a state get a little more prescriptive in our requests of schools/districts? We can show what practices are valuable but leave the decisions about what to use to the schools. For example, MTSS. Look at the words used in MTSS handout provided today. In this document we already have a model that uses some of the key components with supporting language. There is a lot of language in this model that may provide words in many of these topic areas for accreditation that could be put into the accreditation rubric. This could give us the components of what it looks like.
- Most of Kansas schools are doing very well and are working on the hardest kids to help make improvements. Many schools/districts have requested for KSDE to just tell them what they need to do.
- Should include characteristics, not specifics, of how and what must be done.
- Accreditation should not be an event. A team visit for example and then put on the shelf.

- As we move forward there must be flexibility in how schools do accreditation. Choice of AdvancEd and state model. Important to stay on the same roadmap.
- We have an opportunity here to look at everything.
- Funding, we keep losing funding, which cuts teaching resources. It's hard to keep the key components in place that lead to improvement.
- Current system does not allow us to show the effects on the other 4 R's. All we are currently able to show is assessment data.
- We are running on fumes at this point. We have retooled while we had funds but now we are struggling to maintain what we built. The effects of the budget cuts will start showing up in student results.
- This new accreditation system's direction will require staff and resources unless we stick with a checklist. Personally, I like the direction we are going.
- If you plug the large districts who now have the majority of the Kansas schools that are on improvement into a growth model they are doing very well. Their growth has been amazing. They would benefit from this new model.

What are the foundational elements? (The minimum bar)

- Programs and Services (Curriculum)
  - Items outlined in 91-31-32; c9 and 10
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Pieces
- Licensed teachers and leaders
- Meet Qualified Admissions standards (driving current district consolidations)
  - GPA?
  - ACT Scores?
- Compliance (federal and state laws) as appropriate
  - Assessments
  - Data
  - Federal regulations IDEA, etc.

Anything else we need in the foundational elements?

Is there anything else from the checklist that needs to be included?

- What about other academic areas
- Specifics on minimum requirements for graduation.
- Use of the word services leaves it to the local level to determine the how it's met, i.e. librarians, counselors, etc. These specialists are necessary to help kids. (school nurses) teaching and facilitating 21<sup>st</sup> century skills requires more of us.
- 85% of jobs today require post-secondary education. Need a plan in place to help students transition.
- Foundational piece should be inclusive of elements needed through an equity lens. How can we include that foundations piece and what

incentive will I have to go beyond that? Equity needs to be addressed at the foundation level.

Before we even focus on quality what are the pieces we need? What is needed at the “floor” level?

The discussions we have after the specifics have been identified will need to be addressed from the base level up. We will need to be sure that all services are equitably available. Infuse these pieces in the foundation. They are not extra, they are necessary.

How do we put a piece in to add effectiveness for the elements? We set the foundational level at what must be provided the services and then in the rubric include steps in the implementation, transitioning, and modeling levels...Each of these areas will outline components and what it looks like at the various levels.

The R of Rigor will help address the equity issues.

Is there anything in the current bar that should be changed, added to or eliminated?

## **Lunch**

Council divided into 4 groups.

Each group was to look at column headings. What you have seen before today were just ideas to get you thinking. What you have today are topics that came from the state accreditation committee. We are working today on 4 of the 5 R's. Those other than results.

Each group is to look at the whole picture. These are the areas the other group has identified as important.

- Do these areas make sense?
- Is an area totally missing,
- Is something in the wrong area,
- If you went into a school district, what are the areas you need to see to identify quality and focus on improvement?

## **Groups Report Out**

### **Group 1**

- Assumptions –
  - will be funded
  - will include a peer review process
  - no system will get 100%

- How do we build understanding of continuous improvement among stakeholders?
- Accreditation levels – should include a grace period to get compliant
- How do we ensure accountability?
- Support for peer review
- Meaningful conversations
- 

### Relationships

- Profiles of the 21<sup>st</sup> century learners used as guide
  - Do we need internal and external? Perhaps what we need is a list of who needs to have a relationships
    - Teacher
    - Parents
    - Students
    - Board of Ed
    - Business
    - Community

### Relevance

- Move professional development and add it to rigor
- Combine leadership and service (Servant Leadership)
- Where is continuous improvement?
- Need invitational environment, student-centered classroom
- Keep innovation

### Rigor

- Add best practices
- Add professional development

If it gets too broad it's possible to lose the focus. Internal and external heading needs to be more specific. External implies a removal from the group. We need to be inclusive in the language used.

## **Group 2**

### Relationships

- remove internal/ external and define the relationships
  - Adult-student
  - Adult-Adult
  - Student-student
  - School community – stakeholder community
- Also discussed the 21<sup>st</sup> century learner profile for language

#### Relevance

- Change professional development to professional learning
- Change student engagement to authentic assessment/outcomes
- Connected to real world concepts

#### Responsive Culture

- Leadership Board, District/Building include strategic planning
- Move early childhood to Rigor
- Add equity
- Add district facilities

#### Rigor

- Add early childhood
- Add licensure – advanced degrees, above and beyond

### **Group 3**

#### Relationships

- Internal and external....think along a continuum, administration, teachers, support staff, students, school board, family, pta, volunteers, mentorships, community organizations, national/local business, educational organizations, postsecondary education
- Needs to interface between all aspects.

#### Rigor or Results

- Add Leadership accountability (feel something will be lost if not included here) systemic change requires it.

#### Relevance

- Career planning/guidance (Should this be added?)
- Professional learning community – brings relevance to professional learning

#### Responsive Culture

- Add secure environment to safe environment
- Interactive/meaningful communication.

### **Group 4**

#### Relationship

- Eliminate External and Internal
- Identify the stakeholders (family, PTO/PTA Parents, families, students staff, community (business, neighborhoods, agencies, partnerships, colleges)

#### Relevance

- Substitute ICTML for technology column (Information, Communication, Technology, Media, Literacy)

## Responsive Culture

- Is this what we respond to or the problems?
- Define innovation
- Attitude – how do you measure it?
- Discuss – Should the headings under here be the “responders” not the issues to be responded to.
- The “way” in which a district responds to issues
- Respond to Diversity (All diversities: age, race, abilities, etc.)

## Rigor

- Move early childhood to rigor
- Change word “Fiscal” to “Resources” (staff, time facilities)
- Eliminate career and tech ed. because it fits under college and career ready

## Results

- Move data to results. Be sure they are using the data to drive results
- ?issues vs. who is responding to the issues.

## Wrap-Up Discussion

As we begin defining implementing, transitioning, modeling it will help.

Still need definitions for each of the 5 R's so that everyone is coming from the same perspective.

- Funding – doesn't change what is best for quality learning and what is impacting students. The model needs to guide districts of where to develop and move toward being better. Where do you start? A plan to help you grow in the weak areas. If you had the resources, where would you grow and what would you add?
  - Impact, where does the impact happen if the cuts continue. We have no data right now to show what was put into place that raised test scores and what is being cut that will effect scores in the future.
  - Can't expect the locals to pay for the visiting teams or the state department without funding being put in place. If we create something that there is no way to make work then we are back to where we started.
  - Funding is needed to sustain what we put in place.
  - The times require us to focus our resources on what is important
  - It's the who, what, and where, that will impact the districts if there is a compliance component. It requires resources...who will bear the burden?
  - It won't be functional and useful if there is no external evaluation and this will require funds.
  - Sustainability is a huge issue. Educators are tough people but there are limits. We can't continue with resources going down and results going up. It won't happen.

- Monitoring is the funding issue. Monitoring of this new system will be important

Whatever we do we have to be conscious that schools don't look at it and go "how do I pay for that?"

The Kansas Learning Network (KLN) has provided many learning opportunities for what is good practice. If the things these lowest districts have done have created improvement wouldn't it be good for all schools. We don't want this to be an affordability issue.

How do we prove, verify the information provided on the rubric by the district?

This involves mindset change.

KLN is in transition this year. We have hired two service centers to do the logistics. Our federal funding is paying for this. How this continues we don't know.

We have trained 16 fellows this year to continue the work of evaluating schools and where they are.

In Closing – The MTSS model. This document contains verbiage that we want to use as we build this system. It may be helpful to become familiar with this prior to our next meeting.

Thanks for your thoughts and input today. Happy Holidays!