



**NH Accountability Task Force
NH DOE Board Room**

**December 18, 2008
1:00 – 4:00 pm**

Present:

NHDOE: Deb Wiswell,; Tim Kurtz; Gaye Fedorchak; Merry Fortier; Mary Lane; Sallie Fellows; Ginny Clifford; Kathleen Murphy; Marcia McCaffrey; Michael Schwarz, Mary Heath

Center for Assessment and Measured Progress: Shannan Douglas - Measured Progress; Scott Marion, Damien Betebenner - Center for Assessment

District Reps: Brian Cochrane; Charles Pugh; Steve Zadravec; Chris Harper; Diane Lurvey; Gail Paludi; Keith Burke

NOTES:

1. Deb convened the meeting at 1:15, and thanked members for joining despite the storm challenges from last week and the busy time of year.
Deb described access to the web page for the NH accountability system. Anticipate working with OIT to establish a feedback system.
Discussion has not begun at the legislative level yet, report submitted November
Purpose of today: understand what's in the legislative doc; what should/ should not be included in the system; who else needs to be at the table?;
2. Participants were assigned to examine sections of the first half of the committee report, in which the committee describes the accountability mechanisms currently in place in NH. Groups reported on what the accountability component is, who is it applied to (for whom?), who conducts or oversees the program, and any additional features of the component of importance. (*see chart paper transcribed on following page*).
3. Deputy Commissioner Mary Heath offered a reminder about the current status of the committee's recommendations – these are subject to legislative discussion, then potentially legislative action, which may or may not reflect the current recommendations in the document. She suggested inviting members of the legislative committee to sit in on a future task force meeting.
4. To reach an understanding of the recommendations of the joint legislative committee, task force members in groups were assigned to read one of the four sections of recommendations and chart bullet points to share with the full task force. (*See discussion notes and transcribed charts on following pages*)

5. Deb distributed additional resources for “leisure reading” to the task force. These included –
Appendix C of the CCSSO document by Marianne Perie (posted on the DOE website) – this checklist offers questions and indicators to consider in the design of a state accountability system
Appendix D (from above reference) – the Maine rubric for school improvement as one state example
Balanced Scorecard – a research based tool listing indicators for an accountability system
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education – measures and indicators used by Missouri to assess school accountability
(<http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/aplus/index.html>)
New York City Quality Schools Rubrics – indicators used by NYC to assess school performance
(<http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/SchoolReports/QualityReviews/default.htm>)

Baldrige in Education – PowerPoint presentation describing the use of the Baldrige quality measures for assessing educational systems

Deb will try to post the Baldrige information. The others are either posted or we have included links.

4. Next meeting dates – The dates below were confirmed for meetings for all task force members.

FOR ALL TASK FORCE MEMBERS --

January 8, 1 pm– 4 pm
February 5, 8:30 am – 12:00 n
March 4, 1 pm – 4 pm
April 8, 8:30 am – 12 n

Volunteers who agreed to work as a subcommittee scheduled a meeting on
January 28, 2009, 1-4 pm in the Board Room at Londergan Hall.

Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Accountability for an Adequate Education

Review of Committee Document – pages 1 – 20

(from NH Accountability Task Force Meeting 12.18)

****What educational accountability mechanisms are currently in place? ****

Existing Mechanism	What?	For Whom?	By Whom?	Other notes
School Approval Process	Checklist, self report	Schools and districts	School principal and superintendent	*periodic audit indicates reports are very accurate
NH School and District Profiles	Electronic summary of school, district, student data across 8 indicators	Audience = public Also for districts, schools and federal reports	Department contracts with a vendor	Present results disaggregated for subgroups **NEW RFP upcoming, options to change specifications
Statewide Education Improvement and Assessment Program	Included curriculum frameworks to define what students know and able to do; reports of assessment results;	Data to guide schools and districts to improve results	Districts Department	*RSA 193-C (LEIP plans) removed in 2003 Not all curriculum areas have curriculum frameworks
School Performance and Accountability Program	Assesses student academic performance	Students, schools, public	Department through a contractor	Confusion between RSA 193-C and 193-H (above)
Follow the Child Growth Model	Using assessment data to measure growth of individual students over time	Students, schools, districts, public	Department through a contractor	This is an optional (not federally required) NH DOE initiative
Follow the Child Assistance Center	State provided access to Performance Pathways, a data query tool for schools and districts	Schools and districts can analyze data across multiple indicators	Department provides through vendor, using federal \$	*could be used more extensively by state i.e. for deeper insight into quality of student outcomes Expensive, funding concerns; need to determine its impact on overall outcomes, performance
Special Education Accountability	Federally required state (and district) Performance Reports with data across multiple indicators	Completed by districts, used to complete required reports to USED for funding	Department collects and reviews reports; prepares federal reports from data	Part of the federal IDEA accountability process
Accountability for English Language Learners (ELLs)	Measures of progress toward AMAOs and actual performance using ACCESS for ELLs and NECAP tests	ELL students Districts with ELL students Department	Department prepares Title III federal reports from data	Challenge of correlating data from multiple systems/ measures to assess performance

Existing Mechanism	What?	For Whom?	By Whom?	Other notes
For Assistance to Schools				
School Approval Standards	Can receive conditional approval, annual for up to 3 years	Schools not meeting all school approval standards	Department staff review self reports and conduct site visit audits	Used by some schools to present needs to local budget committees
School Performance Targets	NCLB defined consequences and sanctions, from offering choice, supplemental services to corrective action and restructuring	Title I schools not making AYP	Department staff under regulations defined by USED	Rules defined by the feds how to implement these sanctions; challenge of coordinating funding and reporting with the timing of assessments
Limited English Proficient Title III	Requires a root cause analysis to determine reasons for failure to meet AMAO targets, develop corrective action plan	Districts/ consortia receiving Title III funds		This is an emerging system, not fully fleshed out
Statewide System of Support	Includes direct services such as coaching, focused professional development Other services provided = Guidance Focused monitoring Ad hoc technical assistance DINI coordinators meetings	Various – schools, districts, professional staffs, principals, etc Generally targeted to both Title I and non-Title I schools and districts	Department staff and contracted consultants	Dramatically underfunded, both at the state and federal levels; currently only federal Title I funds available for needed supports and limited state funds

**Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Accountability for an Adequate Education
Review of Committee Document – pages 20 – 29**

(from NH Accountability Task Force Meeting 12.18)

****Findings and Recommendations of the Joint Legislative Committee ****

Section	Committee Recommendation	Discussion Points
A. Overview (pp. 20-21)		<p>* Discussion of relative emphasis on “inputs” (i.e., school approval standards) and “outputs” (i.e., student performance results, graduation rates, etc)</p> <p>* Reiteration of adequacy definition to reflect “opportunity to receive an adequate education” versus schools guaranteeing specific educational outcomes (pp 21)</p>
B. School Approval Standards	<p>-- increase frequency of self-assessment (every year, no less than every two years)</p> <p>-- require narrative explanation for self-report checklist with school/ district providing evidence of compliance with the S. A. standards</p> <p>-- continue requiring the certification of the principal and superintendent as to the accuracy of the self-report</p> <p>-- Department should review each self –report</p> <p>-- increase the number of site visits to approximately 10% per year Suggest using volunteers to staff site visit teams Integrate adequacy visits with other regular site visit DOE report to legislature on results of site visits</p> <p>-- ** legislature must identify which of the school approval standards are to be included in the adequacy accountability system **</p>	<p>Page 23 lists the suggested school approval standards to be included in the adequacy system, including academic standards, length of school year, credits for diploma</p> <p>Question: what is the plan for getting legislative definition of a final set of approval standards to be included?</p>
C. Performance Measures D. Demonstrating Adequacy	<p>Options/ flexibility to demonstrate opportunity for adequate education:</p> <p>-- school approval standards</p> <p>-- student and school performance measures</p> <p>-- point system of other indicators as evidence of effectiveness</p> <p>Department should identify the measures, set targets, define process, document reasons for assigning points;</p>	<p>** Major confusion over intention of the committee regarding what measures meet the adequacy criteria</p> <p>–</p> <p>IS IT</p> <p>-- Meet all School Approval standards which are part of the adequacy system AND EITHER (a) or (b) (a) meet adequacy by the point system using existing data collected (to be defined), or</p>

	<p>Pilot system in 2009-2010 Full implementation in 2010-2011</p> <p>-- Point System OPTIONAL for districts</p>	<p>(b) meet adequacy on the point system using existing data plus other indicators from optional set</p> <p>OR is adequacy demonstrated by Meeting designated school approval standards</p> <p>OR earning the required points on either of the two sets of indicators</p> <p>Concern among task force members that only requiring school approval standards focuses only on inputs and not on results of the school's efforts.</p>
E. Corrective Actions	<p>(similar to progressive sanctions under NCLB)</p> <p><u>First year:</u> identify areas, define strategy to improve, show how budget reflect goals of improvement plan</p> <p><u>Second year:</u> mentoring or coaching for leadership; TA from DOE; account for use of funds; plan strategy for parent and community involvement</p> <p><u>Third year:</u> redirect state adequacy \$ to areas of need; assign coach or mentor; account for use of adequacy funds; require one or more of 10 options for improvement</p> <p>Meet quarterly with Department; Department provide annual progress updates to State Board of Ed</p>	<p>Limited discussion of these specific sanctions/ consequences due to confusion over committee recommendation regarding conditions for adequacy</p>