



## NH Accountability Task Force Meeting

**NH DOE Room 15**

**1:00 pm - 4:00 pm**

**Next Full Task Force Meeting: AUGUST 25**

### **Present:**

**Guests:** Jeff Meyers, Senate Legislative Counsel; Mark Joyce, Exec. Dir., NH School Administrators; Louise McCormack, PSU, Director of Health and Physical Education Educator Programs

**District Reps:** Patrick Connors (SAU 53); Janis Hennessy, NH Association of World Language Teachers & Dover HS; Roxanne Wilson (Windham and NHSAA – CIA); Jerry Frew, (Kearsarge and NHSAA); Shannon Bartlett (Shaker Regional and NHSAA – CIA); Chris Demers, Concord; Steve Zdravec, Portsmouth; Kathryn Sheridan (SAU 28); Diane Lurvey;

**NH DOE:** Deb Wiswell, Cathy Higgins, Mary Lane, Ed Murdough, Helen Schotanus, Ken Relihan, Marcia McCaffery, Gaye Fedorchak, Mary Heath, Merry Fortier, Ginny Clifford, Mike Schwartz, Tim Kurtz, Kathleen Murphy, Jan McLaughlin

**Center for Assessment:** Scott Marion

**New England Comprehensive Center (NECC):** Karen Laba

*\*Note: to simplify note taking, using IBAS to indicate the input-based accountability system and PBAS for the performance based accountability system.*

### **1. Welcome and Introductions**

### **2. Status report from Senate Counsel Attorney Jeff Meyers on SB180 --**

Passed by House last week; some minor differences between two versions; will recommend that Senate concur with House amendments, likely be passed tomorrow (Wed., 6/10/09); enrollment process to follow, then signing by governor within next several weeks; effective upon passage

Summary of bill: sets up input accountability system, meets the Court decision about state requirements; attempt to meet dissenters comments; second part, page 5, defines the performance based school accountability system

Beginning on line 12 = input based accountability system (IBAS) due to commence 2009-2010 school year, schools must demonstrate adequacy by END of school year  
Beginning 2011-2012 school year, Performance Based Accountability System (PBAS) in place

Lines 18-21 – Department SHALL evaluate all schools by both systems; will be deemed to have met adequacy if meets one OR the other; consensus among legislators and lawyers advising Dept and legislature, that school have ability to meet adequacy by either way; much interest in performance based system as more reflective of

Responsible for implementing – page 2, III (line 16 ff) – “narrative explanation” of how the school complies with the 12 adequacy standards defined end of page 1 through line 11 of page 2. Still required to comply with all standards in the School Approval system.

Commissioner is responsible for implementing input based system

P2, line 26, if demonstrate, resubmit every 2 years; if not compliant, every year

P3, line 11 – Definition of the task force responsible for development of the performance –based system, to be implemented 2011-2012.

P4, line 15 + = Timeline

- Interim report re the performance based accountability system by April 1 2010
- Reviewed by leaders of house and senate educ committees
- Final report no later than Nov 1, 2010, with recommendations for legislation and adoption of the PBAS; will be set out in a bill to be adopted by the full legislature (previously Senate said Dept could adopt through rules with report to Legislative Oversight)
- Assuming bill adopted during 2011 session, then can implement 2011-2012 and require schools to demonstrated performance adequacy by end of that school year
- Offers task force opportunity to recommend additional changes to legislature, so could pass further changes beginning Jan 2012

P4, line 32+ -- annual NH Accountability Report due from Department beginning Oct. 1, 2012

P3, line 23+ -- duties of task force defines the content of the PBAS to include “best available” data, and on line 37, “may consider” which is a change from original Senate bill, which declared “shall consider”; discussion at the legislature not to require schools to generate new data, or on dept. to ensure schools reporting new data in usable format; allows new or emerging measures to be included in the PBAS; those on the list are a starting point;

P2, line 37 then to P4 – site visits to 10% of schools statewide to assess validity of input system and verify input evidence; lines 8-10, Dept encouraged to use other site visits to verify validity of self-reports; does not say Dept has to look at every school, Dept can focus its efforts to the extent needs to on visiting specific schools; flexibility afforded to Dept to select and visit schools that it feels it needs to

Q: SB180 does not define ‘school’; does this apply to other entities or programs that are considered schools?

A: Court decision applies only to public schools

P5, lines 1-10 – Verification process for PBAS – repeat of ‘best available data’; essentially a field test and feedback from practitioners;

P5, lines 14 + -- corrective actions authority for Dept; not supplanting other authority in statute, this only applies to the Adequacy standards and system;

P6, line 27: describes reporting requirements and authorizes Commissioner to investigate volunteer professionals to supplement DOE staff on site visits;

Q: Does everyone have to start submitting in the same year? Can we split to have half report in the first year, then other half in the second?

A: No, all have to demonstrate adequacy by the input method by the end of the first year; when narrative form finalized, every school will have to submit

Q: The teacher certification standard is not included in the listed adequacy standards; (included in 306.15) though it is referenced in some; should that be included?

A: Then ***should not*** be part of the input based adequacy system if not on the list in the bill; cannot deny adequacy demonstration if other standards are not met; can only comment;

Q: Is *Fiscal Note* considered accurate?

A: Data provided by the Dept; assumption that the system will have no impact in the immediate biennium, as has been claimed and presented by the Dept.;

Attorney Meyers excused himself to attend another meeting.

***Additional Comments*** –

RW: District budgets for next year are already in place; districts and schools cannot comply beyond what they currently have in place;

DW: There are no additional costs to districts to comply with this. The School Approval Standards, already in place; the set of adequacy standards are a subset of the full Approval Standards

M J: Remind all that this system and legislation is only intended to measure adequacy, and not the full set of minimum standards; the state only funds 30% of school budgets (approx) and this legislation requires compliance on a comparable percentage of the full set of Minimum Standards.

**3. Deb provides a brief history of the development of the IBAS .**

Discussion points include

- IDEA, School Approval Standards WILL NOT GO AWAY, will still apply to schools as currently implemented, with consequences as currently enacted
- there may be changes after the Performance System (PBAS) goes back to the legislature in 2011-2012;
- language includes “narrative” so challenge to the group was to make it doable for the schools AND doable for the Dept when it reviews the submissions; aim not to require extensive writing from principals nor extensive time from Dept. staff to assess whether evidence submitted demonstrates ‘the opportunity for adequacy’

**4. Overview of IBAS as currently crafted by Keith and Deb –**

(screen shots distributed for making notations)

DW walks through a typical scenario –

Submitter (school) enters via common system (like i4see)

IDEALLY – at some point will have *all* the School Approval Standards in the system, with some notation to highlight the Adequacy Standards

TABS unique to your school level (elem, ms, sec) appear after you enter your school info on the entry page

Can export the contents of the system to an EXCEL file for transmission to others via email or for distribution

*Elem Social Studies* example: exact language of opening paragraph of the standard is listed in blue box; a link will be added from blue box to the complete standard with all its subsections;

Notation in green: “OTHER” indicates requirements are alternatively met – Please explain.

This tells the user that selecting the OTHER option requires a narrative explanation

The first item in each standard was going to be a question about HQT; HOWEVER, \*\* HQT will be removed since Atty. Meyers has now confirmed that this is not one of legislatively designated *Adequacy Standards*

If user selects YES, then the indicator turns green;

If the user selects NO, then a TEXT BOX opens; currently unlimited in size (?Consider limited text?); the indicator turns RED

If the user selects OTHER, then a TEXT BOX opens, allows input of other evidence, explanation

Q: Who signs to attest the accuracy?

A: Superintendent and Principal

Q: How is this different from current system?

A: Electronic instead of paper; also separates out key indicators within each standard, whereas current system only asks yes or no on whole standard;

This system takes account of the “narrative” requirement of the legislation by trying to fill in the narrative FOR the principal,

Concern about alignment between School Approval Standards responses and these responses; for example, if said YES on SAP form, then principal will need to remember to submit YES on the IBAS.

Ongoing discussion of the criteria for “met adequacy” – is 100% required? Is it 100% of all the sub-indicators?

**TO DO:** Ask this question of Anne Edwards from Attorney General’s office

Discussion of dropping the NO option; consideration of inviting an explanation via a text box for NO responses – may be unnecessary;

Text Box at bottom for COMMENTS EVIDENCE – **ASK AGs office**; if “CURRICULUM Documents Demonstrate” is appropriate stem

RECOMMENDATION – change from “Evidence” to “Explanation of Demonstration of Adequacy” (per the legislation)

IDEA – YES NO at the bottom for the overall standard; no consensus from the participants

Comment: AGs office will rely on recommendations from this group if there is a preference for a certain criteria; so this group can provide advice or their recommendation

Q: When do you fill out the form?

A: By the end of the year; not specified in the legislation beyond 'by the end of the year'

Comment: Legislation says narrative needs to explain HOW the school is meeting the opportunity for an adequate

Technical Question for Ed M: How are school's approved by grade level? How do they find out?

Ed: Should be in the system; the level identification is usually what the School Board requests, whether middle school or elementary school; ideally, should be identified as part of the school ID number; Keith not sure how to integrate this field with other Dept data systems to automate that step

## 5. Receiving Input from Field

Deb W invited members to volunteer to discuss via teleconference how to vet and begin to work on guidance for users of the system

Indicate on Sign In Sheet If Interested

Some discussion to engage a focus group at the Principal's Conference end of June

## 6. Tim Kurtz – Decisions on AYP change recommendations.

Participation Rates: right now schools and districts with 40 or more students must meet participation rates; some instances missed participation rate by 1 student; appeals suggest that previous participation rates high so this one year miss shouldn't have such a great effect; solution offered by Tim is to combine counts for 2 years or 3 years to see if meets 40 minimum; sample runs of this past year's data show substantial number of cases where the data would be reported in place of the "\*\*\*"; would have to be approved by USED for the accountability workbook;

Task Force members generally agree this is a reasonable change

Other AYP changes will be presented via email for Task Force review and recommendation.

## Meeting Adjourned at 4:15 pm

### ACTION ITEMS

1. Marcia McCaffery will convene those content specialists with K-12 standards – arts, PE, health, Tech Ed,
2. Deb W will discuss content of the IBAS with content specialists
3. Deb W will convene the volunteers to develop a plan for gathering input from the field by teleconference

### SINCE THE MEETING:

The system has been refined to include a final step that creates a narrative from the options selected. A video manual has been added to the initial information page. DOE IT staff has said that they will be able to add the system, once it's tested and finalized, to either the ESS

Workbench or a password protected site and include all other school approval standards as the final tab.

Content standards definitions will be finalized during July and August. Next meeting, the Task Force will review the system and get to work on the Performance system. Pilot with some principals during the fall (after sharing with Superintendents at Commissioner's Meeting) so it can get out to all schools after the first of the year.

NEXT MEETING:

AUGUST 25, 1-4 PM, Room 15

Subcommittee work in AM