



**NEW HAMPSHIRE ACCOUNTABILITY TASK FORCE MEETING
FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 2010, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM
RM 15, NH DOE, CONCORD**

Next Meeting: Thursday, July 29, 9-noon

Present:

District Reps: Patrick Connors (SAU 53); Kathy Stavanger (SNHU); Donna Crook (Manchester); Brian Cochrane (Nashua)

NH DOE: Deb Wiswell, Merry Fortier, Susan Randall, Keith Burke, Ed Murdough, Mary Lane, Steve Bos; Tim Kurtz; Paul Leather

Center for Assessment: Scott Marion, Damian Betebenner

Measured Progress: Shannon Douglas

New England Comprehensive Center (NECC): Karen Laba

NOTES

Thank you all for your loyal participation, thoughtful questions, and spirited discussions. I know at times it doesn't seem like we are making progress, but we are. I hope you have a chance to recharge during the summer.

1. Deb Wiswell opened the meeting at 9:10 am. She invited attendees to introduce themselves and share what they might be anticipating (or dreading!) in the upcoming summer. She adjusted the agenda to address the input manual at the beginning of the meeting.
2. **Input Based School Accountability System (IBSAS)** (will be changed to NH-IBSAS) –
Manual: print guide drafted; video will also be available to help users navigate the tool
Brief tour of the website:
 - Log-in/ website: each user has a unique opening screen depending on 'permissions'
 Manual overview:
 - 'easy steps' to log-in in the opening pages for the confident user
 - log-in differs by permissions appropriate to the user's position; e.g., superintendent can see all schools in district, principal can see own school only;
 - manual includes screen shots from the website

Q: is the website timed at all? E.g. if stopped and answered phone, would log off? (**yes, 30 minute time out**)

A: Recommend users treat this as with anything else -- save every time you complete a step; not certain what amount of time is allowed before system logs off; when user selects "Save" they receive a message reporting "Saved Successfully" to assure that work isn't lost

Q: (DW) Advice requested from the group: on the report, should the system print the text of the standard before the submitted response?

A: Keith suggested a stem/ sentence which could integrate with YES or OTHER responses (e.g., “SR School meets the required 8 hour day.”)

Suggestion: Since not every principal constructs the narrative in full sentences, and since various uses might be employed for the reports, add text from the standard as part of the report, with the user-submitted evidence attached in a way that results in a readable statement.

Q: Who will be using these reports?

A: Department will use to identify and prioritize schools for support/ assistance; (Ed M) host districts, sending districts are interested in seeing this information;

Q: Will both days and hours be required to be submitted? RSA written as “either” but DOE forms now filled in require both.

A: System says either, but not yet in manual; Ed M reported that the regulations are being rewritten to focus on instructional hours, because of variability in ways “days” are counted.

(this has been addressed in the manual)

System question: Can tab SCHOOL YEAR (DAYS) and SCHOOL YEAR (HOURS) be made either/ or?
(no, but we have a solution in the manual)

Suggestion: Insert in the manual instructions to select OTHER then enter days/ hours; DOE will need to be alert to look for ‘other’ **(done)**

Arts Tab – need to add note to have “optional” theater and dance on the THEATER standard within the ARTS tab; difficult to program when applies to elementary and not secondary, or is optional in the standards

World Language – similar issue where secondary and elementary differ in required or optional standards

Online tour (continued): SUBMIT tab allows principal to submit to superintendent – locks tabs against changes until the Superintendent logs in to review. Superintendent has the option to submit to NH DOE OR return to data entry source (e.g., principal) with a custom message which is sent via email. (e.g. “ check these entries” or “these responses don’t appear consistent; review”)

Q: Who has district view? Can multiple people have that view in a district?

A: Donna C indicated that current system allows “multiple superintendents” via the “single sign in log-ons.” Same individual can have different roles also, like superintendent AND principal. Likely that applies to this system as well

Q: Is there a Summary Status Report, like the ELL database, across all schools in the district, to show whether submitted, returned for review, not submitted? **(Ryan is working on this)**

A: Haven’t added that but doable if already in place for another part of the system.

Keith showed a sample narrative report. Report prints out in “tab” order; page numbers and ‘printed on’ date included in the footer; standards text is printed then, if user has not submitted an answer, RED phrase “No evidence submitted” or “Not Answered” with the reminder that NO responses require evidence to be entered into the text box.

Request: Ed Murdough: Can private schools be taken out of the SCHOOLS list? Aren’t included in this system, yet their names appear in the dropdown list.

Submitted to DOE view: Discussion of options available to DOE =

Returned,
 Received,
 In Review,
 Approved,
 Closed (**this has been changed**)

Comment: “Closed” can be confusing – does it mean the school was closed? The report was reviewed and assessed? Clarification needed.

Request: text in comment box (following DOE options) should say what section needs revision/correction/ attention and a DOE contact person to discuss corrections needed. DOE may need to develop an internal manual, since roles and responsibilities for review of these submissions varies within the department; will need to test samples through the whole process and decide on a reasonable protocol for responding, tracking corrections; (may be set up similar to ARRA reporting; will need to get worked out) (**currently working on an internal user manual and protocol for DOE staff**)

Q: Is the judgment of ‘adequacy’ based on entering ALL ‘Yes’ (no NO’s) on the system, OR will it be based on “a preponderance of the evidence”?

A: In the school approval process, a school receives “conditional approval” if they are not meeting all the conditions in all the standards. Ed Murdough offered geography example – standard says schools must teach geography; visited a school that didn’t teach geography, but all other standards met; result = conditional approval. In school approval, there are three options: approved, not approved, or conditionally approved. An unapproved school is a closed school, cannot ‘open their doors.’ Legislation requires response to “conditional” within the next year. SB180 allows for correction of adequacy gaps within a specified time frame.

Deb asked all participants to look over the manual. Deb will be developing a feedback form and posting on the website with the manual.

Timeline: User’s Guide and announcement to schools this month (June 2010). Schools have through the summer to submit. Department will review late summer, fall. This is the first year (2010-2011) of implementation required by the legislation.

3. Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) Discussion -- Scott Marion

Deb reminded the group of the two purposes for the use of SGP:

1. to collect information about schools and students, and
2. to hold schools accountable for adequacy.

Decisions last meeting:

Target = on track to be proficient in 3 years or by 8th grade, whichever comes first; proficient or advanced students stay above proficient
 (Clarification -- based on 7th grade standards, which are assessed in October 8th grade)

Discussion:

Q: If a proficient student declines one year, it’s possible for them to be NOT “on track” to be proficient in 3 years, although they are proficient NOW. Does this penalize a school for what hasn’t yet happened?

A: (Scott) the system also uses STATUS measures to determine adequacy; the system can use either status or growth to be judged “adequate” ; also consider the limits of the current test which make it difficult to accurately measure growth at the high end of the scale

Suggestion: Change to “all students” as the subject of the standard, remove mention of “proficient students” mentioned in Scott’s slide

Comment: In order for SGP to have meaning for users, it will be important to have clear statements/ explanations behind whatever standard is established for parents, community.

4. Subgroups Discussion – Scott Marion

Scott presented Damian’s calculations on median growth percentiles by subgroups using NH data--

Super Subgroup (SSG) = any ethnicity, low SES, ELL

Non-Super Subgroup = white, non-econ disadvantaged

Bar graphs showing results across individual subgroups (omitting students with disabilities); discussion of what the graphs show about differences in median SGP

Focus question: Is a school providing an opportunity for an adequate education if it does not demonstrate equitable SGP for ALL students (ethnicity, etc)

Proposal: “schools demonstrate adequacy if SSG meets xxx (target TBD)”

Graph 2: Using status, percent proficient and above, by ethnic groups, econ disadvantaged, SSG/ Non SSG;

Graph 3: Growth and achievement bubble graph by SSG

Observations -- slight shift to left (toward lower achievement) among SSGs but not a remarkable differences between the low SES group and the SSG

Q: should we consider gaps between low SES and non-low SES; or create SSG and examine gap with non-SSG?

Comment: *must look at the data for students with disabilities (SWD) which are omitted from these sample graphs

Discussion:

-- consider who will object to not including ethnicity if we should decide to consider gaps only between economic disadvantages; not much difference in achievement as shown on these ;

-- low SES is the issue for most NH schools; will aid understanding if we accompany these reports with data about gaps in performance by race/ ethnicity that shows there isn’t much difference from the results using low SES;

-- using the low SES group uncovers the actual “gap” in NH schools; but it may be a challenge to educate users that there aren’t great gaps between ethnic groups outside of socioeconomic status

-- another idea – compare S below proficient with those at/ above proficient as subgroups

-- caution not to penalize schools with proficient and advanced S

A: TRY OUT graphing median SGP for two groups (a) students below proficient and (b) students at or above proficient; look at this actual data and see what is uncovered, consider the usefulness of this way to uncover “gaps”

TO DO:

1. (DW/ DOE) Establish and document internal protocols for reviewing submissions, tracking changes.
2. ALL Task Force: Review and provide feedback on *IBSAS User’s Guide*. Deb will post document and feedback form on website.
3. Deb will distribute project narrative for Damian’s grant proposal on student growth percentiles to this committee.

References:

Massachusetts Growth Model Resources, Guidance --

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/growth/>

URL for Colorado Growth Website = www.schoolview.org **