



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

**October 28, 2008  
8:30 am – 12:00 n**

**Present:**

**NHDOE:** Lyonel Tracy, Mary Heath, Deb Wiswell, Tim Kurtz, Gaye Fedorchak, Steve Bos, Michael Schwartz, Mary Lane, Sallie Fellows, Ginny Clifford

**Technical Advisors:** Scott Marion, Damien Betebenner (Center for Assessment), Shannon Douglas. (Measured Progress), Karen Laba (New England Comprehensive Center)

**District Reps:** Keith Burke, Kathy McCabe, Patrick Connors, Heather Cummings, Brian Cochran, Maria Dryer, Steve Zadavec, Nicole Heimarck

**NOTES:**

**1. Commissioner Tracy: Review of impact of work of AYP task force** leading to current work in legislature and in response to Supreme Court decisions and requirements

Supreme Court Assignment #1 = Define an adequate education

Legislators worked throughout 06-07 to come to an agreed upon definition

\*\*all work of this task force will need to align with that definition; (*adequacy definition handout distributed*) \*\*

Supreme Court Assignment #2 = lay out the cost of this 'adequate education'

Legislature worked through 07-08 to complete this assignment

Supreme Court Assignment #3 = now the biggest challenge = how to fund that adequate education; difficult to be a legislator now!

Legislative Assignment #4 = How will school districts be held accountable for use of the adequacy money they receive?

DOE has strong credibility with legislative committee chairs in part because of the good work of this task force; now invited to the table at the outset to help define the process

*NEW CHARGE to the Accountability Task Force – develop a comprehensive accountability system to assure that schools and districts are providing opportunities for ALL students to receive an adequate education*

**2. Mary Heath: Draft proposal to legislature to develop a comprehensive accountability system;** (*\*draft proposal distributed, NOT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW beyond the task force\**) purpose of the system = to describe the extent to which opportunities are provided at a school or district for students to receive this adequate education that the state has funded; Chairwoman Rous authorized NH DOE to go forward (but no \$ allocated) in the design of the system to monitor adequacy

*Tentative Plan:* develop a system to gather evidence from schools that demonstrate that all students have been provided an opportunity to acquire an adequate education; key features of the system = comprehensive; a point system within a rubric/ continuum; use valid performance measures

Considerations to include: offer school district's flexibility in how they demonstrate; system should reflect shared responsibility between state and local entities to provide for student needs personally, physically, socially, academically.

Proposal includes a list of categories to be measures (e.g., school approval standards, existing monitoring indicators for special education, English language learners, AYP, CTE, etc)

Who will develop the system? Task Force already established (this group)

When will system be in place? Review existing data collected by the DOE, research other states' accountability systems; develop a framework and present findings to legislators by May 2009

-- DOE pilot system and train users during 2009 – 2010; will need to create data collection system

-- Use with all school districts 2010 – 2011

-- Annually DOE will report to legislature the number of schools and districts meeting adequacy

Still to be clarified = Corrective Action for schools failing to earn enough points for two, three, or four years; anticipate designing a system of graduated consequences and requirements

Key Points:

-- this will provide opportunities for districts with local education improvement plans to demonstrate their success

-- this will be a comprehensive system, a NH system that meets adequacy

-- the system must use data/ information that is out there already; system must not be a burden to school districts

MH to group = Is this a burden or an opportunity? What does it feel like?

Q: Do we envision two parallel tracks – federal AYP and state adequacy?

A: Yes, so a school could fail to make AYP and still achieve adequacy; or the reverse, make AYP but not achieve adequacy, though unlikely

Q: Criteria that earn 'adequacy points' – are the ones on the list in the draft proposal all the ones that need to be included or are there others?

A: The work that the task force does will determine that

Q: Is the system flexible enough for schools to add their own criteria? Who determines the point values?

A: Will be under the purview of the task force to decide that question; depends on what opportunities the task force decides to recommend/ include

Q: Will all our existing reports be integrated into a ‘monster’ report, each part given a point value?

A: The task force will have to figure out how they (other reports) fit together

Q: Historically, accountability measures (such as those for accreditation) were *input* measures; however, since NCLB the focus has changed to *output* measures. What’s the balance for this system?

A: Want to make everything matter; up to this group to decide the balance; encourage to look at definition of adequacy and think about methods to be used to determine whether schools provide an adequate education; the group will start out looking at everything that is currently measured in some way, then filter out what the task force decides matters most.

Q: If goal 3 is to find funds for providing an adequate education, is it also imperative that the legislature fund the process of monitoring adequacy?

A: This proposal does give some authority to the DOE to identify and provide support for those not making adequacy. Does not provide for funding the monitoring process (*see further response, below*)

Q: Worried about giving extra money to failing schools as part of the consequence of not making ‘adequacy’; the system needs to consider giving money to the excelling schools, give funds to successful schools to help them replicate their success.

A: Good point. Will need to find a balance.

*Comment:* DOE facing unreasonable challenges to completing its assignments because of insufficient funding; don’t have a language arts or math person to attend to existing required assignments; insufficient staff to do school approval adequately; how can the legislature expect the DOE to take on this additional monitoring without funding?

LT: Suggest presenting the framework to the legislature with a caveat: this is what the monitoring system would look like if the DOE is at full capacity; in contrast, this is what the monitoring system will look like at partial DOE capacity;

DW: The statewide system of support will help in identifying DOE capacity and can be useful in helping the legislature see what we have in place and how we can or cannot accomplish new assignments.

### **3. Scott Marion and Damien B – Follow the Child Growth Model Percentile Target Analysis (presentation)**

-- graphs of probability of achieving growth targets by standard deviation

Slight drop for ½ sd to ¼ sd below proficient, similar math, reading, grade group

-- graph of average probability to reach target using scale scores versus using percentiles

Shows that students in the ½ to ¼ sd group have higher targets to reach

(Tim K explains the six target groups by Standard Deviation variance)

Q: Need to consider what legislators need to know – for every student, do schools now have how they did on growth model versus how they performed within the AYP/ status model?

A. That will be covered later, but these graphs represent data that is available to districts at the student level. (The general public has access to school and district level data).

(Presentation continues):

-- bubble graph of median growth percentiles by school size and percent of free and reduced (poverty)

Shows that growth systems is “fair” when correlated with status model

-- bubble graph showing percent meeting growth targets by school size, percent poverty

Confirms that schools serving lots of low achieving students have fewer students meeting FTC growth targets

Q: what about conditioning on other variables? Like attendance; would that show stronger positive correlation?

A: could choose any variable to compare

## **BREAK**

*Continue presentation—*

-- growth percentiles by scale scores graphed alongside FTC actuals

Current model is FTC line; segments of the line are flat, meaning no higher expectations for those at higher levels of attainment

-- Colorado example – state sets targets individually, yearly, based on whether student could be projected to meet proficiency based on past performance

*Comment:* Purpose behind index and growth systems is to see where schools are making gains, with which groups; need to disaggregate to learn more about a particular school or even further, about a particular student

**4. Next meeting dates –**

**FOR ALL TASK FORCE MEMBERS --**

**December 18, 1 pm - 4 pm - Room 12 NHDOE change!**

**January 8, 1 pm– 4 pm - Room 12 or Board Room**

**February 5, 8:30 am – 12:00 n – Room 12 or Board Room**

**March 4, 1 pm – 4 pm – Room 12 or Board Room**

**April 8, 8:30 am – 12 n – Room 12 or Board Room**

Deb recruited 2 subcommittees to begin laying out the work for this project: accountability system and growth targets

*Homework/ Research:* Deb will send a paper recommended by Scott Marion from SCASS project that surveys accountability systems across the country; Deb will email to everyone

**5. Tim K – Participation rate discussion; several high schools missed AYP due to low participation rates; proposal to create formula for participation rate (handout), still need 40 or**

more to calculate; differentiate participation rate by one year rate, two year rate, three year rate; caution that the number of students in subgroups will add together for two year and three year rate; might have escaped review of participation rate if < 40 in past, but under the proposed system participation would 'count' because numbers would exceed minimum; One result this past year = states and districts had small subgroups, but when aggregated at the state level, state missed participation for the first time

*Discussion:* What would be the impact? Would it have made a difference? Not sure. Have data to examine backwards ;

*Recommendation:* look back at the data to determine if this change would make a difference and bring to December meeting

**6. Deb W review of handouts:** two sided AYP source data handout; suggestions invited;

**7. Deb poses a Request:** think about **when would be the best time to release AYP?** Use the list serve to offer your thoughts; Deb will create a link to a section of the web site for posting documents for this group, including the paper mentioned above.

Meeting adjourned 12:15 pm.

Thank you to Karen Laba for taking notes!