



NH Accountability Task Force Meeting
NH DOE Board Room **Tuesday, Aug. 25, 2009** **1:00 pm - 4:00 pm**

Next Meeting Date **OCTOBER 8, 2009 – 9:00 to 12, Board Room**

Present:

District Reps: Roxanne Wilson, Windham; Kathryn Sheridan (SAU 28); Heather Cummings, Gov. Wentworth Regional;

NH DOE: Deb Wiswell, Mary Lane, Steve Bos, Ed Murdough, Helen Schotanus, Ken Relihan, Tim Kurtz, Rob Tenney, Ginny Clifford, Marcia McCaffery, Keith Burke,

Center for Assessment: Scott Marion

New England Comprehensive Center (NECC): Karen Laba

1. Welcome and Introductions – Many schools opening soon so principals not able to attend; welcome Roxanne and Kathryn, some other district folks may be arriving later. Deb will offer ideas from those attending, then solicit input from absentees via notes and email. Deb reviewed the agenda and set expectations for the outcomes of the meeting.

2. Participation Rate and Using ADM Data for Full Academic Year Definition -- Tim Kurtz

-Tim reviewed previous discussions of participation rate, using one, two, and three year accumulations. Results from data review shows that some schools that had 'n's too small to calculate a rate accurately, will now be held accountable for participation because two and three year aggregates raise the n to a reliable size.

- Second issue is to determine which students are counted in a school's AYP performance calculation. Currently, we use a "continuous enrollment" method. Recommendation is to use an average daily membership (ADM). The ADM is based on 365 half-days (denominator). Vast majority of students have ADM of 1.00. Question is what ADM counts as "full academic year" for accountability purposes. For example, would it be appropriate to count a student in the school's accountability calculation if the ADM is 0.90? Currently, we consider Oct 1 through end of school year as full academic year. Proposed ADM method might end up including more students in the accountability calculations than the current system, so it should appeal to USED when submitting for approval.

Input from attendees: already collect the ADM information, but need to have clarity to reduce the irregularities

Still on the table – when are students classified as on an IEP? As part of the Performance Report, must be same as department policy on ADM reporting

Question about home schooled students who come to the school for specials – how do they count as enrolled/ not for these purposes? We think there is already a rule in i4see reporting.

Will need approval of USED as a change in the Accountability workbook.

Decision: DOE will be sending out this information to ATF full members and ask for their input before changing the accountability workbook. Did not get this done. Will get consensus at October 8 meeting.

3. Review of SB180 – Deb

Final passage and signed into law after the last ATF meeting.

Scott, Deb, Keith and Tim demonstrated input system to Commissioner and then to Atty.

General rep, Legislators rep, et al, to solicit feedback on Aug. 5.

At that point, YES, NO, and OTHER was the format presented at that time.

VERY STRONG request to include a NARRATIVE entry by schools.

Version presented at this meeting reflect responses to Aug. 5 input:

e.g. now, “Examples or Evidence that Demonstrates how we meet the standard above” is a required entry box. (the ‘narrative’)

NO statements now require an explanation for “why not” to be entered by the principal.

In response to Dept concerns on the range of content and quantity submitted, AG (Anne Edwards) and Gov’s office (Christen Lavers) indicated to “try out the system” and see what responses are received from the sample/ pilot users.

Changes to the system since last meeting:

- “How to” video prepared to show how to fill out the form
- still keeping the original idea of a database to allow the Dept and the legislature to review a summary of results
- No in red, Yes in green; “Other” prompts a text box to fill in explanation
- example from elementary math, then elementary SS
- “Generate narrative” box at bottom of each page; shows text synthesized by DOE curriculum consultants from the standards as well as specific narrative entries from the submitter
- Deb provides detail on the considerations within the Dept. in adding the statement that “curriculum is aligned with the state frameworks (RSA 193- C)
- Question – what if a school doesn’t like text of the YES as written, can it be changed?
ANSWER – Yes, by choosing the “OTHER” option and type in the words you want to select, for instance; does NOT change the standard text, just adds clarification text as entered into the OTHER text box
- Keith shows the summary matrix that can be viewed by the DOE to look at the individual schools by their YESSSES, No’s, OTHERs by each of the adequacy standards
- ****-- Question – when the Department reads an OTHER and decides whether that means Yes, No – does the Department the change the entry in the data system? (To Be Determined)
- Question -- What counts as “meeting adequacy”? Deb W shared her understanding of the input from the AG and legislature as having no “NOs” in the submission

Deb shared a report on a conversation with the state OIT services and they expect to be able to create a web based system for the content Keith et al have already created. Will include the other 36 school approval standards as a tab. Likely ready a year from now.

Input on Guidance to be provided --

Remind of the purpose -- adequacy

Who will read it?

What's the consequence of "no" responses?

What goes in the Other box?

Q: When will it be rolled out? A: Deb expects in January. She invites Roxanne, Heather to offer some of their principals to try it out as a first pass.

- 4. Commissioner's Task Force** – Deb has authority to recommend members. Will likely include Paul Leather, Kathleen Murphy, Ed Murdough, Deb Wiswell from DOE; Jerry Frew representing NH School Administrators' Association; Paul Couture, Principal Stevens (Claremont) HS waiting for recommendation of School Boards Association; Scott Marion; Daphne Kenyon, State Board; Emma Rouse, NH House; Molly Kelly, NH Senate; 1 additional to be selected

5. Planning the Performance Based Adequacy Accountability System – Scott Marion

Scott presents his PowerPoint (will be posted on the NH Accountability section of the NH DOE website)

Previous discussions with the legislature during development of the statute suggest that the intent was to develop an 'index' system

This group will need to decide which of the suggested measures on lines 108 through 120 to include in the performance system.

(also need to consider what the relationship between this task force and the Commissioner's Task Force as defined in the law)

Questions:

1. Some of the suggested performance indicators seem to be "input" indicators, like percentage of HQT. What's the distinction?
2. What is the meaning of "totality"? Does it also include the input standard? No
3. There are many ways to look at achievement data to get at whether a school has served all students, including special populations of students.
4. What about the non-tested subjects. Is there data we can get, like HQT in non tested subjects, that can give insight into the adequacy performance system?

Deb indicated that there are tools others use to represent student achievement data in ways that expand the usefulness of the data. Damien from the Center for Assessment will be invited to attend a future meeting to share his recent work on growth percentiles.

Recommendation to come up with a definition of Performance Criteria for this system

Continued discussion of the meaning of "performance"

Additional discussion:

Scott proposed goals for the performance system

Categories for the performance indicators – inclusion, achievement, readiness, development

Additional concerns about differences between inputs and outcomes

Must look at indicators already collected, for (e.g. CTE, SPP, in addition to NECAP) and come up with a set of indicators to be used .

Meeting Adjourned at 4:15 pm --

ACTION ITEMS

1. DOE (Deb) will be sending out this information to ATF full members and ask for their input to be returned to Tim Kurtz before changing the NH accountability workbook. – DEB WISWELL
2. HOMEWORK – what do we value? What can we measure? What do we already collect?
3. What data elements are being included in the LDS being developed? GINNY CLIFFORD
4. Identify components and design of some other state accountability systems -- SCOTT MARION