NH Accountability Task Force Meeting Notes
October 8, 2009 NH DOE Board Room 9:00 am - 12:00 pm
Next Full Task Force Meeting:
Monday, November 16, 2009, 1 pm - 4 pm, State Board Room

Present:

District Reps: Brian Cochrane (Nashua); Patrick Connors (SAU 53); Donna Crook (Manchester SD); Jean Briggs Badger (Dover); Heather Cummings (Gov. Wentworth); Lynn Carey (SAU 60) ; Keith Burke

NH DOE: Deb Wiswell, Mary Lane, Helen Schotanus, Ken Relihan, Gaye Fedorchak, Merry Fortier, Tim Kurtz, Steve Bos, Keith Burke, Mike Schwartz, Sallie Fellows, Cathy Higgins,

Center for Assessment: Scott Marion, Damien Betebenner
Measured Progress: Shannon Douglas

New England Comprehensive Center (NECC): Karen Laba

1. Welcome and Introductions

New member: Donna Crook, Manchester School District Data Analyst

2. Technical Adjustments on Accountability Measures

Graduation rate improvement targets –

Discussion highlights --

-- Cohort graduation rate will be available next year as planned; currently using the formula rate (inverse of dropout rate) to calculate AYP and for this discussion; change; discussions around cohort rate calculations will be scheduled at a later time

-- USED requires state accountability workbook to define targets for improvement in graduation rate every year toward 2014; question for this group is what targets

-- suggestion to set 5 percentage point increase each year through 2014, starting with 75% for 2009

-- CTE/ Perkins in NH defines a 77% target rate; CTE won't use same cohort rate as being discussed because most students start at the junior year/ later than 9th grade, making cohort calculations unworkable

Task force agreed to the recommendation presented by Tim to submit a 5% increase in target graduation rates to USED, recognizing that use of the legacy (current dropout inverse) method for calculating graduation rate will be retired after next year.

Average daily membership –

Tim presented the calculations run on enrollment data as currently tracked by schools, reporting that there are wide variations in how schools use the enrollment codes for their own tracking purposes. The proposed method of calculation average daily membership

rates is less problematic than enrollment data. See notes from September meeting for details on proposed change to use .90 average daily membership to define Full Academic Year

Discussion highlights –

-- if a school enrolls a student for 90% of year, then it should be responsible for that student in the accountability system; makes more sense

Participation rate averaging –

The recommendation of the NH DOE is to average participation rates across two or three year to avoid unusual situations in any one year.

Consensus that this method is fairer for both large and small schools.

3. SB 180 Updates

Deb Wiswell distributed the list of members of the Commissioner's SB 180 Task Force. She described how each member fits the requirements of the legislation and contributes a particular perspective. She reported on the agenda of the Oct. 2 meeting and future meetings, as well as a general overview of discussions of the expectations for the performance based accountability system. Notes from all of these meetings will be posted on the NH Accountability web page.

4. Input system update

Keith Burke is still programming the electronic input system to meet the group's specifications. Meeting next Tuesday 10/13 among internal staff to smooth the language across each of the 11 standards. Aim is to recruit some of the DOE Task Force members to try out the system then begin the launch so principals have the time from January through June to submit their responses.

5. Purposes for the Performance Based Component of the Adequacy Accountability System – Scott Marion

Scott discussed the wide array of purposes that can be served by an accountability system. SB 180 defines some of the goals/ purposes of the performance based component of the adequacy accountability system. While this task force can establish high level goals / purposes of the p. b. component, there is the possibility of challenges from the field if the committee decides to go beyond the legislation.

Discussion highlights –

-- SB 180 restricted the input component of the system to a simple decision of met/ not met, no option for demonstrating excellence; the p.b. component may allow options to identify "met" adequacy and perhaps "exceeded"

-- one of the design decisions will be how much structure to incorporate, and how "freewheeling" the system will allow for input; example -- only 31% of low SES students scored proficient in reading last year, one district results showed 44% low SES proficient, yet overall the district was below state averages, because the district enrolls a higher percentage of low SES students than the rest of the state;

Scott presented the Goals of the performance system slide (from the August 25 ppt). SB 180 requires that the system "provide another opportunity for schools to demonstrate adequacy." What other values/ goals should be considered in the p.b. accountability system?

Discussion highlights –

-- worry about adding "excellence" into a legislatively required "adequacy" system

-- nothing precludes going beyond 'adequacy' at a later time; after the short timeline for this system is met

-- don't want to miss the opportunity to improve the system by helping school districts find a way they can structure the performance of their students beyond the minimum, perhaps using the four areas in follow the child (academic, social, personal, physical)

-- understand importance of AYP, but see a disconnect between what NECAP state level assessment tells educators and what teachers are learning from local formative assessment; in one district, teachers are working on a common formative assessment process to gather more timely, instructionally useful information on students; how much can we wrap into the system?

-- think about what districts want; maybe the minimum required of the system to start with, maybe flesh it out with other components at a later time;

-- how can we make Performance Plus system a more helpful tool for this system?

-- suggest this Task Force consider the type of reporting system before going much further into the design

-- use of system to inform allocation of resources so they can be supported to meet their students' needs; for example, data already collected showing that certain populations of students have significant problems accessing the core curriculum;

-- SB 180 also requires public reporting of school performance to education stakeholders

-- bullets 2, 3 and 4 (slide 15) are nice but not necessary; if good design decisions are made for the system to meet the required purpose of demonstrating adequacy, then likely to be able to build out other indicators of excellence at a later time;

-- considerations of equity as an essential element of the system, using the understanding of "opportunity" to embed a conception of equity; for example, using growth or academic achievement targets as indicators might allow the system to reflect accurate measures of performance beyond the limitations of NECAP;

-- consider finding an indicator that captures whether students are ready and prepared for college, not just go to college; also how many succeed and persist;

Deb distributed resource documents –

What standards are used in other places? Scott's summary

What data elements are already collected? Ginny Clifford/ Mike Schwartz list

Possible indicators blank worksheet

Discussion of distinguishing between "input" and "performance" measures. Comments: input leads to performance, so both linked closely; in some cases; most measures of performance appear to be linked to student level data. For example, is access to the curriculum an input or an output?

Ideas for potential indicators offered:

NECAP scores

Curriculum assessment

Report card grades

NWEA scores

Other standardized tests (SAT, AP)

Relative attendance – overall percent of enrolled; disaggregated by reason for absence

Absence bands – e.g. how many absent more than 10% of time;
Graduation rate
Subgroups in NECAP
Equity
Diploma type – offering multiple types that "count" for graduation
e.g. of the kids who complete, percent that are GED rather than standard diploma; completer types
Other common assessments, writing prompts allow districts to customize
AP courses – number that take class, # who test, scores
SAT/ ACT/ Accuplacer – could be number who take, or score,
Applications to college, post secondary
Interventions – number or progress of students within
Competency completions at hs
Student survey/ perceptions/ climate e.g.
Parent surveys/ perceptions
Ability to bring in other measures (as above) into the system
DIBBLES
College career readiness of some sort
Course taking patterns – e.g. Students have taken a comprehensive curriculum, or developed a specialization;
State scholars

Comments on proposed indicators:
Correlation between validity and value (?)
Avoid incentivizing bad behaviors; e.g. professional learning communities
NWEA raises questions;
Design consideration: *list of indicators could be subsetted – don't have to demonstrate all, may offer option to select which indicators demonstrated
Concern about including indicators of items that require students/ parents to pay
NWEA very important or any other adaptive test

Meeting Adjourned at 12:15 pm

Next Meeting: **Monday, Nov. 16 afternoon**

ACTION ITEMS

1. Deb will send out the chart and ask input on (a) indicators offered at the meeting; and (b) "ratings" of the proposed indicators and (c) other indicators you think should be included. Add your comments in the right hand column.