



**Virginia M. Barry, Ph.D.**  
 Commissioner of Education  
 Tel. 603-271-3144

**Paul Leather**  
 Deputy Commissioner of Education  
 Tel. 603-271-3801

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
 101 Pleasant Street  
 Concord, N.H. 03301  
 FAX 603-271-1953  
 Citizens Services Line 1-800-339-9900**

**Task Force to Develop a Performance-Based School Accountability System  
 June 11, 2010, 9:00 am – 12 pm  
 Department of Education Board Room**

**NEXT MEETING: Tuesday, August 10, 12 noon – 3PM (including lunch)**

X	Virginia Barry, Ph.D.	Commissioner of Education
	Brian Cochrane	Director of Assessment and Accountability Nashua School District
X	Paul Couture	Principal, Stevens High School, Claremont
X	Jerome Frew	Superintendent, Kearsarge Regional School District
X	Molly Kelly	Chair, Education Committee, NH Senate
	Daphne Kenyon	NH State Board of Education
X	Paul Leather	Director, Division of Adult Learning, NH Department of Education
X	Scott Marion	National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Dover
	Deborah McNeish	Principal, Conant/Rumford School, Concord, NH
	Judith Fillion	Director, Division of Program Support, NH Department of Education
	Edward Murdough	Bureau of School Approval
X	Kathleen Murphy	Director, Division of Instruction, NH Department of Education
X	Emma Rous	Chair, Education Committee, NH House of Representatives
	Vincent Spiotti	Bethlehem School Board, Bethlehem, NH
X	Deborah Wiswell	Bureau of Accountability, Curriculum and School Improvement, Division of Instruction, NH Department of Education

**Guests**

Representative Franklin Gould, NH House, Lebanon, NH  
 Dean Michener, Executive Director, NH School Boards Association  
 Irv Richardson, NH NEA  
 Karen Laba, New England Comprehensive Center (NECC), RMC Research, Portsmouth, NH

**NOTES:**

1. Deb welcomed members and initiated discussion of next meeting dates. Expect to be able to omit a meeting in July and resume work in August.
2. **Review of the Agenda:** input system progress report; performance indicators decisions to date; student growth percentiles (cont'd); subgroups.
3. **"Input" system Launch:** Deb began a review of the "input" system and credited its development and implementation to the work of Representative Emma Rous, who is retiring from the legislature at the end of this session. Deb reported that Emma has agreed to stay active on this committee to see the results of her work on SB 180 come to fruition.

Two pieces of guidance have been prepared for the 'input' system: a print and online *NH IBSAS Users Guide*, and an instructional video

Tour of online "input" system –

- sample data listed as "Concord School District" though not actual Concord data
- passwords for all administrators already in hand; instructions for requesting a password in the Manual; passwords map to 'permissions' for individual users, DOE: Read Only; principals: school(s) only; superintendent: access to all schools in the district
- selection of years, so yearly reports will be accessible
- tabs for each standard requiring input
- SAVE options and cautions
- Superintendent has option to accept and submit or to send back for more input from principal
- reports printed out showing text from the standard and boilerplate text if a "YES" answer is selected; adds narrative evidence for "NO" or "OTHER" responses submitted by the school
- DOE reviewers have options to accept or send back

Q: so the submitter is *referencing* evidence, not submitting it?

A: Yes, they can also cite URL for online accessible documentation, i.e, student handbook,

Q: curious what users think about the system?

A: seems pretty easy as presented here

Deb reminded that the system flows in a 2 year cycle if "YES" or "OTHER" approved by the department.

*Timeline:* will go out to principals next week; have until September 1, 2010 SY to submit

Pilot schools agreed much simpler than feared, and found it helpful to read the full text of the standards.

Revisit adequacy judgment: is a school 'adequate' if any NOs submitted?

School could select NO and demonstrate adequacy via the "performance system."

School could select NO, Dept could request plan to address; school could choose to continue not changing approach to standard and refer to performance system

**TO DO:**

1. Include explanation in cover letter the "NO" impact on adequacy judgment.
2. In the manual, add expectation that "OTHER" or "NO" need to be addressed.
3. Send a follow-up letter mid summer with clarifications and reminders

Discussion:

- reminder that site visits are used to verify what is entered as 'input' evidence
- need to find a way to synchronize the 5 year School Approval process with the two year Adequacy Input process?
- onsite for School Approval will merge with onsite visits for Adequacy
- implications for a high school principal if required to formulate action plans – can this group reconsider NEASC documentation in lieu of / in addition to these other reports?; NEASC is every 10 years, but there are 2 year and 5 year progress reports; if all staff are involved in the planning, preparation for all these visits (NEASC, School Approval, Adequacy, SINI plans, other continuous improvement etc); building level staff can be overwhelmed
- Discussions of NEAS as (a) alternative entry for input adequacy; (b) include as Level 2 performance optional entry
- Paul Leather reported a close alignment between adequacy standards and NEASC standards (Input system)
- NEASC asks much more than school approval standards; excited about using NEASC

Q: could NEASC serve as the default for input adequacy?

\*\*\*\*A: will check with Ed M how close the alignment between NEASC and Adequacy

**4. Weaving together the Adequacy Indicators:** Deb reviewed decisions to date on the summary chart draft (salmon handout).

SGP: after defining quartile borders, assign point values for different quadrants –

Lower left (low growth, low achievement) = 1

Upper right (high achievement/ high growth) = 4

Upper left (high achievement, low growth) -- ?

Lower right (high growth, low achievement)--? Each could be a 2 or we could choose 2 and 3 depending on what we value

\*1-4 Points each for

- whole school (SGP)
- ethnicity group (SGP)
- low income (SGP)
- students with disabilities (SGP)
- (-- ELL) – use ACCESS for English proficiency and improvement

Possibly add

- whole school writing (achievement only)
- whole school science (achievement only)

Then allocate points for

Graduation rate (1-3) HS only

3 made target

2 improved

1 get worse

Dropout rate (1-3) HS only

? Possibly Attendance (1-3)

3 = 90%

2 = 85-89

1 = below 85

\*High School would use achievement instead of SGP

Comment: Need to communicate the system, why and how to many audiences; opportunity to begin that conversation, and gather further input from summer conferences  
Dept. scheduled to present at the Superintendent's conference, can start this conversation at that point. (discussion postponed to September)

Comment: Concern about report due to Legislature in November following verification of the performance system – are we on target?

Discussion of the requirements for legislation for the performance system. Will decisions about the value or weighting or components require rules to be passed in legislation -- “legislative adoption of the performance based system.” (lines 128-129 ff).

#### **TO DO:**

\*\*\*\*1. Emma Rous and Molly Kelly will review intent of the legislation to provide guidance on the expected recommendation to the legislature due in November.

**5. Student Growth Percentile :** Scott began discussion of (SGP) decisions by the Accountability Task Force.

Target: Individual student growth targets will be based on having all students reach or maintain proficiency in 3 years or by 8th grade, whichever comes first.

Discussion will continue at the AYP task force on what is a good enough cut score will be used in this target – percent proficient or index scale?

Consideration/ question: Should all scores be aggregated or considered separately?

Scott – it's often a hard sell to judge by aggregating scores, better to report separate subjects independently

General Agreement: better to report separately

Revisit bubble chart (referenced as 'quadrants' in the Summary presented by Deb)

- reports median SGP for schools; median is the fairest measure for this use
- Scott provided some interpretations of individual “bubbles”/ schools along the two axes
- generally high growth is good;
- informs Department decisions about which schools might be higher priority for assistance

Decisions about how to slice the graph to allow value judgments that are meaningful and helpful

- generally 50th median student growth percentile is vertical
- what about the horizontal line – should it be state average? Concern that state average is high;

#### Discussion

- how do we take into consideration that the state average is proportionately determined by the performance of districts like Manchester and Nashua? Response: recognize that they are the state's students;
- inherent fairness in SGP model because students are being compared/ ranked against others like them;
- concern about explaining growth to parents
- hard to explain how a school could be penalized if it demonstrates low growth but has high achievement
- adequacy is essentially a judgment about whether students “can get there from here” so achievement matters
- discussion has included using both achievement as well as growth; achievement is associated/ correlated with socioeconomics, demographics more than growth
- growth is more valued by teachers, knowing where the child starts from and where they end up at the close of the year;
- need endorsement from this task force that high growth and high achievement are both valued

Q: does the group want to include science and math?

A: can be included in status/ achievement but no growth scores for those subjects;

**TO DO:**

1. Convene a standard-setting panel to define the quadrant borders based on sample actual data. (Suggestions to work through the C-I-A group (curriculum, instruction, assessment)) **Practice run was held on July 14.**

**6. Gaps:**

Scott reviewed previous discussions of "super sub groups" which eliminates an individual student appearing/ being counted in multiple groups in current accountability (AYP) system. Used in Utah which has similar demographic in NH.

Definitions: Super Subgroup (SSG) includes any student identified for ethnicity, low socioeconomic status; other group includes ELL, white, students with disabilities (unless previously counted under ethnicity)

Bar graph (reading): SSG growth percentile average about 46<sup>th</sup> %ile; non-SSG average = 51%ile (all students, all grades aggregated; 09-10 data)

Math bar graph: very much like reading –

Percent proficient by subgroup, reading: SSG at 62%, non SSG at 82%; contribution of Asians to SSG likely explains;

Questions to group: is economically disadvantaged the subgroup to look at? How about looking at students who started below proficient compared with students at proficient;

Discussion:

- what is the value of separating ethnic groups? How valuable to understand school input
- danger of categorizing by ethnicity is to allow 'blaming' the group
- concern about the small cell size for ethnic groups
- greatest need is for special education subgroup; greatest gap
- can't eliminate considerations of ELL subgroup, now approx. 5 districts receiving
- problem with ethnicity subgroup without Asian students
- all groups will be reported, question remains what will count for adequacy

Decision: No decision yet on subgroups and gaps; suggest further input from C-I-A and other groups

Basic question: where's the bar? For individual judgments and larger groups

**7. Next Meeting: Tuesday, August 10, noon to 3 including lunch**