NH Accountability Task Force

NH DOE Room 15

Next Full Task Force MEETINGS: May 12, 2009, 1 pm – 4 pm
June 9, 2009, 1 pm – 4 pm

Present:

NHDOE: Deb Wiswell, Ed Murdough, Helen Schotanus, Cathy Higgins, Steve Bos, Gaye Fedorchak, Keith Burke, Marcia McCaffery, Ginny Clifford, Michael Schwartz, Ken Relihan, Mary Lane,

Center for Assessment: Scott Marion

Measured Progress: Shannon Douglas

UNH – Todd DeMitchell

District Reps: Brian Cochrane; Chris Demers; Jerry Frew, Kathy McCabe; Patrick Connors, Gail Paludi, Charlie Pugh, Chris Harper, Diane Lurvey,

Association Rep: Diane Rappa, NHAHPERD

NECC: Karen Laba

* Note: Please note these corrections to March 17 minutes: Diane Rappa, NHAHPERD; Louise McCormack

Meeting Outcomes:

♦ Review and revise proposed input standards for Part I of adequacy accountability system
♦ Reach agreement on format for input-based accountability system
♦ Launch discussion and project planning for Part II – performance component of the adequacy accountability system
♦ Consider purposes of the performance system from multiple perspectives: task force, legislators, school/district, parent and community

NOTES:

1. Deb welcomed new/returning members and participants introduced themselves.
2. Deb reviewed the progress of the legislation to date; her expectation that the input process be finalized soon, with definitions of acceptable evidence in an easy to provide, easy to check process, with the full evidence available “if audited” or at the on-site.

Discussion of the current samples and the desired outcome of the “input” method –

-- Task Force wanted to move beyond the letter of the legislation to move the discussion forward, to help schools look beyond, but maybe that is naïve or unrealistic; perhaps the Follow the Child initiative should be the evidence above and beyond; we should keep the high aspirations under the Follow the Child, the input process should stick with the letter of the law

-- agree that the ‘great opportunity’ for schools to ‘strut their stuff’ as we earlier hoped, recognized that that would far exceed what the law allows; the task alone will be daunting for
administrators without going beyond; for example, is there a way to build on data we already have to fulfill the obligation?

Q: where in the system is the capacity to (a) compile and (b) review the evidence?
-- looking at a minimalist approach, state can only require what is required; school approval role assures at least meet minimums; 12 standards are curriculum standards, which we don’t currently collect information on; but it is also true that these standards don’t change wholesale year to year; it may turn out that schools will be sending in the same report every two years, or the system should accommodate ‘addenda’ for example when a new science program is implemented

General Discussion of the Process –
-- the more agreement around the common format the less challenge for input and review
-- having the pieces of evidence in a drop down would make it easier for input, because doesn’t require puzzling about what counts as good evidence
-- one of the thoughts was to hope the process would actually urge practitioners to read the school approval standards, so that having a drop down that list evidence types not previously considered would encourage growth in thinking
-- be sure to ask the building administrators’ perspective, since they will have to fill out the report on all 12 adequacy standards; remember the NH ‘principle’ of local control
-- but a shorter form may not get at what counts as ‘acceptable’ evidence; imagine Dept. may have to engage in some statewide conversations during which the higher aspirations can be presented and discussed
-- other systems in the Department look more deeply even than the Part II performance data
-- from principal’s point of view, the yes/ no is appealing, but the description is really important to have at hand while making a self-assessment
-- are we expecting a yes all the way down? Is it the preponderance of the evidence, as in NEASC for example?; will need to set honest standards and give people time to improve
-- superintendents and principals can be as creative as they choose when filling out state forms; one good thing about the forms is they make one think;
Format suggestion – modify Brian’s format to delete the yes/ no, but make a statement “curriculum doc that identify the K-4 scope and sequence …” with a drop down that lists acceptable or reasonable evidence and a space for “other” listings if schools’ evidence doesn’t fit one of the drop down items;
-- audits can be done by sampling a proportion of the submissions to determine accuracy;
-- prefer that examples indicate what evidence is acceptable and what is not; for comparison with one’s own system
-- having the “other” option to the drop down accommodates need for individual capacity, context of the individual school or district
-- what about a “no, we’re not doing it” choice? For “other” the DOE’s curriculum consultant would need to judge whether ok or not; then perhaps add to the drop down for next iteration, have the system grow or learn; becomes more difficult at the Elem level; it is most difficult to judge the items that meet compliance via alternate means, like health, etc;

3. Review of the various forms drafted in preparation for this meeting.
Science – elementary
Math –elementary, (using ‘weak’ or ‘acceptable’ designations)
Physical Education – acceptable done, below acceptable and target TBD
NEW Science – with yes/ no
Social Studies – elem, ms, hs, (using ‘acceptable,’ ‘less than acceptable’)

Discussion:
-- having the language of the standard in the left column is helpful, because it saves a look-up
-- grain size is key, translating the standard in user friendly terms is critical;
-- appeal to the standards isn’t ‘friendly,’ more useful to the central office; perhaps put the full
text of the standard as a pop-up; always important to have it there in some context; may not
need to include full text
-- suppose with El Sci example – user could select partially, adequately, or exceptionally (only 1); you choose one which best describes your school;
-- suppose looking at BC's example, a drop down with acceptable or partially acceptable
descriptors, a blank to enter a descriptor not already listed; system would evolve to eliminate
indicators not used and add new indicators not considered previously
-- Could a school add in ‘partially’ with the addition, “will be completed by X date”?
-- Will the system allow multiple pieces of evidence? Some yes, some no,
-- three categories emerge – curriculum, instruction and opportunity; would there be different
types of questions for each, for example curriculum may be a yes/ no, but instruction and
opportunity may require evidence or explanation;
-- Proposal: delay in the implementation date of the legislation; honor the varying capacities of
the schools, allow data gathering for a year, to provide guidance for the varied capacities
available; perhaps ask groups of schools to do subsets of the standards as part of a pilot;
-- approve of the pilot process, but not using multiple models; need quick ways to get the work
done, and to trigger thoughts about possibilities for improvement, but best to focus on one
format for testing; recommendation to put out a single model with potential for multiple
analyses for trial;
-- recommendation that the responses to the system go online, so parents and teachers can see
what the school replied/ filled out; would be helpful to have links to the school’s online
materials cited as evidence for the public as well as the Dept.;
-- discussion of whether providing the evidence is required or optional; should the system require
just “assurances” per the new stimulus funds?
-- the guidance document could include a recommendation that, after filling in the report by
indicating yes/no, the school or district create a place on the school’s website to begin
posting the “evidence” per each response, should there be an audit or in preparation for the
(periodic) on-site visit

4. Reaching Consensus on Form of Input Method

Discussion leader: Chris Harper

Goals for the system: Effective, efficient for schools, efficient for readers/ assessors

Standard – (full text of School Approval Standard)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Judgment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Critical Element #1: Evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Critical Element #2: Evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Critical Element #3: Evidence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion points:
-- what should be the unit of interest? Schools report on their own subset of the full standards;
-- should we be looking at the curriculum frameworks or the standards? Which is the unit of measure? A: agree that the standards are the unit
-- “preponderance of the evidence” for indicating YES/NO – entire standard?

DECISION – School Approval Standards in official language – consensus of the group

-- discussion of the judgment of attaining “all or none” levels of evidence for each standard, or whether partial judgments are allowed; the proposed law asks Adequate or Not Adequate, not an option for partially adequate; why list a partial?
-- option to consider -- avoid “partial” and use “under development, to be completed by X”
-- discussion of ‘partially’ adequate as motivator for districts to make change; some belief that ‘partial’ is NOT an option

DECISION -- to add a third category to the individual components “Partial”; self reporting at the individual component level; if all Yes, then overall YES, if not all yes, then the DOE judges whether fully MET or not.; allow to insert a comment

Evidence Discussion: considerations = options -- rubric, radio button, dropdown menu, written text, other?

-- evidence list to be selected by school as yes or no, discussion of whether to add a space for comments on “no” options;
-- another option: if all the dropdowns are selected, then “yes”; if fewer than all, “partial”; if not at all, then “no”
-- consider the central focus of the legislation --“an opportunity for an adequate education” – what evidence is sufficient? Maybe don’t need evidence of every single thing; the opportunity can be evidenced through the existence of a textbook that covers the identified topics; don’t need “partial”;
-- conceptual conflict between integrated curriculum & instruction and the breakdown of an integrated program that becomes necessary by the way the standards are written individually
-- discussion of citations of evidence to support conclusion of Yes No

5. Next Steps:
Deb meeting with Lyonel and Mary next week to discuss this group’s challenges so far

Keith Burke volunteers to take on the challenge of drafting a sample for the April work session.

April 22 – looking for volunteers to work on fleshing out this design; Room 15, 9 am ‘til done
May 12 – am work session, pm meeting
June 9 – am work session, pm meeting
Transcription of discussion on chart board, led by Chris Harper (Thanks, Mike S!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard: ED 306.46 Social Studies Program (HighSchool) (overall layperson’s description – perhaps hover-help)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Element 1: Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ comprehensive curriculum…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ description of ….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other (Comment_______)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adequate: Y/N |
| --- | --- |
| Y/N determined automatically based upon answers below |

| Critical Element 2: Evidence |
| ___ comprehensive curriculum… |
| ___ description of …. |
| ___ xxx |
| ___ Other (Comment_______) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

...