

STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE Accountability and Autonomy Work Group June 24, 2014 Meeting Notes

Present: Bob Lokken, Chair; Representative Donna Pence; Anne Ritter, Valerie Aker and George Harad

Not Present: Representative Reed DeMordaunt; Superintendent Gaylen Smyer

Also Present: Marilyn Whitney, State Board of Education

Chairman, Bob Lokken led a discussion on guiding principles and potential recommendations for the annual planning process, based on his draft memorandum (attached).

Idaho is unlikely to reach the State Board of Education's 60percent goal¹ without continuous improvement as an operating principle.

The process of continuous improvement provides the best opportunity for impact. Accurate and timely data are required. If executed properly at the district level, continuous improvement planning will provide the vehicle to reach the 60percent goal. The planning process needs to be focused on the coming 12 months, and is the forcing function for transparency; it builds awareness, alignment and focus.

Anne Ritter noted that when schools focus on math, reading goes down and vice versa. Mr. Lokken replied that change needs to become standard operating procedure, a rhythm, in order to avoid the Hawthorne Effect.² Ms. Ritter suggested that the recommendation should be more specific to suggest possible changes in behavior, such as the form of instruction, instructional hours, team teaching, etc. Mr. Lokken will update his document accordingly. Ms. Ritter also voiced concern about the timeliness of data since the new law begins on July 1. Mr. Lokken replied that the role of the committee is to identify what needs to be fixed, not how to fix it. The system of data needs to be produced on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) test. Mr. Lokken suggested that the group speak with the testing coordinator at the State Department of Education about timing. The

¹ 60percent of Idahoans between ages 24-35 to have attained at least two years postsecondary education by year 2020.

² The **Hawthorne effect** (also referred to as the **observer effect**) refers to a [phenomenon](#) whereby workers improve or modify an aspect of their behavior in response to the fact of change in their environment, ^{[1][2]} rather than in response to the nature of the change itself. The "Hawthorne effect" study suggested that the novelty of having research conducted and the increased attention from such could lead to temporary increases in productivity.

timeline that this group recommends ultimately must align with data collection and reporting.

Mr. Lokken discussed the attributes of proper execution of the annual planning process. By providing data in cohort groups, districts can gain clarity and alignment about what matters most. The State Board would provide the “big picture” framework for annual planning, which fulfills its fiduciary responsibility and constitutional mandate. However, the actual plan, focus areas, and goals would be completely at the discretion of the local school boards and leadership. Local ownership is very important. Accountability for achieving “good to great” needs to occur locally and cannot happen if districts do not understand how measurement occurs and how they are doing. Achievement against these locally defined improvement goals should become the core basis of local leadership evaluation.

Draft Recommendations:

1. Draft changes we would like to see to the existing strategic planning laws, to shift and refine the laws towards continuous improvement.
2. Recommend professional development and collaborative training and support for local boards/districts to develop awareness of and competencies in continuous improvement practices.
3. Provide detailed illustrative examples to the SBE on the framework, timing, and supporting data that should be supplied to local districts, such that we clarify our recommendations and specific intent, and hopefully minimize the natural confusion that arises from the ambiguity of the English language.

The group next discussed Idaho Schools Annual Planning for Continuous Improvement (Discussion) June 2014 (attached).

In building cohort clusters, it is important that the presentation be oriented to collaboration and is not punitive. In Massachusetts, parents became more involved because it was seen as improvement.

Alternative high schools who serve at-risk students likely should not be included in the regular cohort group clusters because they would skew the numbers. Consider developing a system that accurately reflects their performance and accountability measures.

A SAT 500 score is relevant for professional technical students because machinery has become more automated. Instead of 30 forklifts in a warehouse with 30 operators, one man might mechanically control all 30. Marilyn Whitney notes that many universities have changed their admission standards because 3/4 of students were coming to college in need

of remediation in math. An ISAT score below 500 usually indicates the need for remediation.

Bob Lokken noted that the State Board of Education adopted the 60 percent goal 4 years ago, but the message has been muddled. It needs clarity and focus on what matters most. Kids have the potential to do better when challenged.

Marilyn Whitney suggested that Greg Alexander from the SDE be invited to discuss the 5-Star Rating system and the group's vision.

Bob Lokken suggested a review of the Administrative Rules governing education to determine (1) whether they help schools achieve the 60 percent goal; (2) whether a good reason exists to keep the rule; (3) if a school was not following the rule but achieved 60 percent-plus, would we care, and (4) whether the rule would be better as a locally decided issue.

Marilyn Whitney produced a copy of the Administrative Rules governing education and identified several sections that might be outdated. Many rules are the structure of education, powers and duties of boards, for example; some are in response to judicial decisions or federal requirements. Ms. Whitney stated that the federal reporting requirement requires an onerous amount of data. George Harad asked if we had to report to the federal government, and whether a simpler way might exist. Ms. Whitney replied that federal grant money drives much of the reporting.

Next steps:

Develop a draft recommendation in accountability with core principles, definition of terms, guiding principles and specific recommendations for action in terms the areas of intervention, the 5-star system, and annual planning.

Develop specific recommendations on autonomy, including a list of what can be reconsidered and simplified.

Next Meeting:

Finish today's topics. Discuss autonomy. Final report is due end of August. August meeting will be August 15.

Bob Lokken noted that the annual superintendent meeting is August 7. He is not available and asked someone from the group to present its findings. Either Representative DeMordaunt or Representative Pence will present. Bob Lokken would also like to talk with the other subcommittee chairs.

Memo

Date: June 24, 2014

To: Autonomy and Accountability Work Group

From: Bob Lokken

Re: Preliminary Thoughts on Planning Recommendations

See below a starting point for our discussion about guiding principles and potential recommendations for the annual planning process.

Guiding Principles for Annual Planning

1. The foundation and focus of the annual planning process should be continuous improvement. The state's 60% goal is unattainable without continuous improvement.
2. The value of annual planning is not in the plan itself, but in the process of developing the plan: the transparency of performance and clarity of data, the alignment of key stakeholders that results from reviewing current performance, relative to best practices, to gain a true situational understanding, and lastly and most importantly, the forcing function of the tradeoffs and decisions required to focus on a critical few priorities for improvements needed in the coming year. Subsequently, the actual plan should be very brief, likely 1-3 pages. This is because the plan is not the result of surveying the entire continuum, which happens in the early stages of planning. The plan is the result of deciding on critical focus areas for the coming year. Without this annual improvement effort, it is highly unlikely the district will achieve the 60% goal.
3. The attributes of proper execution of the annual planning process should be:
 - a. Data transparency and clarity about the measurements that matter most. The process should be framed by the improvement of one or more of a defined set of metrics. This forces leadership at all levels to i) gain clarity and alignment across the state on what is most important for our schools, ii) understand how each school is performing against these focus areas, and iii) set clear targets for improvement for each local school.
 - b. Local ownership – state alignment. The annual planning process should be executed within a framework that is provided by the State Board. This allows the state to fulfill its fiduciary responsibility and constitutional mandate. However, the actual plan, focus areas, and goals are completely at the discretion of the local school boards and leadership. Each local district and school is free to select and adjust their local initiatives and goals to best fit local circumstances.
 - c. Clear alignment and focus between the state, the local school board, and the local administration, each year, on achieving the 60% goal.
 - d. Accountability to performance and improvement progress to the local community. By providing clear and consistent measurement, along with the autonomy to adjust to local circumstances, the annual planning process should provide the transparency needed to govern local schools. Achievement against these locally defined improvement goals should become the core basis of local leadership evaluations.

1st Draft Recommendations / Next Steps

1. Draft changes we would like to see to the existing strategic planning laws, to shift and refine the laws towards continuous improvement.
2. Recommend professional development and collaborative training and support for local boards/districts to develop awareness of and competencies in continuous improvement practices.
3. Provide detailed illustrative examples to the SBE on the framework, timing, and supporting data that should be supplied to local districts, such that we clarify our recommendations and specific intent, and hopefully minimize the natural confusion that arises from the ambiguity of the English language.

Idaho Schools
Annual Planning for
Continuous Improvement

- Discussion -

June 2014

Idaho Grade and Subject Area Tests

Idaho Education Metrics											Post					
test / grade	Pre-K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Secondary	Level of Test
IRI		✓														School
IEIA																
NAEP																State only
SBAC																
Reading					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			School
Math					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			School
Language Usage					✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓			School
Science							✓		✓			✓				School
PSAT																
Critical Reading												✓?				School/Dist
Math												✓?				School/Dist
Writing												✓?				School/Dist
SAT													✓			School/Dist
Critical Reading													✓			School/Dist
Math													✓			School/Dist
Writing													✓			School/Dist
ACCUPLACER														✓		School/Dist
Cleaning House																?
Go on rate														✓		School/Dist
Drop out rate														✓		School/Dist
Post secondary completion														✓		School/Dist
Star Rating System																School
Advanced Placement Courses/Tests														✓		School/Dist

Idaho High School Performance Grading

- Each High School gets 2 grades for each given year.
 1. Career & College Readiness Performance (0% ... 100%)
 2. Career & College Readiness Improvement (+/- %)
- Define: Career & College Readiness Performance
 - The % of students from that school that complete HS and are career & college ready – as defined as:
 - a) graduated HS
 - b) scored ≥ 500 on all 3 sections of the SAT (SBE update as testing and metrics change)
 - c) completed and passed at least one advanced placement course
 - Why
 - Aligns with the State's 60% goal
 - Simple and meaningful – for the student, the school, and the community
 - Granular enough to measure year-year progress
 - Takes into account – dropout rate, proficiency visa vi the 60% goal,
- Define: Career & College Readiness Improvement
 - The year / year change in performance of the CCR Performance for the school
 - E.g. 2014 Improvement = $\frac{(2014 \text{ CCR Performance}) - (2013 \text{ CCR Performance})}{(2013 \text{ CCR Performance})}$
 - Why
 - Clear and simple
 - Measures the schools progress towards the goal

Idaho Grade School Performance Grading

- (same as High School... only measure of CCR changes to 8th Grade Proficiency)
- Each Grade School gets 2 grades for each given year.
 1. 8th Grade Proficiency Performance (0% ... 100%)
 2. 8th Grade Proficiency Improvement (+/- %)
- Define: 8th Grade Proficiency Performance
 - The % of students from that school that complete 8th grade and are proficient or better – meaning they are on track to graduate high school on time and career & college ready –
 - a) Completed 8th grade
 - b) Scored proficient or better on all subject areas sections of the SBAC (SBE update as testing and metrics change)
 - c) Have complete a Career and College Readiness Program (details TBD)
 - Why
 - Aligns with the State's 60% goal
 - Simple and meaningful – for the student, the school, and the community
 - Granular enough to measure year-Year progress
 - Can be adjusted to K-6 schools, middle schools, jr. high schools, etc.
- Define: 8th Grade Proficiency Improvement
 - The year / year change in performance of the 8th Grade Proficiency Performance for the school
 - E.g. 2014 Improvement = $\frac{(2014\ 8^{th}\ Grade\ Performance) - (2013\ 8^{th}\ Grade\ Performance)}{(2013\ 8^{th}\ Grade\ Performance)}$
 - Why
 - Clear and simple
 - Measures the schools progress towards the goal

2013 High School Performance – Raw Scores

HIGH SCHOOLS TESTING MORE THAN 50 STUDENTS

SAY 2013		Career/College Rediness		Career/College Rediness			
Rank	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	Performance	Rank	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	Performance
1	RENAISSANCE	MERIDIAN	63%	36	COLUMBIA	NAMPA	24%
2	BOISE	BOISE	60%	37	MERIDIAN	MERIDIAN	24%
3	MOSCOW	MOSCOW	52%	38	SHELLEY	SHELLEY	24%
4	TIMBERLINE	BOISE	49%	39	VALLIVUE	VALLIVUE	24%
5	SANDPOINT	LAKE PEND O'REILLE	48%	40	NEW PLYMOUTH	NEW PLYMOUTH	23%
6	MCCALL	MCCALL	45%	41	BLACKFOOT	BLACKFOOT	22%
7	MADISON	MADISON	42%	42	EMMETT	EMMETT	22%
8	HILLCREST	BONNEVILLE	41%	43	MIDDLETON	MIDDLETON	22%
9	EAGLE	MERIDIAN	40%	44	MOUNTAIN HOME	MOUNTAIN HOME	22%
10	TWIN FALLS	TWIN FALLS	38%	45	PARMA	PARMA	22%
11	CENTENNIAL	MERIDIAN	37%	46	FIRTH	FIRTH	21%
12	CENTURY	POCATELLO	37%	47	JEROME	JEROME	21%
13	IDAHO FALLS	IDAHO FALLS	37%	48	MELBA	MELBA	21%
14	ROCKY MOUNTAIN	MERIDIAN	37%	49	OROFINO	OROFINO	21%
15	TIMBERLAKE	LAKELAND	35%	50	IDAHO VIRTUAL	IDAHO VIRTUAL	20%
16	CAPITAL	BOISE	34%	51	MARSH VALLEY	MARSH VALLEY	20%
17	SKYLINE	IDAHO FALLS	34%	52	POCATELLO	POCATELLO	20%
18	COEUR D'ALENE	COEUR D'ALENE	33%	53	BUHL	BUHL	19%
19	LAKE CITY	COEUR D'ALENE	33%	54	FILER	FILER	19%
20	MOUNTAIN VIEW	MERIDIAN	33%	55	SNAKE RIVER	SNAKE RIVER	19%
21	KIMBERLY	KIMBERLY	32%	56	BONNERS FERRY	BOUNDARY CTY	18%
22	IDAHO	STATE	31%	57	RIRIE	RIRIE	18%
23	BONNEVILLE	BONNEVILLE	30%	58	BURLEY	CASSIA CTY	17%
24	HIGHLAND	POCATELLO	30%	59	DECLO	CASSIA COUNTY	17%
25	FRUITLAND	FRUITLAND	29%	60	HOMEDALE	HOMEDALE	16%
26	GRANGEVILLE	GRANGEVILLE	28%	61	PRESTON	PRESTON	16%
27	LEWISTON	LEWISTON	28%	62	GOODING	GOODING	15%
28	BORAH	BOISE	27%	63	CALDWELL	CALDWELL	14%
29	MALAD	ONEIDA CTY	26%	64	NAMPA	NAMPA	14%
30	LAKELAND	LAKELAND	25%	65	SOUTH FREMONT	SOUTH FREMONT	14%
31	RIGBY	JEFFERSON COUNTY	25%	66	MARSING	MARSING	13%
32	SALMON	SALMON	25%	67	TETON	TETON	13%
33	SKYVIEW	NAMPA	25%	68	AMERICAN FALLS	AMERICAN FALLS	12%
34	SODA SPRINGS	SODA SPRINGS	25%	69	MINICO	MINIDOKA COUNTY	11%
35	ST MARIES	ST MARIES	25%	70	ABERDEEN	ABERDEEN	8%

- Not the actual scores... these are % of students that TOOK the SAT... not the total count of kids that graduated or dropped out. Actual scores would be slightly lower.

- Need 2014 scores to calculate improvement scores

2013 High School Performance – 60% Goal Based Scores

HIGH SCHOOLS TESTING MORE THAN 50 STUDENTS

SAT 2013

SAT 2013				SAT 2013			
Rank	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	Career/College Rediness Performance	Rank	SCHOOL	DISTRICT	Career/College Rediness Performance
1	RENAISSANCE	MERIDIAN	105%	36	COLUMBIA	NAMPA	40%
2	BOISE	BOISE	100%	37	MERIDIAN	MERIDIAN	40%
3	MOSCOW	MOSCOW	87%	38	SHELLEY	SHELLEY	40%
4	TIMBERLINE	BOISE	82%	39	VALLIVUE	VALLIVUE	40%
5	SANDPOINT	LAKE PEND O'REILLE	80%	40	NEW PLYMOUTH	NEW PLYMOUTH	38%
6	MCCALL	MCCALL	75%	41	BLACKFOOT	BLACKFOOT	37%
7	MADISON	MADISON	70%	42	EMMETT	EMMETT	37%
8	HILLCREST	BONNEVILLE	68%	43	MIDDLETON	MIDDLETON	37%
9	EAGLE	MERIDIAN	67%	44	MOUNTAIN HOME	MOUNTAIN HOME	37%
10	TWIN FALLS	TWIN FALLS	63%	45	PARMA	PARMA	37%
11	CENTENNIAL	MERIDIAN	62%	46	FIRTH	FIRTH	35%
12	CENTURY	POCATELLO	62%	47	JEROME	JEROME	35%
13	IDAHO FALLS	IDAHO FALLS	62%	48	MELBA	MELBA	35%
14	ROCKY MOUNTAIN	MERIDIAN	62%	49	OROFINO	OROFINO	35%
15	TIMBERLAKE	LAKELAND	58%	50	IDAHO VIRTUAL	IDAHO VIRTUAL	33%
16	CAPITAL	BOISE	57%	51	MARSH VALLEY	MARSH VALLEY	33%
17	SKYLINE	IDAHO FALLS	57%	52	POCATELLO	POCATELLO	33%
18	COEUR D'ALENE	COEUR D'ALENE	55%	53	BUHL	BUHL	32%
19	LAKE CITY	COEUR D'ALENE	55%	54	FILER	FILER	32%
20	MOUNTAIN VIEW	MERIDIAN	55%	55	SNAKE RIVER	SNAKE RIVER	32%
21	KIMBERLY	KIMBERLY	53%	56	BONNERS FERRY	BOUNDARY CTY	30%
22	IDAHO	STATE	52%	57	RIRIE	RIRIE	30%
23	BONNEVILLE	BONNEVILLE	50%	58	BURLEY	CASSIA CTY	28%
24	HIGHLAND	POCATELLO	50%	59	DECLO	CASSIA COUNTY	28%
25	FRUITLAND	FRUITLAND	48%	60	HOMEDALE	HOMEDALE	27%
26	GRANGEVILLE	GRANGEVILLE	47%	61	PRESTON	PRESTON	27%
27	LEWISTON	LEWISTON	47%	62	GOODING	GOODING	25%
28	BORAH	BOISE	45%	63	CALDWELL	CALDWELL	23%
29	MALAD	ONEIDA CTY	43%	64	NAMPA	NAMPA	23%
30	LAKELAND	LAKELAND	42%	65	SOUTH FREMONT	SOUTH FREMONT	23%
31	RIGBY	JEFFERSON COUNTY	42%	66	MARSING	MARSING	22%
32	SALMON	SALMON	42%	67	TETON	TETON	22%
33	SKYVIEW	NAMPA	42%	68	AMERICAN FALLS	AMERICAN FALLS	20%
34	SODA SPRINGS	SODA SPRINGS	42%	69	MINICO	MINIDOKA COUNTY	18%
35	ST MARIES	ST MARIES	42%	70	ABERDEEN	ABERDEEN	13%

- Not the actual scores... these are % of students that TOOK the SAT... not the total count of kids that graduated or dropped out. Actual scores would be slightly lower.

- Need 2014 scores to calculate improvement scores

Annual Planning Process / Support

- Start of Year Process
 - Provide the prior years performance scores per school
 - Provide the schools grade and subject area scores for each grade
 - (% at or above track to hit career and college ready)
 - Cluster like-kind schools together, and publish to each school...
 - What is the best-in-class school for that grade & subject area
 - Which are the school district(s) that are performing at that level
 - What is the state benchmark expectation for that score
- Planning Deliverable
 - Local schools use the above information, plus local dynamics to pick a small subset of numbers that it would like to improve .. and by how much.
 - Targets and improvement goals (the annual plan) submitted to the SBE
 - Plan is published and publicized
- End of Year Process
 - State provides the prior years performance and grade/subject area scores.
 - Report issued that indicates schools new performance levels, and success against prior years commitment for improvement
 - Results are published and publicized
 - Rewards and celebrations

