

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014

SUBJECT

Recommendations from 2014 Education Improvement Committees

REFERENCE

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| February 2014 | Board established two committees to develop plans to implement the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force for Improving Education. |
| June 2014 | Board approved a legislative idea for the career ladder compensation model and a placeholder for legislative ideas related to implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force for Improving Education. |
| August 2014 | Board approved a proposed tiered licensure rule and a proposed rule to ensure learning plans developed at grade eight (8) are reviewed annually throughout a student's high school career. |

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Structure and Governance Committee broke into three subcommittees: High Expectations, Autonomy and Accountability, and Innovation and Collaboration. Over the past nine (9) months, the subcommittees have met to develop the recommendations in Attachment 1.

The following recommendations of the Structure and Governance Committee will require development of legislation, which the Board will review at the October 16, 2014, meeting:

1. Consolidation and Simplification of Advanced Opportunities. The relevant sections of Idaho Code pertaining to advanced opportunities would be consolidated into a single chapter to provide better clarity to districts, institutions and school boards. It would incorporate the following changes to current advanced opportunities programs:
 - Eliminate the 10% participation cap on the 8 in 6 program.
 - Remove restriction to online courses in the 8 in 6 program to allow for courses taken in traditional schools
 - Remove the requirement that students pay 25% of fees in the Fast Forward (\$200/\$400) program in order to eliminate barriers to those who need it most and to simplify reimbursement to districts.

2. Revision of School Report Card Statute. Legislation would implement the recommendation that each school in the state be scored on two metrics: Readiness and Improvement. Readiness is the percentage of graduating students that are prepared to continue to the next level. Improvement is the year over year improvement in the level of readiness produce by that school.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014

3. Revision of Strategic Planning Statute. Legislation would update the State's strategic planning law to clarify and reinforce the focus on continuous annual improvement.
4. Technology Pilot Program Grants. The section of code establishing the program would be repealed.

Recommendation #7 calls for a subcommittee comprised of large and small districts, charter and traditional schools, online schools, State Department of Education staff, and the IDLA to research and discuss school funding including minimum attendance requirements and funding for professional support staff. This committee would report its finding to the Board no later than February 2015. Recommendation #14 will require the Innovation and Collaboration subcommittee to meet once the Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE) reports on its study of the P20 statewide longitudinal data system and SchoolNet in January 2015.

IMPACT

Adoption of the recommendations will allow Board and Department staff to begin work on implementation plans as applicable and communicate the Board's support for the recommendations that do not require direct Board action.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1 – Summary or Recommendations from Structure and Governance Committee Page 5
- Attachment 2 – Report from Autonomy and Accountability Subcommittee Page 8
- Attachment 3 – Report from High Expectations Subcommittee Page 18
- Attachment 4 – Report from Innovation and Collaboration Subcommittee Page 25

STAFF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Several of the recommendations for implementation from the Structure and Governance Committee will require Board staff to create action plans and consider the sequence of activities necessary for implementation. These plans will be presented to the Board as they are developed.

The Board will consider the Career Ladder compensation model at its meeting on October 16th when legislation is reviewed. The draft legislation will be based on the recommendations of the Career Ladder/Tiered Licensure Committee.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014

BOARD ACTION

I move to adopt the recommendations related to Structure and Governance as outlined in Attachment 1 and to direct Board and Department staff to develop implementation plans for each recommendation and bring them back for Board approval.

Moved by _____ Seconded by _____ Carried Yes _____ No _____

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

**Structure and Governance Committee
Recommendations for Implementation**

Submitted October 3, 2014

The Structure and Governance Committee met regularly since April 7, 2014, with the full Structure and Governance Committee meeting three times for reports and committee questions and feedback on subcommittee progress.

Recommendations:

1. We recommend that Idaho implement a pilot program that provides funding to encourage districts and schools to create their own mastery-based models, tailored to local conditions and opportunities. We recommend that Idaho provide funding for professional development programs to assist districts/schools in implementing mastery-based models.
2. We recommend that Idaho educate districts regarding Idaho law/rule. Idaho law does not prevent districts from advancing students based on mastery or competency.
3. We recommend that the State Department of Education prioritize federal or other grants to support districts who are implementing mastery programs with preference where appropriate given to rural districts
4. We recommend that the relevant sections of Idaho Code pertaining to advanced opportunities be consolidated into a single chapter to provide better clarity to districts, institutions and school boards. We recommend that the following changes be made to current advanced opportunities programs:
 - a) Eliminate the 10% participation cap on the 8 in 6 program.
 - b) Remove restriction to online courses in the 8 in 6 program to allow for courses taken in traditional schools
 - c) Remove the requirement that students pay 25% of fees in the Fast Forward (\$200/\$400) program in order to eliminate barriers to those who need it most and to simplify reimbursement to districts.
 - d) We recommend follow-on work in 2-3 years to simplify and consolidate the Advanced Opportunities programs after review of Fast Forward data.
 - e) We support working with legislators to create scholarships to provide assistance to students who earn college credit in high school.
5. We recommend that Idaho Code Section 33-118, 100.04b be revised to require annual review of a student's 8th Grade Plan in grades 9-12.
6. The committee believes that career counseling is key to reaching Idaho's 60% goal. We recommend that a position be created at the State Department of Education to prioritize career counseling in all districts. We recommend the legislature appropriate

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014

Attachment 1

funds specifically for districts to implement college and career counseling using a model that best fits their needs.

7. We recommend that the state continue with Average Daily Attendance funding; however, we recognize that the current formula needs to be updated in a number of areas.
 - a) We recommend that the current attendance minimum requirements of 2.5 hours for a half day, and 4.0 hours for a full day of attendance be removed and a per credit model developed in its place.
 - b) We recommend that the current restriction on funding more than one FTE be removed and state funding provided in certain situations.
We recommend that a subcommittee be formed comprised of large and small districts, charter and traditional schools, online schools, SDE staff, and the IDLA to explore these areas further and report back.
8. We recommend that the state revise and refine the 5-Star Rating System to facilitate accurate and fair measurement and ranking of schools and districts that require intervention and assistance.
9. We recommend each school in the state be scored on two metrics: Readiness and Improvement. Readiness is the percentage of graduating students that are prepared to continue to the next level. Improvement is the year over year improvement in the level of readiness produce by that school.
10. We recommend a regular review and pruning of bureaucratic elements of Idaho's K-12 system that require overhead and add little value to student achievement, and that restrict freedom to innovate, drive change, and improvement. These include simplifying/streamlining reporting requirements, review of statues and rules.
11. We recommend that the public schools implement an Annual Planning Cycle and Continuous Process Improvement Plans that Lead to Achievement Scores that Align to the 60 percent Goal. We recommend updating the State's strategic planning law to clarify the focus on continuous annual improvement.
12. We recommend the state offer professional development and collaborative training and support for local boards/leadership to develop awareness of and competencies in continuous improvement practices.
13. We recommend that the State Board of Education's Data Management Council (DMC) oversee the entire longitudinal data system in Idaho. We recommend that the Director of Research in the Office of the State Board of Education Chair the DMC, and report annually to the State Board and the Legislature on the state of the project, accuracy of data and future needs/plans.
14. The Legislature's Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE) is conducting an extensive study of the statewide longitudinal data system, the Idaho System for

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014

Educational Excellence (ISEE) and SchoolNet, the state sponsored Instructional Improvement System (IIS). The Innovation and Collaboration Group recommends that it wait for the OPE report, due January 2015, before making further recommendations.

15. We recommend that the State expedite its plans to provide broadband access and wireless infrastructure to all Idaho schools.
16. We recommend that the technology grant pilot program to schools be discontinued and that funding be made available to all districts for technology needs. Students must have access to appropriate devices to support learning.
17. We support the efforts of the Tiered Licensure / Career Ladder Committee to change how information technology personnel are funded in order to allow districts the ability to pay those professionals commensurate with market rates.
18. Keyboarding skills are becoming increasingly important in early elementary school years. We recommend that keyboards for tablets be made available for student use.
19. We recommend that the school year be increased by 3 days (24 hours) to allow for additional paid time for job-embedded professional development and collaboration. This time should be construed separately from professional development training relating to Idaho Core Standards.
20. We recommend that job-embedded professional development and collaboration be scheduled weekly based on school schedules and student needs.
21. We recommend that collaboration skills training be provided to all participating staff.
22. We support the Governor's Task Force recommendation calling for further development and implementation of the Idaho Standards for Effective Principals, which includes ongoing implementation and support for administrator training in the Danielson Framework for Teaching model through TeachScape proficiency exams.
23. The 2014 Legislature passed HB521 which allows school boards to apply for reimbursement of training programs. Each school board will be responsible for developing an annual strategic plan. We support the recommendations of the Autonomy and Accountability Group which is refining the current legislation to reinforce the focus on continuous improvement.

**Accountability and Autonomy Subcommittee
Report and Recommendations**

Members:

Bob Lokken, Chair, CEO, White Cloud Analytics and Idaho Business for Education
Reed DeMordaunt, House of Representatives, District 14; House Education Chair
Donna Pence, House of Representatives, District 26, House Education Committee
Gaylen Smyer, Superintendent, Cassia School District
Anne Ritter, Idaho School Boards Association
George Harad, Idaho Parents and Teachers Together
Valerie Aker, Teacher, South Middle School, Nampa

Subcommittee Charge: to further refine the following recommendations of the Governor's Task Force:

#5 Revamp the State's Accountability Structure Involving Schools

#6 Empower Autonomy by Removing Constraints

#7 Annual Strategic Planning, Assessment and Continuous Focus on Improvement

Subcommittee Deliverables:

- **Recommendations on the state's accountability measures and structure for public schools and timelines for implementation.**
- **Recommendations on changes to Idaho's education code to empower autonomy at the local level and timelines for completion.**
- **Recommendations on establishing continuous improvement methods in the public schools and timelines for implementation.**
- **Recommendations on training for school administrators and school boards.**

#5 Revamp the State's Accountability Structure Involving Schools

#7 Annual Strategic Planning, Assessment and Continuous Focus on Improvement

The 2013 Task Force recommended the state revamp the accountability structure involving schools and replaced the current compliance mandates with a system that is based on accountability for student outcomes. Central to the structure would be an annual continuous improvement cycle and strategic plan founded on improvements in student outcomes and key focus areas for the district.

Objectives and Components:

The objective of the accountability system and district annual planning should be to support the State's goal to have 60% or more of its students prepared for career or college.

To achieve this goal, the accountability and annual planning system must have two major components:

1. The first component is designed to provide state intervention and assistance for schools needing to improve.
2. The second component is designed to create dynamics that will propel good schools to become great schools, and great schools to continually advance.
The design of the second component differs from the first, in that it is founded on continuous improvement and relies on local control and transparency to establish accountability to the local community.

Accountability Recommendations:

1. **We recommend that the state's 5-Star Rating System¹ be revised and refined to facilitate accurate and fair measurement and ranking of schools and districts that require intervention and assistance.**
 - a. This system allows schools and districts to be sorted into multiple categories. The State should not impose an arbitrary bell-curve that forces schools into a classification. The classification should reflect the actual performance of a school. Schools identified as needing improvement should continue to receive the necessary assistance from the State Department of Education in the form of expert assistance and resources. Schools that refuse additional assistance or do not "turn around" within a period of time would trigger more forceful intervention on the part of the State.
 - b. Revisions to the existing 5-star system should include adjusting the balance between student growth, school achievement, and other relevant measures. The work team already in place to review the 5-star system should receive and consider this feedback.
 - c. The State's intervention and assistance program for schools should:
 - 1) Initially focus on resource and technical support and encouragement. Only if the school in question does not improve and/or the district refuses outside assistance or demonstrates repeatedly that local leadership is unable to turn the school around, should the State intervention become more forceful.

¹ <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/assessment/starRating.htm>

- 2) If necessary, the ultimate intervention should include replacing local leadership (principal/superintendent) that has demonstrated, for whatever reason, that they are unable to turn around a school. Without this level of intervention, the state would be failing its constitutional and fiduciary responsibility, and the cost of this failure would be born directly by the students in that school and indirectly by the community and state when those students are not prepared for career and/or college. (For further notes on the issue of to whom the local superintendent is accountable, see Final Notes, p. 11.)
 - d. If federal regulations allow, alternative schools should be removed from this part of the accountability system. An alternative ranking system should be explored that is clear, and more specifically tailored to alternative schools.
- 2. We recommend that the State implement an Annual Planning Cycle and Continuous Process Improvement Plans that Lead to Achievement Scores Aligned to the 60% Goal.**

“Turn every good school into a great school”

- a. Update the State’s strategic planning law² to focus on continuous annual improvement. The current legislation requires each district to have an "annual strategic plan," which has been interpreted in the context of classic organizational strategic planning that is rooted in mission and vision statements and a 3-5 year planning horizon, while the original intent of the Governor's Taskforce was that each school and district have an annual improvement plan with clear, measurable goals. These plans were to be the foundation of local control and accountability to the local community and an alignment mechanism to the State’s overall strategic goal of 60%. Amending or replacing the existing legislation is necessary to reflect the original intent.
- b. Each school district, led by its board and superintendent, should be required to prepare annually a performance improvement plan, setting clear, measureable goals to improve achievement in the coming school year.

The plan would identify a focused set of targets for improvement, selected from a collection of relevant measures provided by the State Board of Education including the Career and College Readiness or High School Readiness score for the school/district (for more on "CCR Score" and "HSR Score" -- see below), and the focus areas and measurable improvement targets selected for improvement. The intent is that all plans lead toward the achievement of the career and college readiness goal for the state. The goals for each school and district should be summarized into a simple one-to-three page plan headlined by the CCR Score (or HSR Score) and the targeted CCR Score (or HSR Score). The district's current CCR and HSR Scores, the annual improvement plan, the goals for improvement

² <http://legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title33/T33CH3SECT33-320.htm> and http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/communications_center/publication/IDAPA%20080201801.pdf

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014**

Attachment 2

and the results against the prior year's goals should then be published and widely shared within the district and the community as well as submitted to the State Board of Education by August 1st of each year.

- c. Each school in the state should be scored on two metrics: Readiness and Improvement.
- 1) Readiness is the % of graduating students that are prepared to continue to the next level.
 - a) The Career and College Readiness Score (CCR Score) should be measured as the percentage of students leaving a particular high school who are deemed academically ready to move to the next level. For high schools, this would be a measure of how many high school students from that school are ready for career or college work, directly in alignment with the state's 60% goal.
 - b) If the school is an elementary, middle school, junior high, etc. that does not continue through 12th grade, then the measure would be the percentage of students completing the highest grade within that school who are academically testing at or above the level that is deemed to prepare that student for success at the next level. For a school that sequentially precedes high school, this (for example) would be called the High School Readiness Score (HSR Score) and would measure proficiency rates of the highest grade (8th or 9th) as measured by an appropriate statewide assessment. If an elementary school's highest grade is 6th grade, their score would be a 7th Grade Readiness Score... etc.

 - 2) Improvement is the year over year improvement in the level of readiness produce by that school. The Career and College Readiness Improvement (CCR Improvement) or High School Readiness Improvement (HSR Improvement) should be measured as a percentage change in the CCR Score or HSR Score measured year-over-year. For example, if a school in 2014 had a CCR Score of 56%, and the same school had a CCR Score of 51% for 2013, then the CCR Improvement for that school in 2014 would be +9.8% ((56%/51%) – 100%).

| Examples | Readiness Score | Improvement Score |
|-------------|---|--|
| High School | Career and College Readiness Score (CCR) (e.g. % students >= 500 on all SAT Sections) | CCR Improvement (e.g. 2014 CCR / 2013 CCR) |
| K-8 School | High School Readiness Score (HSR) (e.g. % students proficient or above on 8 th grade SBAC) | HSR Improvement |

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014**

Attachment 2

| K-6 School | 7th Grade Readiness Score (7GR) (e.g. % students proficient or above on 6 th grade SBAC) | 7GR Improvement |
|---------------|---|------------------------|
|---------------|---|------------------------|

- 3) The State will provide to each district its official Readiness and Improvement Scores for each school in the district at the end of each academic year.
 - 4) These State reports should include state goals, statewide and cohort comparisons so that local districts have a context to interpret the numbers, which is critical to local accountability.
 - 5) Timeliness of the report must be adjusted to match the planning rhythm of the districts.
- 3. We recommend the state offer professional development and collaborative training and support for local boards/leadership to develop awareness of and competencies in continuous improvement practices.**
- 4. We recommend that the timing of data be reviewed and adjusted to align with budget and annual planning deadlines for both school boards and teachers.**

The timeliness of the State's report information is critical to the districts' annual planning process. Today, data are delivered too late for analysis and planning work while teachers are still on contract.

#6 Empower Autonomy by Removing Constraints

The 2013 Task Force emphasized that autonomy is critical for two reasons. First, autonomy ignites empowerment, engagement, and ownership for results. Second, local circumstances vary greatly and change frequently, thus optimal decisions can only be derived from local knowledge of factors material to the decision.

Far too often, the state has exercised its authority and accountability for our education system via laws and rules that dictate and micro-manage how things are done and how money is spent. Although well intentioned, this level of operational control/mandates work to undermine the level of engagement by local people, and erode the level of efficiency and effectiveness.

This subcommittee discussed areas of K-12 policy that impose a high burden on school districts with a low return of value. Based on input from superintendents across the state and a review of existing laws and administrative rules, the committee recommends the following to improve autonomy for local school districts.

- 1. We recommend that the legislature research and consider the potential impact of proposed new laws on the education system.**

We urge lawmakers to fully research short and long-term financial and personnel implications not just to the state general fund but also to individual schools and districts as well as state education agencies. We further recommend that the legislature conduct a cost/benefit analysis of new laws before adoption to assess effectiveness and determine unintended consequences.

Many times, new legislation imposes requirements on the system that are burdensome and costly and do not lead to efficiency or improved student outcomes. New laws and regulatory requirements should be minimized. Review of new laws could be achieved through sunsets on new legislation.

- 2. We recommend that the legislature limit the number of funding streams to school districts and prescriptive requirements for disbursement whenever possible to allow districts flexibility to use funds as needed based on local needs.**

While it is the Legislature's role to set the K-12 budget, the districts would benefit from having more flexibility in the allocation of funds within the district. With the work to revamp how the state compensates teachers, there should be a need for no more than two funding "buckets" – one for compensation and one for operational expenses. Directives governing the use of operational funds should be kept to a minimum so that local district boards and administrators can best address the needs of their schools year to year.

- 3. We recommend that the State Board of Education include a regular review of new and existing statute and rules to assess relevance and efficacy as part of the duties of the Board's Accountability Oversight Program Manager and that a regular review of laws and rules is included in Board process.**

Reviewing statute and rule to assess relevance and efficacy and to find areas for consolidation and streamlining should not be a one-and-done exercise. The Board should implement a continuous improvement process with respect to education laws and rules. We recommend that the Accountability Oversight committee solicit and review input from K-12 stakeholders, ensuring school and district administrators are involved, who can provide feedback and recommendations on how to reduce or eliminate requirements that inhibit efficiency and focus on students.

- 4. We support the work of the Innovation and Collaboration subcommittee to identify ways that the burden of data reporting to the State Department of Education's ISEE system can be mitigated.**

Much of the feedback from school administrators regarding burdensome regulation and reporting requirements involved the required reporting to the state's ISEE system. There is a disproportionate amount of time being spent on reporting, and smaller districts face a larger burden based on resource availability to support the data entry and reporting.

Definitions of Key Terms

1. "**Achievement**" means academic performance relative to a standard. For example, one measure of achievement could be the percentage of students who score 500 or greater on Standardized Achievement Tests, such as SAT
2. "**Improvement**" measures the change (positive or negative) from year to year in the percentage of students in a particular school or district who met the achievement standard. For example, if 70% of students at a particular high school achieved 500 or greater on the SATs in year one, and 77% achieved or exceeded that level the following year, that would be a 10% year-to-year improvement.
3. "**Relevant Indicators**" includes such factors as the number of Advanced Placement tests taken and passed, the number of students successfully participating in dual credit programs, and similar indicators of advanced academic achievement.
4. "**Growth**" measures the improvement in the performance of an individual student from the beginning to the end of a given school year (or specified number of years), relative to the student's initial status and growth of his or her relevant cohort.
5. "**60%**" or "**60% Goal**" refers to the state's goal to have 60% or more of its citizens entering the workforce with some form of post-secondary diploma or certificate (1, 2, 4, or more) by 2020. The supporting SBE goal is that Idahoans age 25-34 will have achieved the 60% goal. For the purposes of the taskforce work on the K-12 system, we focused on how the K-12 system prepares its students to achieve that goal.

Note: the terms "*improvement*" and "*growth*" should not be used interchangeably. "*Improvement*" is measured at a school or district level, and relates to the change in levels of "*achievement*." "*Growth*" is measured at the individual student level, and may or may not result in aggregate "*improvement*" depending on the starting and ending points for the measurements and the mix of students being measured.

Guiding Principles for the Statewide K-12 Accountability System (K12-AS)

1. The goal of the K12-AS is to help the State achieve its overall goal of >60% of young adults entering the workforce having completed some form of post-secondary (PS) degree/ certification. The role of the K-12 system in this goal is to prepare students for success at the post-secondary level, in alignment with the state's 60% goal (see Key Terms above).
2. The K12-AS must serve two related but different purposes. First, it must have an "intervention" system for under-performing schools designed to move the entire system to acceptable levels of performance. Second, the accountability system should serve as a catalyst for "good schools" to become "great schools." In Idaho, we don't want merely good schools. We want all Idaho schools to be great schools. The two elements of the system have very different methods by which they would accomplish their respective purposes. It would be a mistake to try to serve both purposes via the same mechanisms.
3. Key elements of the "intervention" system:
 - a. The intervention system must have clearly defined measures and triggers used to identify a school that is *underperforming* and therefore in need of intervention.

PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014

Attachment 2

- b. There should be identified levels within the intervention system. These levels should indicate the degree of underperformance and chronic nature of the situation. These clearly defined levels would in turn drive the type and degree of intervention(s) required.
 - c. The intervention system must not simply produce a “judgment”. The system should offer tools and assistance to help struggling schools improve performance.
 - d. The system should apply to a school, not a district, although the district superintendent would be the “point person” in terms of accountability. The state should not undermine local leadership by meddling in local operational matters. It is the superintendent's and local board's responsibility to hold local building leadership and personnel accountable. The local board is accountable to local voters. The superintendent is primarily accountable to the local board, and secondarily accountable, as the district's senior leader, to the State. For further discussion on this matter, see the side notes at the end of this document.
 - e. The State, in cooperation with the local school board, would be the primary agent of enforcement at this level of accountability.
 - f. This part of the accountability system would necessarily require force – we cannot allow struggling systems to fail continually.
4. Key elements of the “Good-to-Great” system:
- a. The goal of this system element is not episodic intervention, but rather continuous improvement, innovation and collaboration. With this in mind, specific annual improvements should be determined and driven locally.
 - b. The good-to-great system should have an annual cadence and rhythm with ongoing small improvements, continually refined and compounded over time. This is how schools become great, and stay great.
 - c. The good-to-great system requires a finer-grain measurement system than the 5 Star System. This measurement should allow for annual progress that can be measured, evaluated, and celebrated. Coarse-grained measures such as the 5-Star System and underperformance triggers are not useful in continuous improvement efforts.
 - d. Unlike the intervention system, the good-to-great system should be owned and driven by the local school boards and administration. The role of the state would be to support these local efforts with clear, concise, uniform, and transparent measures, which would serve as the foundation of the improvement system. (Outcomes would measure improvement, and should not be confused with activities and activity measures.)
 - e. Public transparency and the local school boards would provide accountability in this system.
5. The foundation of the K12-AS is clear, concise, uniform, and transparent measurement of student achievement. Measures that are overly complex or indirect in terms of whether they accurately measure student learning should be avoided. The measures should lead directly to the identification of opportunities for

improvement. People need to understand and have clarity on what is needed; this is eroded with complex or questionable metrics.

6. The focal point of the state's K12-AS must be local leadership, specifically the local Superintendent. The state should not disenfranchise the local community by reaching around the Superintendent. Nor should the state hold the "district" or "school" accountable. Whether used to identify schools where intervention is required or support continuous improvement to make good schools great, the accountability system should focus on leadership.

Guiding Principles for the Annual Planning Process

1. The greatest value of annual planning is not in the plan itself, but in the process of developing the plan: establishing performance measurements, providing clear and transparent data, gaining the alignment of key stakeholders, understanding outcomes in the context of current performance relative to best practices and lastly and most importantly, setting priorities to focus on a critical few areas for annual improvement. The actual plan itself 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 identifying key focus areas for the coming year. Without this annual planning and improvement effort, it is highly unlikely a district will achieve the 60% goal of preparing its students for successful post-secondary education or career pursuits.
2. Key attributes of proper execution of the annual planning process:
 - 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 gain clarity and alignment across the state on what is most important for our schools, to understand how each school is performing against these focus areas, and to set clear targets for improvement for each local school. Each school is unique. The local board and leadership should have the autonomy to set specific targets and focal points for improvement as they see fit, as long as the overall school and district are in alignment with the state's higher goal of the 60% prepared for career and college.
 - 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 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 for performance and improvement progress rest with 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.

Final Notes

1. Under the State Constitution, the state has a clear role in the K-12 system. The constitution designates constitutional offices and grants them authority (the State Super and the State Board) to govern the school system.
2. Local school boards are accountable to the local electorate. There is no line of accountability from a local board to the State, other than areas covered by law, and laws are about compliance not performance.
 - a. So there must be accountability to the state... somewhere. If it is not the Local Board... then the only other option is the local Superintendent.
 - b. In law, today, the State grants a license to a Superintendent... without which the Superintendent cannot practice in this state. If the State has authority to grant a license, it logically follows that the state can withhold that license.
 - c. In law, today, the State has the authority to take over a chronically underperforming school ... this is in the existing statute. Once the state takes over a district, then the Superintendent would be accountable to the State.
3. Just because the superintendent is primarily and normally accountable to the local board, it is in no way inconsistent that they are also, in certain matters, accountable to the State. This idea does not represent a new idea or precedent.

In relation to GROWTH METRICS:

1. Growth metrics that measure the longitudinal growth of students over a school year are somewhat controversial at this point in time. Research shows that unless there are strong and consistent standards across the overall system, growth metrics should not be used for formal accountability at the State level.
2. An argument can be made that growth metrics are best used as a part of teacher feedback and for tactical/operational improvements in the classroom. The State's role in accountability is at the school and district level. And the State's role is oversight for achievement levels, not operational practices. Thus it can be argued that growth is not a measure the state should be using for the district accountability system.
3. The State's goal is clearly stated as the 60% benchmark. Growth, while related, is not directly a measurement of that 60%. Thus introducing this into the State's accountability system brings complexity.
4. For this reasons above, it does not make sense to include growth metrics into the State's accountability system.

**High Expectations Subcommittee
Report and Recommendations**

Members:

Tom Taggart, Chair; Executive Director, Idaho Association of School Business Officials
Steven Thayn, Senator, District #8
Cheryl Charlton, CEO, Idaho Digital Learning Academy
Alan Millar, Administrator, Forrest Bird Charter School, Sandpoint
Jason Hancock, Deputy Chief of Staff, State Department of Education
Cindy Wilson, Teacher, Capital High School, Boise

Subcommittee Charge: to further refine the following recommendations of the Governor's Task Force:

- #1: Shift to a Mastery Based System where students advance based upon content mastery, rather than seat time requirements.**
- #4: Ensure that all students have access to advanced opportunities by expanding offerings.**
- #13: Shift from Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Funding Model to Average Daily Enrollment/ Membership to enhance fiscal stability and remove current barriers to personalized and/or mastery learning.**

Subcommittee Deliverables:

- Implementation strategies and timelines for moving Idaho's education system to a mastery or proficiency based model.
- Recommendations on modifying the public schools funding formula to support student mastery and outcomes and timelines for implementation.

#1 Mastery-based System

The 2013 Task Force recommended the state shift to a system where students advance based upon content mastery, rather than seat time requirements and that mastery be measured against high academic standards. Replacing the current time-based system with a competency-based system would include the following features:

1. Students advance upon mastery
2. Competencies include explicit, measurable, transferable learning objectives that empower students.
3. Assessment is meaningful and a positive learning experience for students.

4. Students receive timely, differentiated support based on their individual learning needs.
5. Learning outcomes emphasize competencies that include application and creation of knowledge, along with the development of important skills and dispositions

The research of this subcommittee on this topic from Maine and other states has indicated that there is no wide scale adoption of a mastery-based model. Rather, states are using pilots programs, professional development and training to create these models. Both Maine and South Carolina have utilized Reinventing Schools Coalition (RISC), a Division of Marzano Research Laboratory, to implement their mastery based systems.³ RISC aligns with Idaho's statewide education standards.

The ideal of the mastery-based classroom is one where students progress at their own rate toward performance goals. Students use their own data to set their own goals, and once they master a skill or lesson, they move on to the next level. This changes the classroom model, and teachers typically work with smaller groups or individual students to provide targeted interventions or enriched tasks/projects, etc. A mastery-based classroom typically delivers less large group lecturing and may include an electronic element to more closely monitor student progress. Students are more involved in setting their own learning targets and monitoring progress towards them. This model has been shown to be effective in increasing student achievement.

Recommendations:

The committee recommends a two-pronged approach to implementing a mastery based education model. The first approach applies to grades K-6. A separate approach applies to grades 7-12 and is based on the Advanced Opportunities Programs (Recommendation #4) and is discussed more fully in that section.

1. **We recommend that Idaho create an “incubator” model designed to identify and support those districts\charters that are willing and ready to start moving toward a competency based education system in grades K-6.**
 - a. That assessment would be used to create the initial cohort of districts/charters, and should include a demographically representative group of districts/charters. That cohort would be provided support for staff professional development; stakeholder education; and ongoing assessment and coaching.
 - b. These “Incubator” districts\charters would collect relevant data to allow for meaningful analysis of the process. This data would be used to identify future improvements and modifications.

³ <http://www.reinventingschools.org/>

2. **We recommend that the State Board adopt the competency based education model developed by the RISC.**

RISC provides a research-based, data-driven model that has proven successful across the country, including in Maine and South Carolina. We view the statewide adoption of the Danielson evaluation system as a good example of how this can work.⁴

3. **We recommend that the State Board, State Superintendent, Legislature, and Governor support a statewide awareness effort concerning “Competency Based Education.”**

This could be accomplished in partnership with RISC, if recommendation #2 is adopted. There is a clear need for better understanding of competency based education by legislators, business leaders, education administrators, teachers, parents, and students. If this is done correctly, the demand for becoming an “incubator” would start to increase.

4. **We recommend that a follow-up committee comprised of superintendents, principals, teachers, and members of this committee meet in Fall 2014 to further explore specific RISC’s options; identify roadblocks and possible solutions; develop recommendations for the incubator process; and discuss the data that should be captured throughout the process.**
5. **We recommend that the State Department of Education prioritize federal or other grants to support districts who are implementing mastery programs.**
6. **We recommend that over the next five years districts\charters adopt a mastery based assessment report card which is aligned to Idaho’s statewide standards.**

Fiscal Impact:

- Statewide awareness plan: \$80,000-100,000
- Site visitation and readiness assessment for 20% of districts and charters: \$300,000.

FY 16 impact: \$400,000

Implementation Cost:

It is estimated to cost \$44.60 per student per year for a three year fully supported district implementation. Districts\Charters would be chosen for implementation based on readiness assessments, demographics, and available funding.

⁴ <http://danielsongroup.org/framework/>

FY17 impact: \$1,500,000

Fiscal impact in future years would depend on desire and readiness as more districts are assessed.

#4 Advanced Opportunities

Recommendations

- 1. We recommend that the relevant sections of Idaho Code, Title 33, Chapter 16⁵ pertaining to advanced opportunities be consolidated into a single chapter which will provide better clarity to districts, institutions and school boards.**

The focus on enhancing advanced opportunities has resulted in several new sections of code to delineate specific programs such as 8 in 6, Early Completers, and the new Fast Forward. Consolidating the information in one chapter and reorganizing the information will help students, parents and schools navigate the various offerings more easily and effectively.

- 2. We recommend that the following changes be made to current advanced opportunities programs:**
 - a. Eliminate the 10 percent participation cap in the 8 in 6 program;
 - b. Remove restriction to online courses in the 8 in 6 program to allow for courses taken in traditional schools.
 - c. Remove the requirement that students pay 25 percent of fees in the Fast Forward (\$200/\$400) program in order to eliminate barriers to those who need it most and to simplify reimbursement to districts.
- 3. We recommend follow-on work in 2-3 years to simplify and consolidate the Advanced Opportunities programs after review of data on the implementation of the Fast Forward program.** We envision that within 2-3 years, the State would fund 100% of all successfully completed dual credit courses, advanced placement exams, and transferable professional-technical courses or industry certification exams while in high school to encourage students to apply for scholarships.
- 4. We support the State Board in working with legislators to create scholarships to provide assistance to students who earn college credit in high school and go on to a postsecondary institution in Idaho.**
 - a. For 9 college credits earned in high school, the student would receive \$1,000 per year for 2 years;

⁵ <http://legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title33/T33CH16.htm>

- b. For 18 college credits earned in high school, the student would receive \$2,000 per year for two years.
- c. For 30 college credits earned in high school, the student would receive \$3,000 per year for two years.

Fiscal Impact: If advanced opportunities programs were maximized and 60% of Idaho's high school seniors (approximately 21,000 students) completed an average of 9 credits by the time they graduated @ \$65 per credit the total would be approximately \$7 million. The Committee estimates that it will take several years to reach this level. Programs such as "8 in 6" and Early Completers, while growing steadily are not experiencing large year-over-year increases in participation.

5. The committee believes that college/career advising is key to reaching Idaho's 60 percent goal. We recommend the legislature appropriate funds specifically for districts to implement college/career advising using a model that best fits their needs. Suggested models include, but are not limited to: AVID, Near-Peer mentoring, stipends, shared staff, and remote counseling.⁶

- a. The committee has explored several career counseling models, including AVID, Near-Peer and other leadership roles, and implementation of a remote career-counseling model. These models could be funded as block grants. The AVID program has proven results in Idaho and elsewhere and is designed to reach the "middle" group of students, rather than the top quartile.
- b. During the budget cuts of the recent recession, counseling services in many schools were eliminated and the role of counselors further shifted to more administrative tasks and social services. The result has been that many schools have little, or no, staff able to work with students on course counseling, career exploration and college application and preparation.
- c. The committee plans to survey school counselors, superintendents and administrators in order to gain insight into how career counseling can best be integrated into every middle and high school. Survey results will be added to this report when available.

Fiscal Impact: The state could begin by using the approach used for IT staffing as a model at \$2.5 million per year.

⁶ <http://www.avid.org/>;

6. We recommend that Idaho Administrative Rule be revised to require annual review of the 8th Grade Education Plan in grades 9-12.⁷

- a. Advanced opportunities, such as 8 in 6 and Fast Forward have created incentives that did not previously exist, but parent/student awareness and planning needs to begin earlier in order to take advantage of these programs. Simplifying and consolidating the Advanced Opportunities programs will help.
- b. Encouraging parents and students to think about career options earlier than 8th grade is key to reaching the State's 60% goal.⁸ Currently, schools often work with only the upper quartile of students on a traditional 4-year college path. The 60% goal mandates that schools reach more students who may choose a professional-technical certificate. Reinforcing options with students and parents early will help to ensure they are aware of opportunities and decisions down the line.

#13 Shift from Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Funding Model to Average Daily Enrollment/ Membership to enhance fiscal stability and remove current barriers to personalized and/or mastery learning.

This subcommittee researched funding models in Montana, Alaska, Wyoming, Colorado, Washington, and Utah and studied the 2007 report on ADA funding done by the Legislature's Office of Performance Evaluations.⁹ In addition, the committee met with State Department of Education staff regarding challenges with current funding model and talked to superintendents across the state to get their perspectives.

The perception as the subcommittee began its work was that the mastery-based model would need a different funding mechanism. However, research into what other states are doing has led to the conclusion that implementation of master-based models do not require changing from ADA to enrollment funding. There may be no need to completely change the funding formula for schools, but rather make the current formula work better.

The original Task Force had hoped that funding on enrollment would release some requirements in the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) data points, provide fiscal stability, and encourage mastery based education models. Based on the committee's research, we find only small gains in reporting requirements, minimal improvement in fiscal stability, and no need to change to enable moving to a mastery based system.

⁷ <http://adminrules.idaho.gov/rules/current/08/0203.pdf>

⁸ 60 percent of Idahoans aged 24-35 to have a certificate or degree by year 2020.

⁹ <http://legislature.idaho.gov/ope/publications/reports/r0901.pdf>

Other challenges in the funding formula exist, however, such as multiple enrollment; more than one FTE limit; a 2.5 hour half day and 4.0 hour full day requirement; and unique virtual school timing issues for which the committee recommends further study.

Recommendations:

- 1. We recommend that the state continue with Average Daily Attendance as the basis for public school funding. However, we believe that the current formula needs to be updated and improved in a number of areas. The goal of any changes should be to improve fiscal stability, and to make the formula fairer and easier to report in ISEE. (See recommendation #5 below.)**
- 2. We recommend that the current attendance minimum requirements of 2.5 hours for a half day, and, possibly, the 4.0 hours for a full day of attendance, be removed, or modified, and a different attendance reporting model developed in its place.**
- 3. We recommend that the current restriction on funding more than one FTE be removed in those cases where it would better serve students.**
- 4. We recommend that the current attendance formula be amended to remove the “Best 28 weeks” as a factor in determining funding. If this change is made, solutions regarding unique situations that may negatively impact districts or charters need to be implemented. These could include alternative high schools, online charter schools, and possibly other circumstances.**

Fiscal Impact: Removing the best 28 weeks as a factor would cost \$1-\$1.5 million if the unit factor was unchanged or revenue neutral if the unit was lowered slightly.

- 5. We recommend that a committee be formed comprised of representatives from large and small districts, charter and traditional schools, online schools, SDE staff, and the IDLA to explore possible solutions, both short and long term, to the current funding formula.**

**Innovation and Collaboration Subcommittee
Report and Recommendations**

Members:

Cori Mantle-Bromley, Chair
Don Soltman, Board Member, State Board of Education
Roy Lacey, Senator, District 29
Bill Brulotte, Principal, Twin Falls School District
Katie Graupman, Teacher (2014 Milken Award), Timberlake High School

Additional Member Consultants:

Greg Bailey, Superintendent, Moscow School District
Becky Meyer, Principal, Lake Pend Oreille School District

Subcommittee Charge: to further refine the following recommendations of the Governor's Task Force:

- #8 State-wide electronic collaboration system**
- #10 Educator and student technology devices with appropriate content**
- #17 Site-based collaboration among teachers and leaders**
- #18 Training and development of superintendents and school boards**

Subcommittee Deliverables:

- **Recommendations on teacher collaboration methods and timelines for implementation.**
- **Recommendations on ensuring teachers have opportunity for ongoing, job-embedded professional development opportunities.**
- **Recommendations on training for school administrators and school boards.**
- **Recommendations on technology implementation in schools.**

The 2013 Task Force recognized that core to how our schools continually transform themselves in pursuit of the 60% goal are the two strategies of innovation and collaboration. It should be the norm that schools are embracing new ideas, new technologies, sharing best practices, and continually improving.

Collaboration is critical as it provides the support, the diversity of perspective, and the ability for good ideas to spread virally and be further enhanced. Technology is obviously a vital infrastructure that underlies these strategies, especially in our geographically scattered and rural state.

The state plays a vital role in these strategies in providing the infrastructure, ecosystem, and incentives in support of local schools in the pursuit of these strategies.

The 2014 subcommittee recognizes that there is disparate technology in the hands of students and teachers across the state. This issue needs to be addressed. Furthermore, districts and schools are not getting data back in a timely manner in order to make good decisions. Our recommendations address this issue as well.

There should be ongoing funding for technology integration, maintenance, upgrades and training.

#8 State-wide electronic collaboration system

Recommendations:

- 1. We recommend that the Data Management Council (DMC) oversee the educational data systems in Idaho.**
- 2. We recommend that the Director of Research of the Office of the State Board of Education chair the DMC, and report annually to the State Board of Education and to the Legislature on the state of the project, accuracy of data, and future needs/plans.**

The Data Management Council has representation from the Office of the State Board, public postsecondary institutions, the State Department of Education, urban and rural school districts, the Division of Professional-Technical Education, and the Department of Labor.

The Data Management Council has identified, in policy, four areas of responsibility:

- a. Data Standards and Quality
- b. Access and Security
- c. Change Management and Prioritization
- d. Training and Communication

- 3. Schools need accurate and timely data and training on how to use data for school-based decisions.**

The Legislature's Office of Performance Evaluations (OPE) is conducting an extensive study of the current state of the Idaho's longitudinal data system (LDS), the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) and SchoolNet, the state sponsored Instructional Improvement System (IIS).

The Innovation and Collaboration Group recommends that it wait for the OPE report, due January 2015, before making further recommendations.

- a. On a preliminary basis, the Innovation and Collaboration Group does not feel that a single state-supported ISS system, such as SchoolNet, is in the school districts' best interests. Instead, we believe that districts should continue to have the

flexibility to choose the system which best meets their needs provided that the system fulfills State reporting requirements.

- b. Individual vendors, such as SchoolNet, Milepost, and Skyward, have more technical resources and incentives to work with districts in a timely manner than the State Department of Education. They are in a better position to:
 - 1) Tailor IIS systems for district needs in a timely manner;
 - 2) Conform district data to state reporting needs.

#10 Educator and student technology devices with appropriate content:

Recommendations:

1. **We recommend that the State continue its plans to provide broadband access and wireless infrastructure to all Idaho schools.**
 - a. Connectivity is the single most important need in schools. Without this underlying infrastructure, all other technology is compromised.
 - b. The current system does not provide equity in access and connectivity across the state.
2. **We recommend that the technology grant pilot program to schools be discontinued and that funding be made available to all districts for technology needs. Students must have access to devices that support the highest quality of learning.**
 - a. We recommend that the 2013 and 2014 technology grant projects be evaluated for lessons learned. We believe that the pilot projects benefit individual schools but do not necessarily lead to scalable innovation.
 - b. Choice of technology devices should be left to individual schools that have the knowledge to determine what works best for them. Decisions could include allowing students to bring their own devices.
 - c. Implementation of technology and the cultural shift in teaching take time.
 - d. The state's Doceo Centers¹⁰ could be used to provide professional development opportunities and for guidance on choice of technology devices.
 - e. The State Department of Education should work to create a "technology coaches" list serve and coordinate technology professional development opportunities with district professional development coordinators.
 - f. The State Department of Education should work with the Idaho Association of School Administrators and the Idaho School Boards Association to monitor and collect district technology policies to identify best practices and provide model policies

¹⁰ <http://www.doceocenter.org/>

**PLANNING, POLICY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
OCTOBER 3, 2014**

Attachement 4

- g. The “Next Generation Classroom” will be defined, not in what it has, but in what it does to provide the skills needed for success in a post-secondary education or career. The Next Generation Classroom will:
- 1) Use technologies to meet life-long learning challenges;
 - 2) Support personalized learning based on data-driven goals for instruction;
 - 3) Create an instructional environment which shifts the role of the teacher to facilitator and enhances peer-to-peer interaction;
 - 4) Combine discipline knowledge and research techniques to solve problems;
 - 5) Provide performance-based learning which requires students to demonstrate mastery based on high, clear and commonly-shared expectations;
 - 6) Construct learning experiences through both the geographic and internet-connected community; and
 - 7) Authenticate the student’s voice which is the deep engagement of students in directing and owning their individual learning.

FISCAL IMPACT: Potential \$180-\$200/student per year or approximately \$60 million (inclusive of the funds already being spent) with an appropriate phase-in.

- 3. We support the efforts of the Tiered Licensure/Career Ladder Committee to change how information technology personnel are funded in order to allow districts the ability to pay those professionals commensurate with market rates.**

Schools need two types of experts:

- a. Those with technical skills to support infrastructure and devices;
- b. Those with the pedagogical skills to understand classroom teaching and learning needs and encourage integration efforts.

- 4. Keyboarding skills are becoming increasingly important in early elementary school years. If the statewide assessment requires keyboarding, we recommend that physical keyboards for tablets be made available for student use. If the assessments have a listening portion, we recommend that quality earphones be provided to all test-takers to ensure equitable test-taking experiences.**

#17 Site-based collaboration among teachers and leaders:

Recommendations:

- 1. We recommend that the school year be increased by 3 days (24 hours) to allow for additional paid job-embedded professional development and collaboration. This time should be construed separately from professional development training relating to Idaho Core Standards.**
- 2. We recommend that job-embedded professional development and collaboration be scheduled weekly based on school schedules and student needs.**

3. We recommend that collaboration skills training and the use of data to inform instruction training be available to all participating staff.
4. Schools that have already moved to job-embedded professional development should not be penalized and may use the additional funding to increase instructional time.

FISCAL IMPACT: Per day for all staff \$4-\$5 million/day

#18 Training and development of superintendents and school boards:

Recommendations:

1. We support the Governor's Task Force recommendation calling for further development and implementation of the Idaho Standards for Effective Principals, which includes ongoing implementation and support for administrator training in the Danielson Framework for Teaching model through TeachScape proficiency exams.
2. We support professional development for administrators and school board members on all new state and district initiatives.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK