

Accountability Round Robin Notes

4-20-17

<p>Accountability Focus</p> <p>Breakout Round 1 (yellow) Notes</p>	<p>Round One Group Members</p> <p>John Ashley Jose Martinez Brian Jackson Frank Humphrey Duff Martin Fran Finco Heather DuBois Bourenane Amy Devine Mike Thompson [Two legislative aids]</p>	<p>Time frame:</p> <p>Round One: 10:10-10:35 (25 mins)</p>
--	--	---

Notes: Capture general thoughts, not specific quotes, Do not attach ideas to people

- Desire for “Culturally responsive” assessments across the board.
- Pro averaging subgroup performance. More fair to identification. Concern about how averaging may bring up the aggregate performance of subgroups.
- 10% cap—is it a “hard” cap. Schools that are “close” to the threshold might want the support.
- Is the 10% cap based on budget? Not simply arbitrary threshold.
- What kind of movement out of focus/priority status have we seen?
- Like annual review for targeted and that they continue to be monitored for two years.
- Resource equity is critical to achieving goals.
- How might comprehensive and targeted support schools be concentrated in districts?
- Can schools stay targeted if they desire?
- Comprehensive schools will want to leave status while targeted schools will want to stay for resource purposes.
- How will status affect communities? Reporting is critical here. Could be stigma without necessary resources.
- Could be different rate of growth for schools starting lower than state averages to measure progress toward long-term goals. Recalibrate based on where schools start. As schools improve, targets should increase. Change takes time.
- Mechanism for celebrating success for schools that are making good progress.

Summary statement (based on hearing the conversation, write one or two summarizing statements from your perspective):

- A cap on the number of schools for targeted support is logical in order to best distribute resources. How can we support schools that may fall slightly above cap or that desire to continue targeted status even if exit criteria have been met?

Type anything from the chart paper that the facilitator writes specific to this group:

- How is progress toward the goal, a component of the exit criteria, measured and defined?
- Other groups might mask the poor performance of very low-performing subgroups
- Is 10% cap a hard cap?
- How do we celebrate success/progress?
- What gets lost when we average?
- Penalty for diversity?
- Annual review and consecutive monitoring are positives
- Overall, averaging subgroups for targeted identification seems like a good idea to be as fair as possible

<p>Accountability Focus</p> <p>Breakout Round 2 (red) Notes</p>	<p>Round Two Group Members</p> <p>Jim Bender Salvador Carranza Mel Stewart Chris Thiel Linda Seermeyer Carole Trone</p>	<p>Time frame: Round Two: 10:40-11:05 (25 mins)</p>
---	---	---

Notes: Capture general thoughts, not specific quotes, Do not attach ideas to people

- Interest in difference/comparison between state and federal systems
- Chronic Absenteeism definition is different in federal system.
- Interest in how ESSA reporting might look.
- Interest in one-pager/crosswalk between the two systems. Purpose of systems is critical here.
- Resource allocation is an unknown.
- Desire to see what individual subgroup identification vs. averaging subgroup identification.
- Certainty and consistency are important for day-to-day educators. Keeping state and federal systems details in mind is important and difficult.
- Implementation fidelity is vital to improvement and success.
- 10% cap is rational due to resource limit. Could there be schools that don't necessarily need additional resources but want flexibility to make changes. Change of practice (implemented with fidelity) is just as important.
- If we need to focus on SwD for example, maybe that's how targeted identification should work. However, perhaps averaging provides some safeguards, etc.

Summary statement (based on hearing the conversation, write one or two summarizing statements from your perspective):

- Might averaging subgroups mask the low performance of some subgroups causing a school that needs support to not be identified?
- A cap on the number of targeted support schools is logical, but is there flexibility for schools that are near the cap to reallocate funds or receive additional support without supplementary dollars?

Type anything from the chart paper that the facilitator writes specific to this group:

- In the absence of sufficient resources, might identification have a negative impact?
- How do you ensure fidelity of implementation?
- If federal resources are insufficient, what happens?
- Should identification caps limit flexibility/opportunity?
- How do you ensure fidelity of implementation?
- Can resources be allocated at “base” rather than “on top?”
- Caps make sense from resource allocation perspective

Accountability Focus Breakout Round 3 (blue) Notes	Round 3 Group Members Lisa Pugh (had to leave) Jim Lynch Jesse Harness Woodrow Wiedenhoef Sen. Lena Taylor	Time frame: Round 3: 11:10-11:35 (25 mins)
---	--	--

Notes: Capture general thoughts, not specific quotes, Do not attach ideas to people

- Desire to add another SQSS indicator. Especially with regard to SWD.
- Check targets for long-term goals.
- What is lost when averaging of subgroups occurs? Is low performance being masked?
- System of targeted support needs to be clearly mapped out.
- Average of averages is not a true indicator.
- Don't like average for targeted support nor 10% cap. "Thinking small" to start (10% cap) is not a strategy for success. How do we know we can't handle more? We need to have more information about resources. Resources can come from different resources/levering other sources.
- Summary doc between state and federal system is desired.
- Is the plan written to simply satisfy the requirements of ESSA (regarding resources)?
- Needs assessment structure of ESSA allows for school improvement—resources are a part of this.
- 10% cap is not important—who we want to serve is the desired goal. Can we set threshold after funding is allocated.
- Who do we want to serve and how?
- Purpose of ESSA should not just be to receive federal funding.
- Simply labeling a school doesn't work. Support is the critical component. We want to have an impact. Not stretched too thinly. Schools that need the most help should get it. Interventions provided are sufficient to make a difference.
- How can we be informed of % cap change?
- System should be "Wisconsin way" not simply dictated by feds.

Summary statement (based on hearing the conversation, write one or two summarizing statements from your perspective):

- The system for identification of schools (especially targeted) should be built on what we value in Wisconsin and not simply what ESSA mandates. Resource allocation, provided as a function of identification, should be based on all funding sources and on needs assessments. The goal of the system should be to support schools and to provide adequate and meaningful supports, not to label and punish.

Type anything from the chart paper that the facilitator writes specific to this group:

- Identification triggers needs assessments—how do we do the work?
- Who do we want to serve and how? Independent of funding
- How can we cut the gap in half if we are only supporting 10%?
- Don't average an average
- Add another SQSS indicator
- Opportunity to target and differentiate to make impact—need to have support sufficient to make a difference