

School Improvement Round Robin Notes

4-20-17

<p>School Imp Focus</p> <p>Breakout Round 1 (red) Notes</p>	<p>Round One Group Members (first and last names)</p> <p>Carole Trone Dr. Mel Salvador Carranza Jim bender Sec Seemeyer Chris Thiel</p> <p>Team: Jonas, Deb Ila, Rachael, Jeff</p>	<p>Time frame: Round One: 10:10-10:35 (25 mins)</p>
---	---	--

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

- Exit Criteria:
 - What does the state consider sustainability?
 - But if you are school A and hit all benchmarks, how long can school A say “I like being here?” Especially given the resources associated
 - Benefit cliffs. Could this be gradual?
 - If schools don’t exit and falls within the 5%, how do you support newly identified
 - If there is no penalty, what the incentive to exit?
 - How do we build a system that builds sustainability from the beginning?
 - Do we have examples of schools moving out of this? If so, what are they doing? If we don’t have examples of this then what are we doing differently?
 - NCLB was punitive, some language carries over, but some is more about support.
 - Pupil achievement grant in Milwaukee worked. But SES did not work. Schools will still not want to stay in the bottom 5%?
 - There is success in no longer being identified, but what happens when they get out at 6%?
 - How definitive do you want to get in this document? Or, do we want to be descriptive in this document?
 - What is the state doing to allow me to make the changes we need to improve.
- Support
 - Superintendent powers are listed as an intervention, reads well on paper, but has not really been used. A helpful document would be to see what’s new versus what’s existing.
 - Does the state level have the resources to do the accountability part?

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

- We need to think about what happens to schools as they start show improvement over time, even if they exit. Be clear about this.
- How can we highlight bright spots and make information about what's working broadly available and support innovation
- Make sustainability part of the plan from the beginning- also consider changing in school culture

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

- Decision: Could be made collaboratively between DPI-LEA
- Do this gradually- resources/support
- Schools exiting/or not- how do we continue to provide support
- Sustainability- a focus from the beginning
- How is the culture changed?
- Responsibility of SEA/Feds-support

<p>School Imp Focus</p> <p>Breakout Round 2 (blue) Notes</p>	<p>Round Two Group Members (first and last names)</p> <p>Lisa Pugh Jim Lynch Jesse Harness Woodrow Wiedenhoef Craig Trost Leena Taylor</p> <p>Team: Mike, Jeff, Jonas, Deb, Ila, Rachael</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

- Support
 - If you don't build support right no one will exit

- Needs to be better clarity about how we get “other players” at the table. Legislature, DHS, other state agencies, etc. Assumption made that in order to provide the supports, we need these state agencies at the table.
- Need to focus on both support and exit criteria if you are going to create sustainability.
- Should be more than state level thinking, because in the end if there isn't a local support system improvement won't last
- Supports are only as good as the connection to the community
- There needs to be a connector so that schools can access ways that work from folks that know. Farm to school example. The problem is that rural WI has it covered, but there is no connector to urban places.
- How can you reflect that the resources are available at the local level- implementation science for example. Be more explicit about this in the plan response.
- Intent to collaborate with other entities is not clearly reflected other than the note that the entities are partners.
- In the end, if the end user is the student then coaching is going to play a huge role in this. Are we intentional about this?
- Coordinated effort looks good.
- Exit Criteria
 - Pages 38-39 representation from all community members, but provide a long list of examples. These examples don't get at our exit criteria. Don't the leap that the neighborhood is a subgroup. It could reflect some of that, but a local level could exclude some of the subgroup if you are not explicit. Not a direct or clear enough level of specificity. A number of the examples are not directly dealing with subgroups.
 - The list was about creating pathways to ensure that all are bringing something to table to support subgroup needs
 - Schools have to be part of saying that they are ready.
 - How does the exit criteria tie back to the family piece? If families are engaged meaningfully, then they need to be part of the decision at the end confirming sustainability.
 - Include teachers in the sustainability piece.
 - How comfortable are you in looking at your data, identifying issues, etc. as part of the exit criteria.
 - Collaborative effort in determining sustainability.
 - The work is not done even though you exit.
 - Fab lab example. What is the mechanism that can bring everyone to the table?
 - Dynamics of the process are important.
 - How do we create opportunities in low performing schools?
 - Collaborative piece allows us to see avenues that were otherwise unseen.

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

- Focus on support, or no one will exit.
- Connections connections connections. For sustainability to work, supports have to be

- made available at the local level, not just from state level agencies.
- Include LEAs, families, and teachers in the determination of sustainability.

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

- How do they institute practices that are likely to keep them moving forward?
- Plan needs clarity about the state level support- Departments, communities, legislature, etc. Support beyond educational supports -integrated- need connectors
- Local support needed for sustainability
- How do you guarantee resources for implementation
- Local definition of equity
- Intent to collaborate across agencies
- Clarity about subgroups and the list
- Feedback from families about sustainability and moving to a light touch
- Gradual release
- What is the level of comfort with carrying on on your own
- Sustainability built from the beginning

<p>School Imp Focus</p> <p>Breakout Round 3 (yellow) Notes</p>	<p>Round 3 Group Members (first and last names)</p> <p>Duff Frank Humphry John Ashley Brian Jackson Jose Martinez Heather Dubois Fran Finco Amy Devine (sitting in for Sally)</p>	<p>Time frame: Round 3: 11:10-11:35 (25 mins)</p>
--	---	---

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

- Supports
 - We keep coming back to resources. We are concerned that the plan is laid out in a way that makes sense, but concern about sustainability. If I exit, I give up resources
 - Theme has been around engagement in discussion, but it feels like a footnote to the plan. Don't feel the actual implementation is present in the plan.
 - How can we talk about equity with our communities when they are not practicing. How do we ensure there is equity in stakeholders. Need to revise

the plan to make clear what/how equity will be modeled, and families will truly be engaged.

- If schools are failing, how will they know what to do without support. If we know they are failing, what does it look like to support schools flexibly?
- Improvement plan driven by need, so not only explore from instructional perspective, but other needs as well. How do we authentically engage with people.
- Page 40: military families are not included.
- What are we doing that's *not* working?
- Like the focus on the population, because that context matters.
- Family and community engagement should be better connected in the plan (parameters) to the chronic absenteeism.
- Exit Criteria
 - How can you use the money you have differently?
 - Is this plan going to work for the lowest 5% of schools the way it's written right now.
 - Sometimes the local decision making process can be problematic because of politics (Milwaukee example).
 - When a school gets the identification that the school needs support, with school choice, how much money will be lost for students leaving. Counter argument that open enrollment does the same thing.
 - Have a measurable mechanism to applaud achievement. Not seen clearly in plan. Could be
 - Does this plan address actually improving instruction

* Note: A participant in this group pulled Rachael aside at the end and suggested that the state provide coaching and be explicit about changing mindsets so that any blame on parents shifts to true engagement of parents.

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

- Significant concerns about resources being available for these supports.
- Be more specific about what *it* will look like or how *it* would be achieved, actual family engagement, for example.

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

- Question about sustainability/resources
- Overall plan reflects spirit of key tenants
- Engagement- how do we engage students, families, communities-what does that look like?
- Caution not to fall back on same habits-calling all the same people, etc.\
- How to help schools that may not know how to improve? What does that support look like?
- parent/community engagement especially important for addressing chronic absenteeism
- Mechanism to applaud progress and achievement. Celebrate what's working.

