

Draft Only  
Approval Pending  
**SUMMARY of  
PROCEEDINGS**



**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STATEWIDE EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY**

---

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING INFORMATION**

July 27, 2011

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY MEMBERS PRESENT**

Bill Schilling, Chairman  
Tony Anson, WASSP  
James Bailey, Unita Co. Sch. Dist. #1  
Sue Belish, Wyoming State Board of Education (by phone)  
Diana Clapp, Fremont Co. Sch. Dist. #6  
Sheryl Lain, Wyoming Department of Education  
Kris Cundall, WAEMSP  
Mary Kay Hill, Governor Mead's Office  
Molly Kinsey, Sheridan Co. Sch. Dist. #2  
Brian Kaumo, Sweetwater Co. Sch. Dist. #1  
Jack Patrick, Carbon Co. Sch. Dist. #2  
Janine Bay Teske, Teton Co. Sch. Dist. #1

**LEGISLATIVE SERVICE OFFICE STAFF**

Dave Nelson, School Finance Manager  
Tania Hytrek, Staff Attorney

**OTHERS PRESENT AT MEETING**

Scott Marion, National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment  
Chris Domaleski, National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment  
Michael O'Donnell, State's Counsel, Wyoming Attorney General's Office

Please refer to Appendix 1 to review the Advisory Committee Sign-in Sheet  
for a list of other individuals who attended the meeting.

*The Committee Meeting Summary of Proceedings (meeting minutes) is prepared by the Legislative Service Office (LSO) and is the official record of the proceedings of a legislative committee meeting. This document does not represent a transcript of the meeting; it is a digest of the meeting and provides a record of official actions taken by the Committee. All meeting materials and handouts provided to the Committee by the Legislative Service Office, public officials, lobbyists, and the public are on file at the Legislative Service Office and are part of the official record of the meeting. An index of these materials is provided at the end of this document and these materials are on file at the Legislative Service Office. For more information or to review meeting materials, please contact the Legislative Service Office at (307) 777-7881 or by e-mail at [lso@state.wy.us](mailto:lso@state.wy.us). The Summary of Proceedings for each legislative committee meeting can be found on the Wyoming Legislature's website at <http://legisweb.state.wy.us>.*

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Advisory Committee met in Casper to discuss the theory of action and creation of a framework for an educational accountability system for the State of Wyoming. The discussions included student and teacher/administrator accountability, overall goals of the system and options for growth models.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Schilling called the meeting to order at 8:30 am. The following summarize the Advisory Committee proceedings by topic. Please refer to Appendix 2, page 3 to review the Advisory Committee Agenda.

## **REVIEW OF TIMELINE AND WORK PLAN**

LSO Staff informed the members of the Advisory Committee that the following dates are tentatively scheduled for meetings in Casper, WY of the Select Committee on Educational Accountability ("Select Committee") and the Advisory Committee:

- August 17 (all day – Select Committee);
- August 18 (morning – Advisory Committee);
- September 14 (afternoon – Advisory Committee);
- September 15 (all day – Select Committee); and,
- October 5 (all day – Advisory Committee).

## **THEORY OF ACTION**

Mr. Scott Marion and Mr. Chris Domaleski of the National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment ("Center") provided the Advisory Committee with information regarding a theory of action and the components of creation of a theory of action for Wyoming for its Educational Accountability System. The Advisory Committee engaged in discussion of components members felt were important to be included in any Educational Accountability System adopted in Wyoming.

## **CORE COMPONENTS OF SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY**

Advisory Committee Members broke into two (2) groups to discuss one (1) of two (2) topics, either school accountability or teacher accountability. Mr. Marion gave a summary of the discussion held by the group that discussed school accountability. Mr. Domaleski gave a summary of the discussion held by the group that discussed teacher accountability. Mr. Marion invited the Committee to send emails with any additional thoughts on both topics that the Committee may have upon the conclusion of the meeting.

Mr. Domaleski briefed the Advisory Committee on the four (4) main goals of any accountability system, namely achievement, growth, readiness and equity and engaged in discussion with Mr. Marion and the Advisory Committee on each of these components and their co-relation to each other. Advisory Committee members were given a few minutes prior to the discussion to think about the questions posed on pages 10 and 11 of Appendix 2 as related to each of the four (4) areas articulated by Mr. Domaleski.

The Committee then undertook discussion of each of the areas, beginning with achievement. Growth was not discussed during this agenda item as it was left for another segment. In relation to achievement, the Advisory Committee agreed that an assessment needs to be adopted that is compliant with the federal requirements and gives our State a local, state and national comparative for student achievement. The consortium assessment was mentioned as an option that would accomplish these goals. A few Advisory Committee members expressed concern regarding the writing and reading portion of the PAWS test. The example cited was a statewide decrease in the writing assessment by ten percent (10%). A few Committee members thought the decrease was inexplicable given the additional instruction in these areas.

Several Committee Members indicated that confidence in the test and the results is very important in any accountability system.

On the topic of readiness, the Committee discussed the importance of graduation rates and the possibility of a differentiated graduation rate for those students that graduate in their fifth or sixth year of attendance. A few Advisory Committee members expressed concern about AP and IB classes and the varying degree of availability across the state, mainly due to size variation. Mr. Domaleski offered the Advisory Committee a variety of approaches in dealing with this issue. He expressed that this issue can be dealt with during the design phase and in the construction of the business rules but that he appreciated knowing that the Advisory Committee believes AP and IP classes and course curriculum are important and should be accounted for somehow. Mr. Domaleski requested the Committee's feedback on the importance of obtaining post-secondary data on college preparedness and remediation rates in the context of building an accountability system. Many Advisory Committee members thought that access to this data is important and should be considered in building an educational accountability system. Superintendent Clapp indicated that the State Longitudinal Data System and the SEA 52 Group have undertaken an effort to collect longitudinal data and could assist the Consultants in obtaining this information via the P-16 Council.

The Advisory Committee then engaged in discussion around the issue of equity and the options for defining focal students. Related to that, a few members communicated the importance of dealing with the minority or sub-group populations of the state, specifically Hispanic and Native American. Mr. Marion responded to Superintendent Clapp's request for clarification on dealing with mobility. He agreed that defining this term will be necessary during the design and drafting of the business rules.

In conclusion, Sheryl Lain expressed concern about designing a system which will be so complex that it loses sight of the importance of teaching students to read. A few Advisory Committee members expressed concern in adopting a system that has such high stakes for children that they end up dropping out rather than failing the measure. Mr. Marion expressed that there are ways to design a system that have high stakes that do not drive students out. James Bailey continued to express concern in this regard, noting that when Massachusetts adopted a high stakes model successfully, it did so by building capacity, and Wyoming, including the Department of Education, does not have the capacity to accomplish what Massachusetts did and that in the past it has been necessary to go outside of the state to support this type of capacity building.

## **DISCUSSION ON TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS**

Mr. Marion provided the Advisory Committee with an overview of the components of an educational accountability system as related to teacher effectiveness and pressure points in moving forward in designing an educational accountability system. Appendix 3. Mr. Marion also pointed out that teacher effectiveness and the implementation of a teacher accountability system will be a part of the work conducted in Phase II of this project, as required by 2011 Wyo. Sess. Laws, Ch. 184 (SF0070), but that general discussion of the issue and goal setting is important to undertake at the onset of building the framework for such a system.

Jack Patrick asked how the Ch. 29 Teacher Evaluation Rules and Regulation promulgated by the Department relate to SF70 and its requirements. Mary Kay Hill clarified that the requirements of Ch. 29 are embedded into SF70, but that SF70 goes a step further requiring a more coordinated state level system of teacher/administrator accountability and student assessment.

## **DISCUSSION OF THE GOALS OF THE SYSTEM**

Mr. Marion and Mr. Domaleski asked Advisory Committee members to think about two questions, considering all the opportunities and challenges associated with evaluating educator effectiveness: 1) If you were designing the system the most important thing to accomplish is \_\_\_\_\_?; and, 2) The most important threat to address is \_\_\_\_\_? Each Advisory Committee member then provided a response to these questions for consideration by the consultants in moving forward. The majority of Committee member expressed concern about creation of a system that was too complex, either in administration or in enforcement, or targeting teachers and administrators inappropriately or unfairly.

## **DISCUSSION OF GROWTH MODELS**

Mr. Marion provided information to the Advisory Committee on the various growth models that are available, including categorical, gain model, value added, and normative. He introduced the components of each model and provided examples of how each worked in theory and practice. Mr. Domaleski then asked the Advisory Committee for input on the various models and requested opinions on which models would work best for Wyoming. The consultants indicated that the gain score and value-added table models would not work well for the State because they are too coarse for measuring results in Wyoming due mainly to its sparse population. In addition, Mr. Marion indicated that the same model cannot be used for the non-tested subjects and grades as compared to those that are tested grade and subjects (example: PAWS is tested in certain grades, in specific subjects). Mr. Domaleski also addressed variables that may be related to achievement that may be incorporated into whatever growth model is adopted. The Committee also discussed the implications of No Child Left Behind on any educational accountability system established in Wyoming. Several Committee members agreed that this is a Wyoming assessment and accountability system and would be administered separately from any assessment in compliance with NCLB and for the calculation of AYP. The Committee did agree, however, that the two be combined to the extent that the two converged.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

JODI BENNETT (PARENT AND BUSINESS OWNER)

Mrs. Bennett requested the Advisory Committee consider high-end, high-achieving, gifted and talented students both in the accountability realm and the content sense. The Advisory Committee agreed with points raised by Mrs. Bennett and the Consultants echoed that this will be addressed in the system that will be created, as well as addressing the low performing children and sub-groups.

Mrs. Bennett also expressed frustration in the overall preparation of the students as a business owner in the State and also requested that business owners be given a voice as a stakeholder as these issues continue to be discussed.

Chairman Schilling expressed interest in obtaining input and anecdotal statements from various members of the public in light of Mrs. Bennett's comments. Mr. Marion suggested that public input wait until such time as a product or some recommendations have been made to the Select Committee. LSO staff echoed this sentiment and provided the Advisory Committee with information regarding the legislative process, which allows for public input at numerous intersections.

KATHRYN VALIDO (WYOMING EDUCATION ASSOCIATION)

Mrs. Valido expressed concern about the human aspect of this system, including the students and teachers, and encouraged the Advisory Committee members to keep this in mind in moving forward with the design of the system.

**MEETING ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chairman Schilling adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

File Storage: F:\AA\SCHOOL 2012\SF0070 ADVISORY COMMITTEE\Minutes\2011 07 27 Advisory Committee Meeting

# Committee Meeting Materials Index

---

---

<b>Appendix</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Appendix Description</b>	<b>Appendix Provider</b>
1	N/A	Committee Meeting Attendance Sign-In	Legislative Service Office
2	Theory of Action; Core Components; Teacher and Student Accountability	Advisory Committee to the Select Committee on Statewide Education Accountability Meeting, July 27, 2011, Briefing Book and Meeting Materials	National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment
3	Focus on Teacher Effectiveness	Designing a Statewide System for Measuring Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness, Casper, WY, July 27, 2011	National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment