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NCLB: Birth and Disillusionment

- Texas was one of the earlier states to develop statewide testing systems during the 1980s, and the state adopted minimum competency tests for school graduation in 1987.
- The Texas accountability system enacted in 1994 in Texas and later became No Child Left Behind.
- The creators of the Texas system of accountability originally envisioned the policy as an information exchange, however the punitive evolution of Texas testing and accountability has fomented disillusionment amongst many former supporters of accountability. Any operationalization of student outcomes should foster collective community goals, rather than a top-down one-size-fits-all approach.
NCLB: As Good as Advertised?

• Researchers, educators, parents and policy makers alike have asked whether policies that reward and sanction schools and students, based on average school-level test scores and disaggregated by student demographic groups have closed the achievement gap.
• Waivers are occurring because NCLB will not close the achievement gap by 2014.
• Recent statistical research by Sean Reardon at Stanford has shown that the slope of improvement has been lower on the NAEP in the midst of high-stakes testing and accountability. It will take 80 more years to close the achievement gap on the NAEP based on the slope of change during the past decade of NCLB (Reardon, Greenberg, Kalogrides, Shores, & Valentino, 2012).
• NAEP scores did not improve for the first time in decades.
A Conceptual Approach for Community-Based Policy

• Dominant paradigm of high-stakes testing and accountability despite vocal opposition.

• Top-down, hierarchical models ostracize community-based alternatives.

• More research in area bringing to forefront effective models of community engagement.

• Over past 20 years, community organizing has emerged as powerful form of public engagement in educational reform.
Community-Based Policy (Cont.)

• Mark Warren (2011) has written extensively on community organizing. He argues public engagement in education reform is a way to address historical inequities.
• Civic alliances in impoverished communities build civic and political capacity.
• Challenges exist in organizing disenfranchised groups – underlying inequities must be addressed.
• Relationships are key – building power – social capital.
California’s Local Approach for Accountability & School Finance
California School Finance History

- Property owners frustrated with increasing taxes dedicated to education.
  - Legislature imposes “revenue limits” - 1972
- *Serrano v. Priest* - 1976
  - Demanded equalization of funding
- Prop 13 - 1978
  - Capped property taxes; led to state financing
- Implementation of Categorical Aid Programs
Local Accountability Plans

• Each recipient of LCFF funds must develop an LCAP –
• The plans must receive public input
  – Committees
    • Parent Advisory & English Learners
  – Public Comment
  – At least 1 Comment Hearing; 1 to Adopt

• Approval Process
• Must specify goals for the district
  – Qualitatively & quantitatively measured
• Must address state priorities
State Priorities for LCAPs

• The state has identified a number of priorities that must be addressed by the goals in LCAPs
  – Qualified instructors, appropriate materials, sound facilities
  – CCSS and English learners
  – Parental involvement in decision making
  – Multiple measures of student achievement
  – Student Engagement – drop out/attendance rates
  – School Climate
  – Broad course of study with programs correspond to LCFF funding
  – Subject area outcomes
  – Professional development
  – Outreach to foster youths
Implementation

- 8 years to fully implement
- General Enthusiasm
- According to new PACE study, concerns over:
  - Quickly going into effect
  - Potential for change
  - LCAP template
  - Engagement
Available Online

- For more on local accountability: http://CloakingInequity.com/category/community-based-accountability/
California’s New Approach: LCFF

• Base Grants
  – Based on grade level – K-3, 4-6, 7-8, & 9-12

• Supplemental Grants
  – ELL, Foster Youths, & Economically Disadvantaged
    • 20% of base grant for unduplicated pupils

• Concentration Grants
  – 50% of base for unduplicated pupils over 55%

• Must use SG & CG funds for services for those students targeted

• K-3 class size reduction; 24:1 goal
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Problems with Testing

• Reliance on multiple-choice and short answer items
• Far too much standardized testing
• Highs stakes for students, teachers and schools
• Narrowed curriculum, teaching to the test, emotional stress, disengagement, limited learning
Resistance and Reform Movement

- Parents, students, teachers active across nation
- 550,000+ opt outs
- Initial victories: lower stakes, less testing
- Some changes coming with new ESEA include allowing states to overhaul assessment
- New Hampshire has started under a waiver
Hallmarks of Alternatives

• Projects, performances, portfolios
• Teacher-designed and controlled
• Student focused, student empowerment
• Formative as well as summative
• Produce viable data for public reporting
NY Performance Standards Consortium

- Best US example to survive NCLB
- Now 38 schools, 36 in New York City
- Public High Schools, standard admissions
- Demographically mirror NYC student body

Here are some slides from the Consortium, from research on 26 NYC schools (prior to last year’s expansion):
THE TASKS: multiple ways to express learning

- All Consortium schools require students to complete academic tasks to demonstrate college and career readiness and to qualify for graduation. Tasks must be completed in four areas:

  - ENGLISH: ANALYTIC LITERARY ESSAY
  - SOCIAL STUDIES RESEARCH PAPER
  - ORIGINAL SCIENCE EXPERIMENT
  - APPLICATION OF HIGHER LEVEL MATHEMATICS

Schools add additional tasks: e.g. Creative Arts, Art Criticism, Internships, Foreign Language
Teacher-designed Rubrics

- Rubrics provide the basis on which to review the quality of student work across performance tasks.

- Tasks reflect common core standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Consortium</th>
<th>NYC High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Black &amp; Hispanic</td>
<td>71.95%</td>
<td>71.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ELLs</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students w/ special needs</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students in poverty*</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 8th grade proficiency (out of 4.50)</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Graduation Rate (based on 2 or more years of enrollment)</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Graduation Rate (based on 2 or more years of enrollment)</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Graduation Rate</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Graduation Rate</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Graduation Rate</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Graduation Rate</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Graduation Rate</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students w/ special needs Graduation Rate</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minority Male College Data

Consortium

86% of African-American male Consortium graduates accepted to college, 2011

90% of Latino male Consortium graduates accepted to college, 2011

Data obtained from school documentation.

National

For comparison purposes: The American Council on Education report “Gender Equity in Higher Education: 2010” cites the following national percentages:

37% of African-American male graduates going to college

42% of Latino male graduates going to college

(http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Press_Releases2&TEMPLATE=~/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=35338)
Chart 2: Persistence in College: 2nd Year Comparison Between Consortium, National and NYS Rates, Class of 2008

- **4-Year Colleges**:
  - Consortium Rate: 93.3%
  - National Rate: 74.7%
  - NYS Rate: 80.8%

- **2-Year Colleges**:
  - Consortium Rate: 83.9%
  - National Rate: 53.5%
  - NYS Rate: 59.1%

*Data obtained from [http://www.higheredinfo.org](http://www.higheredinfo.org).*
85% - Percent of students in a 4-year CUNY school, either graduated or remaining in (any) college, post 01/01/2011

67% - Percent of students in a 2-year CUNY school, either graduated or remaining in (any) college, post 01/1/2011

Consortium data based on National Student Clearinghouse, Feb. 2012
Resources

- http://www.fairtest.org
- http://performanceassessment.org
Creating a Culture of Improvement with Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)

San Juan Teachers Association and San Juan Unified School District
Cheryl Dultz
San Juan Unified School District

Current Role:
• One of the Lead Consulting Teachers for our Center for Teacher Support (Induction, Peer Assistance, and PAR)
• Mentor for Peer Facilitators and Administrators in the System of Professional Growth pilot (Professional Practice)

Background:
• Classroom teacher for 24 years
• Taught at a school that partnered with California State University Sacramento for pre-service work for teachers
• Assessment Mentor
• Instructional Technology Integration Specialist
Overview of the Presentation

• Principles and beliefs
• Components of the system
• Peer Assistance and Peer Assistance and Peer Assistance and Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)
• Who are the participants in the process
• The process
• What we have learned
Principles and Beliefs

• Ensure high quality teaching and learning for all students in the San Juan Unified School District

• Collaboration and partnership built upon trust and transparency between the District and Union

• Support for beginning and veteran teachers by teacher leaders
Components of our Current Professional Growth System

- Induction
- Professional Practice
  - Peer Assistance and Peer Assistance and Peer Review (PAR)
Two Types of Support

Peer Assistance
- Voluntary
  - Targeted Support Determined by the Teacher

Peer Assistance and Review
- Involuntary
  - Targeted Support with a Mandatory Improvement Plan
Peer Assistance

• Teacher self-identifies need for support and contacts SJTA

• A consulting teacher (CT) is assigned to support the referred teacher

• Completely confidential process with no evidence collected

• CT only reports to governance panel if resources are needed or resistance is encountered

• Principal remains in the role of evaluator
PAR (Peer Assistance and Review)

• Improvement plan developed with CT, principal, and teacher

• Minimum of 3 hours weekly support: observations, coaching, resources

• Up-dates to panel every 6 weeks

• At the end of the first year, the governance panel makes a recommendation to Human Resources
What is Peer Assistance Review (PAR)?

• Peer Review: *Getting Serious about Teacher Support and Evaluation* (Koppich and Humphrey 2011)

• Essentially PAR is intensive support for struggling teachers. Support may include: modeling of lessons, co-teaching, coaching with targeted feedback, peer observations of exemplary teachers, and analysis of student work.
Who are the participants in the PAR Process?

- Referred Teacher
- Consulting Teacher
- Administrator
- Governance Panel
  Led by the Co-Directors
Referred Teacher

- Enters PAR after receiving unsatisfactory marks in two or more standards.

- Responsible for working with the consulting teacher, the PAR Governance Panel and administrators to identify and implement high quality instruction instruction in areas identified for growth
Consulting Teacher

- Four year term

- Rigorous selection process – written application, panel interview, observation of teaching

- Highly skilled and calibrated (weekly teamwork)

- Released full time
Administrator

- Coaches and observes teachers to identify areas for growth

- Collaborates with the referred teacher and the CT to develop an improvement plan

- Participates in PAR Panel reporting and discussion of next steps
Governance Panel

• The Program Co-Directors oversee the program

• The panel meets on a consistent basis to review evidence of performance

• Determines next steps and additional supports that may be needed
Co-Directors –
Chair of the Governance Panel

• Currently SJTA President and SJUSD Assistant Superintendent of Secondary

• Meet jointly to set agendas and discuss programmatic issues

• Meet with the Lead CT regularly

• Serve as communication conduits to their organizations
THE PROCESS
• A teacher is referred to PAR after receiving unsatisfactory marks in two or more standards.

• The referred teacher, the evaluating administrator, and the consulting teacher meet to design an improvement plan
The consulting teacher supports the teacher in a variety of ways which may include modeling lessons, identifying professional development opportunities and providing observations of teachers throughout the year, with an expectation of a minimum of three contact hours per week.
• Every six weeks, the CT presents evidence of performance in a formal report to the PAR Panel and others in attendance including the referred teacher, a union advocate and the site administrator.

• After the CT presents his or her report, the referred teacher, union advocate and site administrator are given an opportunity to provide evidence as well
• The PAR Panel discusses the evidence presented and makes inquiries to the CT, the referred teacher and/or the administrator to determine what additional supports may be needed.
The PAR Panel can make the following recommendations:

1. Return to the classroom and a normal evaluation cycle.

2. Continue with PAR support for an additional year.

3. Exit teaching
WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED...
Positive Impacts

- Induction/PAR collaboration has carried over to other labor-management issues
- Collaboration, transparency, and trust are norms between union and district
- Capacity building of teachers
- Improvement of teacher quality is our shared responsibility
Direct Positive Impacts

- Some Referred Teachers were competent teachers that needed support and are now excelling

- Others saw the objective evidence presented and resigned before the year ended
**On-going challenges...**

- New superintendents and/or school board members can lead to changes in focus and resources

- Consulting teacher term limits creates the need for continual extensive training of new CTS

- Availability of qualified Consulting Teachers when needed
Extension of this work...

Evolving from evaluation to

A System of Professional Growth
Cheryl Dultz – cdultz@sanjuan.edu
(916) 971-7133
Ken Zarifis
President of Education Austin
Questions?

Please submit them in the question box of the GoToWebinar taskbar.