

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

Accountability and Support Committee Meeting

Estela Lopez, Chairperson
Charles Jaskiewicz III
Patricia M. Keavney-Maruca

August 23, 2013

Draft Minutes of Meeting

Pursuant to notice filed with the Secretary of the State and posted on the State Department of Education's Web site, the State Board of Education Accountability and Support Committee met on August 23, 2013, in room 307 of the State Office Building, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut.

I. Call to Order

Chairwoman Estela Lopez called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Present were Dr. Lopez, Allan Taylor, and Charles Jaskiewicz (via telephone). Mrs. Keavney-Maruca was absent.

Also present for all or part of the meeting were Commissioner Stefan Pryor, Morgan Barth, Pamela Charland, Andrew Ferguson, Adam Goldfarb, and Dr. Dianna Roberge-Wentzell.

II. Review of Alliance District Plans Review Process

Commissioner Pryor welcomed the Committee, and noted that the purpose of today's meeting is to summarize the Alliance District process to date. While it is the Commissioner's responsibility to approve Alliance District Plans, Commissioner Pryor wanted to ensure that the Board is comfortable with the process and invited any suggestions members may have.

Andrew Ferguson gave a PowerPoint presentation, and spoke about the more user-friendly, refined application process in year 2, which focused on primarily three areas: (1) talent strategy focusing on educator evaluation and support systems; (2) Common Core State Standards and next generation assessments; and (3) interventions in low-performing schools.

Four sample plans were presented to the Board to review as examples: Hamden, Manchester, East Hartford and New Haven.

Commissioner Pryor spoke about the process that Delaware uses for district monitoring and support, noting that Delaware officials meet one-on-one with districts to review data. He would like to design a similar process in Connecticut.

Mr. Ferguson summarized the Year 2 Planning Timeline, and discussed the types of iterative feedback given to districts. He noted that of 16 district resubmissions received, one plan was approved so far. Of the three partial approval requests submitted, two were approved. District growth areas were aligned to three areas: Common Core; Evaluation and Support; and School Turnaround.

With regard to the state's efforts to support districts' rollout of the Common Core State Standards, Dr. Roberge-Wentzell stated that the work has included, among other methods, a train the trainer model for district Common Core leads.

Dr. Lopez questioned how change is measured, as a result of the training. How will the impact of professional development be shown? For example, she would like to see evidence of positive outcomes as a result of training in the Common Core – not just the percentage of staff members who participated in the training.

Commissioner Pryor noted that this is a good point, and perhaps could be addressed by showing the percentage of participants rated “proficient” at the conclusion of the training.

The committee members reviewed one of the sample plans provided to them (East Harford). Discussion ensued regarding how and when to share feedback forms with local school boards. Commissioner Pryor suggested that it might be appropriate once the plan had been approved. Dr. Roberge-Wentzell noted that CABE is providing assistance in this regard, specifically in the area of how the board can support the superintendent.

Mr. Taylor asked who reviewed the plans. Mr. Ferguson replied that inter-agency review teams are comprised primarily of staff members of the Turnaround Office.

The Committee discussed the appropriate method of collecting and publishing data on Alliance District performance.

Mr. Jaskiewicz suggested that the Education Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly be provided with information on progress in the Alliance Districts.

Mr. Taylor made a request to couple statements about assessment systems with the aligned and resulting interventions from those assessments in future materials.

Commissioner Pryor described next steps in the process. He noted that staff will continue the iterative process toward approval of plans. He offered to provide a report to the Accountability and Support Committee at the end of the process, and stated that he will continue to provide updates for the full board at their monthly meetings.

III. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: _____
Pamela V. Charland

