

**Missouri School Improvement Program
Resource and Process Advisory Committee
Feedback Form
Meeting #3
(Continuation of Activity 2 from Meeting #2)**

Given the information that you have heard about how Resource-Process-Performance all work together in one accountability system, please provide feedback on the current standards and the implications that process standards have on teaching, leading and learning?

Which Fourth Cycle Process Standards and Indicators are working to improve teaching, leading and learning?

Table 1

- P. 4 – 6.3.4 – list identified groups
- P.4 Proposed – 8. Does work
- P.4 – 6.4 keep resources – add more detail on extending curriculum so that learning can occur 14 hours a day
- P.5 6.5.3 – standards based –
- 6.8 – LMC – culturally – diverse/equity & identified instructional needs
- 6.9-6.9.3 – individual 4-6 year plan

Table 2

- 6.1 as a standard is working
- 6.1.1 needs language update – Essential content & skills (all subject areas)
- 6.1.3 needs to reflect 21st C Skills
- 6.2 student growth – bold type – disaggregating all data will cover this
- 6.2.4 – isn't working – simply adjusting instruction wont do – needs multi pronged focus – interventions (teaching, learning, relationships, feedback)
- 6.2.5 – updated language
- 6.2.6 – not working – schools will always try to get kids to take tests seriously – omit this
- 6.3 standard needs to be removed is addressed by Federal standards
- 6.4 – pull it – it's a resource standard, not a process standard
- 6.5 working
- 6.6 working
- 6.7.1-6.7.3 – needs reworking
- 6.7.4-6.7.6 – working
- 6.8.1 not working – doesn't focus on teaching it focuses on the faculty

- 6.8.2 not this covered by teacher requirements
- 6.8.3 – not working – clerical except for collection analysis & selection
- 6.9 – working should reflect 2009 language
- 7.1 & 7.2 – Federal guidelines address these standards so they should be omitted
- 7.3 2009 proposal looks good
- 7.4 it's working, but should be a focus on promoting, not just making it available
- 7.5 its working
- 7.6 not working – beyond the scope of the mission of public education
- 7.7 working
- 7.8 working
- 8.1 reflect 2009
- 8.2 – take it out – reflect 2009
- 8.3 (22) The board of education and district leadership collect qualitative and/or quantitative data to guide & monitor the development and implementation of a shared vision, strong organizational mission, and (high expectations for every student
- 9.1 (12) The Board of education & district complies with Public Law 111-296 Healthy Hunger Free Kids Act 2010 in the establishment and management of local school wellness policies (see in attachment) in compliance with the Coordinated School Health Model support by documentation of implementation progress) & evaluation <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21291905>
- 9.1 (10) add – The district ensures adequate time for students to eat breakfast and lunch
- 9.1 (25) ok
- 9.1 (26) ok
- 9.1 (27) ok
- 9.1 (11) Add – noted on page – The district ensures safe & efficient transportation (including walking & cycling) to and from school is provided in compliance with MO. Statutes, regulations, and local board of education policy.
- 6.1 – (including – Physical Education/Health, Fine Arts, Gifted, Guidance, CTE, Information Technology & Special Ed)

Table 3

- 6.1.1 – working
 - add Common Core Standards to align district goals and Show Me Standards – local, state, federal
 - curriculum revision – not enough PD time to for teachers to learn
 - PLC schools – not mentioned MSIP 4 should be integrated – state-wide model
- 6.2 Add EOCs
- 5 Common Core Stds. Add in LEP, migrant, gender – 5 or more students...disaggregated for board review – “purpose of this? too much data what is rationale? Why board review?
- 6.2.6 – does not need to be in MSIP review (up to individual schools or districts)
- 6.3 Professional Learning Communities (PLC) schools – should be integrated – state wide model “who we are!” Fits into all areas

- Need 6.3.1 & 6.3.2, 3, 4 – needs to be mentioned in MSIP 5 – If appears elsewhere in MSIP does not need to be here
- 6.4 – 6.3 & 6.4 – to be consolidated Like 8&9 (exception of 9.9 – a given)
- 6.5 – Need a system in place for positive learning climate PBS, PBIS, Leader in Me examples of
- Is school penalized if school does not use PBS? State suggested
- 6.6.1 A written code of conduct should be for both students and staff. – this should exist – content should be up to local community (district)
- 6.7 2, 3, 4 & 6 as Best Practices
- Library 6.8 2009 ok
- 6.9 Counselors should be counseling, not test administration or social work
- 16 ok!!!
- 7.1 out
- 7.2 combine 7.2 with 16
- 7.3
- 7.4 ok

Table 4

- 6.1 Keep # 1, 2, 3, 4 Curriculum experts review curriculum. Teachers seem to be using the curriculum. Necessary components of curriculum are identified
- 6.2 all should be used.
- 6.3 #1 – should be in MSIP 5 #2, #3, #4 – should remain
- 6.4 #1, 2, 3, 4 should remain
- 6.5 #1, 2 (work – keep)
- 6.6 #1-4 are working – keep them
- 6.7 – all are valid – have a problem with the committees (see does not work)
- 6.8 – all are valid
- 6.9 #3 – the requirement for planning should start no later than 8th grade works and should remain.
- 7.3 – should remain as stated in 2009 yellow revisions highlighted
- Curriculum had consistent components to review
- 7.3 – Dennis Harden has turned in documentation

Table 5

- 6.1.2 – Training on the curriculum review.
- 6.5 & 6 – The Advance surveys work well to address area.
- 6.7 The district should have a written plan. (Is the plan being developed by a committee that addresses student learning).
- 6.8 More integrated to current instructional practices
- 6.9 Fine
- 7.1 Addressed under Fed. Program standards
- 7.2 Needs to have part in process or will be left out by local districts because of no part in accreditation in program.
- 7.3 Fine
- 7.4 available versus needs being met. (How is availability determined, numbers being able to access?)

- 7.5 Measure of “encouraging or provides opportunities?”
- 7.6 Was it stricken due to no impact on student learning?
- 7.7 Fine, seems out of place in middle of document should maybe lead all parts.
- 7.8 Fine
- 7.9 Fine, spells out how it is to be measured.
- 8.1 Fine, Spells out how it is to be measured.
- 8.2 now included in 8.1
- 8.3 now addresses Board’s responsibilities
- 8.4-8.14 now addressed in 8.1

Table 6

- 5 in sub group? Page 3 (6.2) fund PK?
- Project based learning (6.3)
- Test taking skills? (6.3)
- Librarians – tech people? Teachers? (6.8)
- Alternative schools (6.9)
- Career ed – critical (6.9)
- 6.1 Show Me standards?
- Reinstate #3 on 7.3 #3
- Counseling Recommend that the desirable population per one counselor is 250 students
- 6.4 Instructional Resources – do not limit to just technology
- Each Education Learning Group needs to be linked in the Process and Resource Standards
 - Gifted
 - IDEA
 - Career Ed
- 7.1 Leave as is with addition of #5 which encourages the districts to help transition students away from IEP to prepare the student for the workforce (functioning independently self advocacy, transition off IEP) Disability & self awareness

Table 7

- 6.1 – overall yes at the most basic level #3 all the workplace – readiness skills is this there
- 6.2 – yes #1 & #3 #2 we agree w/intent but worry about the fidelity of imp
- #4 – NOT working is this happening
- # 5 – no on strategies for assessing standards not assessed on MAP - does the staff development go far enough
- 6 NOT Working
- 6.3 NO – has not achieved desirable result
- 6.4 NO lack of resources
- 6.5 #3 this is NOT well documented
- 6.6 yes
- 6.7 yes 2 intensive, on going – lots going on, but intensive, sustained, embedded – no way!
- 6.7 #3 intregal needs to be better defined

- 6.7 #4 yes
 - 6.7 #5 collected – but not highly utilized
 - 6.7 #6 – NO substantial
 - 6.8 #1 some of this is dependent on resources
 - 6.8 #2 and #3 yes
 - 6.8 #4 – no resources w/staffing
 - 6.9 #1-5 yes
 - 7.1 #1-4 yes working
 - 7.2 #1 not working systematic & at all grades
 - 7.3 #1-4 yes
 - 7.4 NO only in some districts, & within some districts only some populations
 - 7.5 #1 not effectively due to PAT funding cuts
 - 7.5 #2 not across all districts
 - 7.5 #3 yes
 - 7.6 #1 & #2 not universal across all districts
 - 7.7 yes
 - 7.8 yes
 - 8.1 #1-2 yes
 - 8.2 yes
 - 8.3 yes – particularly 8.3.4 board training
 - 8.4 not needed – required by law
 - 8.5 holding “community” accountable not realistic
 - 8.6-8.14 yes
 - 2009 *crosswalk reference back to 4th cycle
 - Like the idea of “all students” means ALL students and not distinguishing among groups and should be clarified as such
- Measurement:
- #6 – classroom observations
 - – work samples
 - – assessments (formative samples, classroom state)
 - – written curriculum analysis
 - – agendas, meeting notes, sign-in sheets
 - #7 – test results
 - – documentation of data team processes
 - #8 – test results
 - – teacher documentation
 - – team meeting documentation
 - – observations & staff evaluations
 - #9 – observations & interviews
 - – teacher evaluation process
 - #10 – agendas, sing-in sheets, meeting minutes
 - – plans
 - – teacher evaluation, observation
 - #11 – curriculum review

- - observations, interviews
- #12, 13 - observations, interviews, survey
- - behavior data, office referral
- #14 - observation
- - facility review
- - curriculum & CSIP review
- - collection analysis review documentation
- #15 - review of curriculum
- - documentation of Model Guidance Program
- - personal plans of study
- - interviews, observation
- #16 - written process
- - surveys
- - data team records
- - observation
- #17 - needs more details - staff, curriculum, assessment, program design (EC) & caution use of "available" & change to "offers"
- #18 - surveys
- - program offerings
- #19 - Programs? if necessary these are part of individual program requirements
- # 20 - A+? if necessary these are part of individual program requirements
- # 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 - Board minutes, agendas, & policies & CSIP Budget & finance review, surveys (condense to one standard)
- Other recommendations:
- - single statement at beginning: "district is in compliance with all requirements of state & federal programs for which they participate." Then, take out all references to that in the standards
- - single statement at beginning: "District is in compliance with all local, state, & federal laws/regulations."

Table 8

- 6.2 In larger districts
- 6.6
- 6.7.5 & 6
- 6.7 - except it should be based on needs assessment & not interest survey
- 6.8 - works to an extent (some info seems trivial)
- 6.9 - works to an extent
- 7.1 - works to an extent
- 7.2 - works to an extent
- 7.4 - is a wash...no evaluation, just a check-off
- 7.5

Table 9

- 6.1 - We can answer yes to the items but it is not used consistently (move over to what is not working)
- All strikeouts in 2009 version are agreed to

Table 10

- 6.1 aligned with common core standards
- 6.2 assessment plans have been beneficial
- 6.4 resources need to be available/equitable
- 6.7 Equitable p.d. across curriculum research based
- 7.2 Research forthcoming – without it, students wont receive needed services.
- 7.3 Career ed is VITAL

How do you know?

Table 1

- Bullying policy more effective when it enumerates groups

Table 2

- Observing
- 7.3 – Dennis Harden has turned in documentation

Table 8

- 6.1.1 – Common format
- 6.2 – Proven by evidence & reports in larger districts
- 6.6 – Proven from stakeholder feedback, advanced questionnaire & artifacts
- 6.7.5 & 7 – Data, student performance
- 6.8 – Data, student achievement
- 6.9 – Although we can see/observe the various “items”, is the program INTEGRAL to the schl ?? – student interviews, teacher & admin. interviews, student perf. Data
- 7.1 – Provides accountability BUT level of implementation is questionable
- 7.2 – same
- 7.5 – student perf – program highly dependent on funding

Table 10

- 6.1 Our experience shows that when districts have written curriculum they are more apt to teach it.
- 6.5 #1 school climate – how is it measured? #2 vague
- 6.6 – expected behaviors are taught & practiced

Which Fourth Cycle Process Standards and Indicators do not appear to have an impact on teaching, leading and learning?

Table 1

- 6.4 should be altered for CCS –
- P.1 – 6.1 – needs includes adaptations for ELL, special education & gifted, local culture/ethnic groups
- P.5 6.5.2 – missing learner accountability also missing objective common grading system
- 6.5.1 – climate evident is better
- 6.6.4 – add “all forms of bullying” add “collect violence/cyber bullying toward staff” “violence against students & staff/volunteers” “against students & adults of the learning community”

- P.7 – 6.7.1 – PDC not working in many districts without the 1%

Table 2

- 6.2.6 schools will always work hard to get students to take tests seriously

Table 4

- 6.1 We weren't evaluating quality of curriculum (only checked for components)
- Common Core Standards will need to be addressed in MSIP 5.
- 6.2 #5 – Should address Common Core Standards, should address formative assessment
- 6.5 #3 – Intervention strategies are preferred over retention strategies.
- 6.6 add #5 – concerning cyber safety
- 6.7 – add the PD committee s/b under direction of an administrator – even that admin. has veto power
- 6.8 – Libraries should have flexibility to supplement the fiction and non-fiction hard copy requirement with electronic access of material.

Table 5

- 6.1 – Incorporate Pacing Guides – Incorporate a vertical Curriculum – Identify what was done differently & Monitoring system
- 6.2.1 – How is district being held accountable in between visit (Formative Assess/Evaluations – Benchmarking).
- 6.1-3 The workplace – Readiness skills are not as in depth as need to be – should be change to career-readiness. Define “Equity”
- 6.2 All students should administer the same assessment (Optional EOC administration)
- 6.2-3 “Reviews” rather than “Made Aware”. Perhaps it should state “provide training” or “made a result on what has been found”
- 6.2-4 Should be reviewed as trends over time
- 6.2-6 Not practical
- 6.4 How do you measure?
- 6.5 This may become subjective – according to evaluator and/or resources. (Should this be reversed with 6.6 – Perhaps the school will should be orderly to create a positive climate. How do you measure to ensure that this is an ongoing process.
- 6.7 P.D. should be individualized as well – what is substantial?

Table 6

- Strong counseling/career ed/special ed component
- 7.4 p. 13 Preschool – Including but not limited to Parents as Teachers
- Curriculum – page 1 – 6.1.1 Curriculum should include suggested learning strategies & activities to meet the needs of all learners including gifted/talented, students with disabilities, English Language Learners
- 9. On page 4 – add: 9. Meet the learning needs of all students, including students with disabilities, gifted, English language learners, homeless, migrant, ethnically diverse and low socioeconomic groups.
- P.5 6.6 – add to #5 bullying & sexual harassment
- 8.3 – 21. Remove 2nd sentence – on 1. – All formal contact...
- 24. – replace 3. d w/new # and add 7 essential components of eval. System

- 24.8. Add for new construction – lab rooms meet industry standards

Table 8

- 6.1.3 – written curricula. Incorporates content & processes related to equity, technology, research & workplace – readiness skills
- 6.1.2 & 6.1.4 & 6.2 & 6.2.3 – too much testing!!
- 6.2.6
- 6.3
- 6.4 – depends on what the most important thing is to be measured
- 6.5
- 7.3

Table 9

- 6.1 – Is not used. Steps that are not addressed. Not embedded in the workplace.
- 6.1.3 – This is implied but not practiced. Most follow Grade-level, moving to Common Core and do not implement all areas
- 6.1.4 Data should be used to address areas of concern. 6.2 would take care of it if being practiced appropriately.
- 6.2.4 & 6.2.6 School districts identify 6.2.4 & .6 but we do not feel that it needs to be a process standard (yet a practice by districts and evidenced appropriately).
- 6.3 Simplify with the bolded statement. Take out indicators & leave the standard. Standard will carry more weight.
- 6.4 Just need the standard & not the indicator
- 6.5 Just need the standard & not the indicator
- 6.5.3 If retention is not an effective strategy, where does this fit into 6.5?
- 6.6.2 Taken from the AQ???
- 6.7.3 & 6 P.D. “substantial” Question the need and validity of the word
- 6.8 Prepare for the future needs – Library resources through technology

Table 10

- 6.2 #6 – has 0 to do w teaching leading & learning
- 6.8 LMC not written well enough to facilitate TLL we question being able to open LMC before/after school – can we mandate it?
- 6.9 How do we ensure guidance doesn’t just mean assessment? Addition of testing coordinators?
- 7.1 IDEA – omission is due to legalities that are enforced.
- 7.4 Are there any parameters? (pre-school)
- 8.3-8.12 All agreed the rest contributed to improvement of TLL.

How do you know?

Table 2

- 6.8.1 librarian as teacher has a measurable impact on student achievement – see state studies (including MO) at www.LRS.org studies by Keith Curry Lance and others

Table 4

- From experience on an MSIP team
- 6.5 – experience has not seen any cases where retention works

Table 8

- 6.1.3 – Different DOKs – no common curric. Structures w/in school districts, from dist. To dist., across state – tough when kids move
- 6.1.2 & 6.1.4 – Because there is so much discrepancy w/in districts, and there is seems to be no procedure in place for review
- 6.2 – Smaller districts have difficulty doing this – 6.2.3 – majority of BOE do not understand the data – 6.2.6 – Incentives don't work w/older kids
- 6.3 – States to “provide”, but no guidance on how to identify – again, discrepancy bet districts & inconsistencies – 6.3.1 – is difficult to assess given limited am't of observation
- 6.4 – the wrong thing is being measured: it shouldn't be whether we have the tools – it should be HOW the tools are used
- 6.5 – Not enough detail provided – talks about promoting but doesn't lay out what's expected
- 7.3 – These items do not indicate being an “integral component” of the educational program – Let's be real...the emphasis is on “college-ready” ...and we are seriously shortchanging a significant portion of our students & future workforce

Suggestions:

- We would like to see categories of process standards:
 - For example organize info into broad groups such as:
 - Curriculum & Instruction (CI)
 - Data & Assessments (DA)
 - Board of Education (BOE)
 - Prof. Development/Learning (PL)
 - Safe & Orderly Environment (SE)
 - Extended & Support Services (Guidance, Health Services, LMC, Food Service, Pre-School, A+, etc.) (ES)
- Under each category numbers need to begin again: ie
 - Curriculum & Instruction =
 - CI1
 - CI2, etc
 - Data & Assessments
 - DA1
 - DA2, etc