

SCDN Meeting
March 7, 2002

Planning Regulation – Jim Butterworth

- No planning regulation YET
- Why plan? – improve student achievement; too many disjointed plans need to be integrated; create systems from disjointed buildings; improve low performing schools
- No Child Left Behind – align with NYS mandates
- AYP = after 2 years, public school choice; 3 years, supplemental academic services may be from private; 4 years, corrective action – SURR
- 5 levels – classrooms, buildings, districts, BOCES, SED
- Safe schools, technology, teacher quality, reading, accountability, assessment, ELL, flexibility
- Data driven, results based planning to coordinate all aspects
- Rural Education Achievement Program – flexibility (Title VI); transfer and aggregate funds
- 100.11 change from building-based to district-based planning “connect the dots”
- CDEP –after 4 years: capacity builder, data uncovers diverse student population needs, focus on student achievement
- “When the water hole dries up, all the animals begin to look at each other differently.”
- Tolerate ambiguity – effective leader
- Design Principles: simple and easy; incorporates other plans; flow from SED strategic plan; focus on student achievement; all districts; all stakeholders in the planning process; planning as a means – implementation is key; recognizes unique circumstances of NYC; recognizes unique needs of districts and flexibility; not punitive – not stigmatize low performing districts; continuous review – evaluation and public reporting
- Design to practice – evaluate HR1
- PROCESS: What has been the role of BOCES in previous comprehensive planning efforts? What can BOCES do to build capacity in districts?
- SCDN Role – examine unique problems and successes in districts; identify best practice; know resources in the region; use educational research in planning school improvement; build skills of planning and facilitation; special attention to districts with little experience and capacity; assist in disaggregation and analysis of data; assist with best use of data and identify root causes; foster systems thinking; BOCES wide reviews of planning efforts; examine own program in light of the results achieved in the region; model and share BOCES strategic planning

Successful Planning Models –

Planning Best Advice – Jim Butterworth

Using Test Results to Inform the System – Gerry DeMauro

- Changes in two pass system data; more confidence, less helpful
- Scoring turn around – imbedded field testing - scales quicker
- Test difficulty has not significantly changed
- Scale scores and raw scores are predictable – based on probability of getting item correct; probably not useful to use raw scores for AIS
- No more pattern scoring; 3 parameter scoring for MC, 2 parameter for open ended – only helpful at tail end
- 3 years of data? Predictable validity? Steadily increasing relationship between grade 8 and regents – need individual student data –
- district level performance? Which items predict passing regents at 65 – best predictor PI 1, 2; **get overhead** - memo next month
- districts can be characterized by patterns of growth; different patterns for different student groups
- #32 ELA 4 – independent writing; scoring may be inconsistent; CTB will investigate

- ?Regional scoring study? Site code – analysis to be done re: variability, levels,
- 8th grade ELA? January 2003 science?

Building Bridges – Jim Butterworth

- assessment and accountability
- build capacity – do right work at right level; use time with precision; teacher quantity and quality;
- report results
- Close Gap – special ed., ELL, big 5
- create, sustain, grow regional networks – federal money through state
- technology – electronic information platform; free services to districts
- state aid formula changes – dollars on the margins
- teacher quality – basis for solid education system
- educational leadership – implement planning systems
- university resources

Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction – Roseanne DeFabio

- Learning connected to all systems
- Support children learning
- 55-64 extension: gen. Ed 13% ELA between 55-64; 8% math
- 97 cohort study
- 200K public school – grade 9; graduate 150K – 30K more than 4 years
- students coming to HS unprepared
- Incentives to work toward standards? 65 – threshold level skills; repeat regents exams – make it or increase score; 55 – kids stop early
- How do we deal with system to eliminate disincentives?
- Middle School math – gap between early elementary and HS math; unprepared for HS
- RSSC – TRC – BOCES support for grades 5,6 math teachers
- Design math support/initiative for elementary teachers
- Early literacy – 82 million for reading excellence; 75 million per year/6 years
- Test accommodations/modifications change – discourage giving up on young children to learn to read, make calculations

Dropout Prevention/Attendance Regulation – John Soja, Linda Woodward

- Dropout - Handout of powerpoint
- Dropout is culmination of events
- Adult ed staff development consortium
- Attendance - due June 31, 2002; implemented by July 1, 2003
- Handout of power point; available on SED web/Q&A
- Build capacity of schools to higher achievement
- CR 104.1/revised
- “departmentalized” – identify how frequently districts must take attendance; how will data be used to improve building level performance? Review by building principal
- define excused/unexcused – local decision – for course completion policy *optional
- BOE annual review of data, policy
- Field memo in March to summarize