

Metrics Relative to Mission goal team

DRAFT Minutes from 2/16/2007 meeting (7:00a-8:30a, Claypit Hill Elementary School)

Attending: Jeff Dieffenbach, Cyndy Dunham, Steve Goldstein, Jim Lee, Dianne Zeskind

The group began with a brief round of (re-)introductions, a summary by Jeff of the status of the work of the other three goal teams, and a summary of the 1/23 Metrics meeting.

The group affirmed the value of input (for instance, from surveys) from a broad base of constituencies: teachers, students, parents, and other residents. Jim likened such a survey to the school council surveys that are conducted from time to time. It was suggested that a survey, if conducted, include questions about the “demographics” of the respondent: children in school now, in the past, in the future, or never.

Jeff outlined questions that need to be answered with an eye towards the group’s self-imposed April 23 interim report to the School Committee (WSC).

- What format should our report to the WSC take?
- What format should the “Metrics report card” (to the town) take?
- Is there value to defining a smaller set of key metrics backed up by secondary metrics?
- What consideration should be given to ease of collection?

Regarding the last point, the group made the distinction between rolling up existing data versus complementing with new data collection.

Steve reviewed “benchmark” materials that he had compiled. *[Steve—can you please send Jeff your presentation? We should post our minutes and supporting materials to the WSC web site.]* He started by referencing Jim Collins’ “Good to Great and the Social Sectors,” a monograph that he had supplied to the WSC. In that monograph, Collins delineated measures of two types: quantitative/qualitative and input/output. Examples are shown in the table below (not discussed at the meeting).

	Example input measure	Example output measure
Quantitative	Per pupil expenditure	10 th grade MCAS scores
Qualitative	Focus on differentiated instruction	Students reach full potential

Several metrics were discussed: number of clubs, number of teams, number of performing arts groups. Jim raised the idea of the profile of a successful student: a combination of grades and activities, for instance. Steve suggested percentage of special education students in regular classes. The group discussed success with three types of students: top, middle, and lower.

Steve pointed out the challenge of developing a set of metrics in parallel with the development of a mission (the Admin Council work with Dr. Blumer) and of district priorities.

The group discussed the WSC's list of peer towns and districts (listed later in this document). Steve's benchmarking list dropped smaller districts (e.g., Boxborough and Sherborn). Jeff explained that the WSC compared itself to "composite" districts. For instance, Wayland compares to the combined Acton ES/MS, Boxborough ES/MS, and Acton-Boxborough HS district, not each of those districts individually.

The group talked about the scope of benchmark districts.

- Project Blueprint schools
- Area private schools
 - Roxbury Latin, Windsor, Belmont Hill, BBN, Milton, Rivers
- Other notable districts
 - Thomas Jefferson (outside of Washington DC)

Steve presented a table showing progress of local public peers, Project Blueprint, and other notable districts in terms of having a stated mission statement, principles/values, goals/plans, planning processes, and measures related to mission. Steve asked about getting WSC permission to talk with other districts on these various dimensions. While he noted that Wayland trails most of the comparison schools on most of these dimensions, he thought that Wayland could become a leader (along with only a few other districts) by fleshing out metrics relative to mission.

The Needham performance report was discussed.

http://district.needham.k12.ma.us/reports/perf_report_04.pdf

It is used by Needham both as a community relations tool but also as a management tool.

Steve reviewed several benchmark districts and the types of measures that they report.

- Greenwich CT: highly quantitative
- Branford CT: working towards 21st century skills, in steps

Steve then presented potential Wayland measures organized by Domain (e.g., Student Learning, Staff Performance, ...) and Sub-Domain, showing whether those measures are input or output and quantitative or qualitative.

Jeff distributed a collection of metrics that the WSC has been reporting at recent budget and other forums.

After Jeff departed, the rest of the group discussed action items (see below).

The meeting adjourned at about 8:30am.

Action items

- Integrate benchmark and currently collected measures (Steve)
- Collect benchmark measures from private schools (Steve)
- Collect benchmarks from international schools (Diane)
- Collect internal measures already in use (Cyndy)
- Collect teacher input on measures (Jim)
- Post meeting minutes and supporting materials to WSC web site, with WSC permission (Jeff)

WSC peer towns/districts (single/composite districts marked with “*”)

- Acton
- Acton-Boxborough *
- Belmont *
- Boxborough
- Brookline *
- Carlisle
- Concord
- Concord-Carlisle *
- Dover
- Dover-Sherborn *
- Lexington *
- Lincoln
- Lincoln-Sudbury *
- Needham *
- Sherborn
- Sudbury
- Wayland *
- Wellesley *
- Weston *

Cumulative list of measures discussed so far

- Meeting 1
 - DIBELS, GRADE, and DRA assessments
 - Teachers recruited, hired, and mentored
 - Number of teachers with advanced degrees
 - Average teacher tenure and teacher turnover
 - Progress against MA curriculum frameworks
- Meeting 2
 - Number of clubs, teams, performing arts groups
 - Percentage of special education students in regular instruction classrooms
- Jeff's materials (updated) supporting Meeting 2 (aligned to Domains/Sub-domains, those available from the Department of Education at <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu> indicated with "DOE")
 - Student Learning
 - > Mission: TBD
 - > Curriculum: Specials per elementary school grade
 - > Assessment: TBD
 - > Extracurriculars: Activities per student
 - > Student Services: Class Size
 - > Student Services: Percentage of eligible students attending public school
 - > Student Services: Dropout rate
 - > Student Services: Attendance rate [DOE]
 - > Student Services: In-school and out-of-school suspension rates [DOE]
 - > Student Services: Student-FTE (teacher) ratio [DOE]
 - > Student Services: Youth survey results
 - > Supplies: TBD
 - > Technology: Students per computer [DOE]
 - > Technology: Classrooms on the Internet [DOE]
 - > Results: Teacher survey
 - > Results: SAT scores
 - > Results: AP scores
 - > Results: MCAS scores [DOE]
 - > Results: Colleges attended
 - > Results: Post-graduation plans [DOE]
 - > Results: Sub-group results
 - > Results: Graduation rate [DOE]
 - Staff Performance
 - > Hiring: TBD
 - > Professional Development: Hours per teacher per year
 - > Mentoring: TBD
 - > Evaluation: Percentage of teachers licensed [DOE]

- > Evaluation: Percentage of core academic teachers who are highly qualified [DOE]
- > Evaluation: Teacher performance
- > Evaluation: Administrator performance
- > Retention: Average years of service
- District Leadership
 - > Leadership: NEASC accreditation status
 - > Planning: TBD
 - > Evaluation: TBD
 - > Communication: TBD
 - > Governance: TBD
- Financial Management
 - > Financial Management: Teacher Salary
 - > Financial Management: Cost per pupil
 - > Financial Management: Fees per student
 - > Business processes: TBD
- Community Support
 - > Engagement: Parent survey
 - > Engagement: Private funds raised