

Sample Script for Item Presentation on Consensus Call

Criteria Requirements – Item 3.1 asks how the applicant determines its student segments and how it determines the requirements, expectations, and preferences of its students and stakeholders. This Item is aimed at ensuring the continuing relevance of the applicant’s educational programs, offerings, and services, the development of new opportunities, and the creation of a climate conducive to learning and development.

Key Factors

1. Key student segments: regular (K-12), special education, ESL, ESP, LCC, and NCS5. Student demographics – 3.5% Asians, 11.2% Hispanic, 3.3% Native American/other, 51% white, 45% disadvantaged, with Region 3 highest disadvantaged (71%)
 2. Four key stakeholder groups: parents (P), taxpayers (TP), the school board (SB), and businesses (B)
 3. Student and stakeholder requirements/key success factors (KSFs): academic excellence (all); high-quality curricula and instruction (S, P, SB); friendly, supportive, and safe learning environment (S, P, SB); effective support services (S, P); and effective and efficient fiscal management and operations (TP, SB)
 4. Other providers/competitors 16 private schools (<10%); home schooling (1%)
 5. Strategic challenges—Education/learning: Be agile and respond to changing performance expectations such as those mandated by NCLB; address poverty-based gaps in levels of readiness to learn. Community-related: Engage parents, community, and business in collaborative learning efforts.
- (Note: no one mentioned the strategic challenges as a key factor in the individual scorebooks, but you’ll see that some of the comments deal with strategic issues, so the challenges have been included in the KFs.)

Comment Summary - I have four proposed strengths.

Comment 1. Focuses on 3.1a1 - how the applicant determines its student segments using the Segmentation process, and discusses these segments. Most of us agreed that this was a strength, although there was one person who indicated that it wasn’t clear how the segments were determined.

Comment 2. Focuses on 3.1a2 - how the applicant determines student and stakeholder requirements and expectations using its Student and Stakeholder Requirements Determination process. We all agreed that this was a strength, I’m proposing this as a double strength – a potential role model practice – due to its systematic nature and breadth of deployment to all stakeholder groups.

Comment 3. Focuses on another part of 3.1a2 dealing with how the applicant uses the information gathered to make changes in the instructional programs for students and the community.

Comment 4. Focuses on 3.1a3 and the use of PDSA to evaluate the Student and Stakeholder Requirements Determination Process and related processes.

Strengths not used: None

Proposed OFIs - I have three proposed OFIs.

OFI 1 focuses on a specific question in 3.1a2 asking how the applicant determines the relative importance of stakeholder requirements. This comment was proposed by only one person, but I thought it was important and the rest of us missed it.

OFI 2 also focuses on another part of 3.1a2 which asks how the applicant used specific types of information such as utilization of offerings, facilities and persistence data in the determination of requirements and expectations and for planning purposes, marketing and improvements. The comment basically says that the applicant is doing well in listening and learning directly from students and stakeholders; it isn't using other possible sources of information to help it plan new or improve existing programs.

OFI 3 focuses on the lack of clarity around listening and learning methods aimed at students in "pockets of poverty" – a key strategic challenge.

OFIs not included:

As you can see from the section titled "OFI's not included" on the draft Item worksheet, some of the OFIs were not included because they conflicted with strengths, they were beyond the Criteria, or were prescriptive.

OFIs not used/why:

"Not clear how segments are determined" - conflicts with strength #1.

"Segments don't include receiving schools, and contacts with local colleges limited" – prescriptive

"Prospective students are not targeted for educational programs" – Criteria don't require educational programs that are specifically aimed at the prospective student segment.

"Students served by other educational providers, e.g., private school students, are not evident in determination of student segments" – conflicts with strength #1

"No evidence that PDSA considers impact on other processes of changes in the SSRD process" – goes beyond the Criteria.

Needing resolution: One area where there was disagreement was whether students of other providers (private school and home schooled students are adequately covered by the listening/learning methods for determining requirements. I decided to include them as part of the 3.1a1 strength, giving the benefit of the doubt.

Proposed Site Visit Issues – I propose three SVIs that basically cover all of the strengths and OFIs.

- The first verifies the steps, deployment, and use of information from the Segmentation Process and the Student and Stakeholder Requirements Determination process. Clarify how the applicant determines the relative importance of stakeholder requirements.
- The second SVI clarifies how the applicant uses information related to utilization of offerings, facilities, and services and persistence/voluntary departure/transfer in planning of educational programs, offerings, services, marketing, etc.
- The third SVI clarifies how the applicant listens and learns to determine the expectations and requirements of students in "pockets of poverty."

Proposed Scoring Range

Based on the comments, I am proposing the 50-65% range. The applicant's approaches seems to meet the multiple requirements of the Item in its systematic approaches for determining student segments (Student Segmentation Process), determining student and stakeholder requirements (Student and Stakeholder Requirements Process), and for keeping those approaches current; and the approaches and the information from them appear to used throughout the district in curriculum and instructional planning. This would lead to the 70-

85% range. However, the applicant has some opportunities for improvement, particularly in 3.1a2, to improve the robustness of its approach for determining requirements and expectations – especially in the way it determines relative importance of requirements and the way it uses information that does not come from its direct listening and learning methods. There is also a question about the integration of these approaches with organizational needs, especially regarding its strategic challenge of the students in “pockets of poverty.” Thus, I am proposing the 50-65% range, but at the top of that range.