

Powell, Shannon

From: Kammerud, Jennifer DPI [Jennifer.Kammerud@dpi.wi.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2012 9:48 AM
To: Brickman, Michael - DOA; Archibald, Sarah; Kulow, Chris; Kestell, Steve; Olsen, Luther
Cc: Justman, Jessica C - DPI; Thompson, Michael DPI; Evers, Anthony S DPI; Liedl, Kimberly - GOV; Grant, Peter
Subject: RE: DPI Response to Accountability Draft

Dear All,

DPI's consistent position has been that, in order to have a single statewide accountability system, schools receiving public dollars that are deemed to be among the persistently lowest performing in the state require aggressive state intervention/oversight to turn around performance, or closure/removal from the program. Our positions in the Design Team, in our waiver proposal, and in our Quad Chair discussions, have always been in line with that goal.

We take issue with the claim that DPI held a position that "set very different standards for different types of schools." We have maintained our position that all schools in a single statewide accountability system should face aggressive state intervention/oversight or closure/removal from the program, which is a position that was shared by the majority of the Design Team members. During our Design Team discussions, it was made clear by choice and charter representatives that they had concerns with state interventions for their school types, given the different nature and regulatory environment of their schools. In an effort to try to meet these concerns, we proposed to the Quad Chairs and thought we reached consensus on the performance agreement option, whereby the state would not direct the diagnostic review and interventions, but rather would leave those activities to the schools and set the performance benchmarks schools would be required to meet. This option, we believe, responds to the issues being raised by the choice and charter schools, without compromising needed, consistent accountability among all publicly-funded schools.

As we've stated before, DPI is opposed to a soft approach of allowing a choice or charter school that is persistently low performing to continue to operate without any state interventions or performance oversight after being identified. This is inconsistent with, and significantly more lenient than, the interventions being proposed for public schools. In the interest of the children who attend these schools, and the public that funds them, we will continue to oppose options where the state has no role in or oversight of the performance of persistently low performing schools of any type.

Finally, we are very concerned with the fact that, after we pulled together the State Superintendent, Senator Olsen, and Representative Kestell, along with the Governor's office staff in what all agreed was a decision-making meeting, positions are changing after your side meetings with the choice and charter groups only. To portray now "the need to have decision makers in the room to reach consensus once and for all", but to include only the State Superintendent, the staff to the Ed Chairs and the Governor's office, and the choice and charter lobbyists in that request as the "decisions makers" in our view is wrong. If we are no longer going to honor agreements made in the spirit of the consensus of the Design Team, then we should consult with all of the Design Team members individually on these proposals, not just select interest groups (i.e. choice and charter).

Please let us know if there is a different proposal to which you'd like our response. Since it does not appear that we are at a place where we can advance anything that accurately represents the work of the Design Team, and unless there is a new proposal to which you want our response, we do not see the need to meet. We are not going to support something just to say we did it. That would not be the right thing to do by our schools, our students and their parents, or our communities.

We will still work with you on the other three issues, if you desire, and, to that end, would support Option A as noted in your email.

Jennifer

-----Original Message-----

From: Brickman, Michael - DOA [mailto:Michael.Brickman@wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 7:38 PM
To: Kammerud, Jennifer DPI; Archibald, Sarah - LEGIS; Kulow, Chris; Kestell, Steve; Olsen, Luther
Cc: Justman, Jessica C. DPI; Thompson, Michael DPI; Evers, Anthony S DPI; Liedl, Kimberly - GOV; Grant, Peter
Subject: RE: DPI Response to Accountability Draft

All,

I think we need to act in the interest of moving forward. This process has been about steadily working toward a greater level of understanding and agreement. The document you referenced was an evolutionary step in the right direction and was a major leap forward from the previous DPI position that set very different standards for different types of schools. It was made very clear on all sides, however, that your document did not represent a final endorsement by anyone.

On this issue, our office's position has consistently been (and DPI has expressed support for this as well) to treat all schools fairly. The choice and charter schools, despite a shaky relationship with DPI, desire to be held accountable. As they have expressed to all of us, they want only to have a few safeguards in place. They ask for this not to protect the worst of the worst but to ensure that while DPI intervention may look a bit different depending on the type of school in question, the intervention will be triggered by similarly poor performance. These schools, rightly or wrongly, feel DPI may not hold them to the same standards as public schools - we must assure them of fairness. Giving nervous schools (including public schools) a bit of reassurance when we are talking about such stringent and very new accountability measures around a system that has not yet even been built simply seems like the right thing to do.

We have not endorsed the choice and charter proposals nor are we saying DPI's proposal is quite there either. We simply feel the need to have decision makers in the room to reach consensus once and for all. Certainly we have talked about these issues before but we are much further down the road now, are talking about enacting law rather than writing a report, and are at a fairly defining moment for the future of these systems we have all worked so hard to develop together.

For these reasons, I would suggest a meeting tomorrow with the Superintendent, representatives from choice and charter schools, and our normal staff group to resolve these issues.

If you are unwilling to meet, I believe that may leave us able only to pursue one of the following two options:

- A) Introduce a bill this week creating the public-private partnership for Read to Lead and a separate bill encompassing our agreements on the other Read to Lead items as well as educator effectiveness and hold off on school accountability, including increased authority for the superintendent, until a future date.
- B) Implement only the provisions of school accountability that require legislation now and include these provisions for introduction this week along with option A). This would include the data requirements, a requirement to make the report card public, and an overview of the components of the report card (We seemed to have agreement here previously). We would follow this up with further legislation dealing with accountability once we know how the system would truly operate.

Michael

From: Kammerud, Jennifer DPI [Jennifer.Kammerud@dpi.wi.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 4:18 PM
To: Archibald, Sarah - LEGIS; Brickman, Michael - DOA; Kulow, Chris - LEGIS; Kestell, Steve - LEGIS; Olsen, Luther - LEGIS
Cc: Justman, Jessica C - DPI; Thompson, Michael DPI; Evers, Anthony S DPI; Liedl,

Kimberly - GOV; Grant, Peter - LEGIS
Subject: RE: DPI Response to Accountability Draft

The document we advanced was not only DPI's position, but reflected the agreements reached in the meeting that the State Superintendent had with Sen. Olsen, Rep. Kestell, and the Governor's staff. Once again, the attached document was the proposal that was written up as a summary of the meeting, which is why we sent this out to the design team under that same premise.

Tony needs to know if the position of Sen. Olsen, Rep. Kestell, and the Governor's office has now changed from what's reflected in this attached document to positions being advanced by School Choice Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Charter Schools Association. He is not inclined to backtrack from agreed upon positions. We are not supportive of exempting choice and charter schools from that system.

Tony is not interested in meeting if we are going to be rehashing positions that he feels were already agreed to earlier by all the principals.

Jennifer

From: Archibald, Sarah [mailto:Sarah.Archibald@legis.wisconsin.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 4:11 PM
To: Archibald, Sarah; Kammerud, Jennifer DPI; Brickman, Michael - DOA; Kulow, Chris; Kestell, Steve; Olsen, Luther
Cc: Justman, Jessica C. DPI; Thompson, Michael DPI; Evers, Anthony S DPI; Liedl, Kimberly - GOV; Grant, Peter
Subject: RE: DPI Response to Accountability Draft

In the interest of moving forward in the absence of a response on this issue, Peter is going to work on drafting using the document DPI brought to the meeting (labeled 115.38), WITH THE EXCEPTION of 4 a and b, which will not be included at this point, for which we will work out a compromise at the meeting I've proposed that we have tomorrow with the legislators, choice and state superintendent.

From: Archibald, Sarah
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 3:29 PM
To: 'Kammerud, Jennifer DPI'; Brickman, Michael - DOA; Kulow, Chris; Kestell, Steve; Olsen, Luther
Cc: Justman, Jessica C - DPI; Thompson, Michael DPI; Evers, Anthony S DPI; Liedl, Kimberly - GOV
Subject: RE: DPI Response to Accountability Draft

All,

Thank you for your clear response to our proposal.

We are willing to consider school accountability legislation that lays out the system, but we feel strongly that DPI needs to be willing to reach a compromise on choice and charter, as we have compromised on numerous issues. As you know, we held a meeting last Thursday where they laid out a proposal, and what Mike came back with was "we like what we had in the draft school accountability draft." When we said that we needed movement in our direction or we didn't want to put the system into legislation at all, DPI comes back with this as a response.

I met with Jim Bender and Terry Brown this afternoon. They are preparing their testimony for Thursday. I think we need to have a discussion tomorrow (Tuesday) that includes Tony. We can't continue to have meetings where a decision can't be made. One of the goals of our new school accountability system was to include all types of schools that receive taxpayer money. We are in danger of falling short of that (for the waiver, for the report, and for the legislation) if we don't come to some agreement very shortly.

Thanks,
Sarah

From: Kammerud, Jennifer DPI [mailto:Jennifer.Kammerud@dpi.wi.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2012 2:58 PM
To: Brickman, Michael - DOA; Archibald, Sarah; Kulow, Chris
Cc: Justman, Jessica C - DPI; Thompson, Michael DPI; Evers, Anthony S DPI; Liedl, Kimberly - GOV
Subject: DPI Response to Accountability Draft

Sarah, Chris, and Michael,

The State Superintendent will oppose accountability legislation that fails to establish a single, statewide accountability system that applies to all publicly-funded schools in the state. An accountability system is much more than a report card or reporting requirements under s. 115.38. It is a system of identification, supports, rewards and interventions that can be used to drive improvements to school and student performance. This includes the state superintendent's ability to intervene in our persistently lowest performing schools and school districts. These elements are essential to any legislation surrounding accountability, and were the foundations of our Design Team's work, as you know.

We have offered a framework for legislation that applies to all public, charter, and choice schools in response to LRB 3740/2. While we are open to changes to that proposal, we believe that framework, coupled with the agreements that the State Superintendent, Senator Olsen, Rep. Kestell, and the Governor's office reached during a recent meeting on intervening in low performing schools, is much more representative of the accountability system that the State Superintendent, and all of your principals, signed onto at the beginning of the School and District Accountability Design Team process (see attached op-ed).

We believe we have agreement on the kindergarten literacy screener, and have a few remaining issues to work out on educator effectiveness and the Read to Lead Council. We will not, however, support the accountability draft as written in LRB 3740/2 or discussed under your proposal today to substitute an accountability system for reporting requirements for choice schools. As such, if the intent remains that this will be one legislative proposal, DPI would oppose the bill on the grounds described above. If you want to continue working on the other three drafts as separate pieces of legislation that do not address school and district accountability, we would be happy to do so. If you would like to revisit creation of an accountability system, please let me know.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kammerud
Legislative Liaison
Department of Public Instruction
125 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53707
(608) 266-7073 - jennifer.kammerud@dpi.wi.gov

<http://dpi.wi.gov>

[cid:image001.png@01CC4ACE.39CB87A0] [cid:image001.jpg@01CCDF6A.77CE7BD0] <<http://facebook.com/WisDPI>> [cid:image002.png@01CC4ACE.39CB87A0] [cid:image002.jpg@01CCDF6A.77CE7BD0] <<http://twitter.com/WisconsinDPI>> [cid:image003.png@01CC4ACE.39CB87A0] [cid:image003.jpg@01CCDF6A.77CE7BD0] <<http://youtube.com/WisconsinDPI>> [cid:image004.png@01CC4ACE.39CB87A0] [cid:image004.jpg@01CCDF6A.77CE7BD0] <<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/eis/newsfeeds.html>> [cid:image005.gif@01CC4ACE.39CB87A0] [cid:image005.jpg@01CCDF6A.77CE7BD0] <<http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/e-lists/index.html>>