

**Summary of Meeting of Co-Chairs of Quality of Education Committee
Monday, March 26, 2007 and 8:30 AM**

Present: Deb Gillespie, Bill Bender, Wayne Gersen and Marjorie Rose

1. Procedures for requests from subcommittee for information on SAU schools current assessments

The superintendent and co-chairs discussed ways to interface with the schools in order to fill gaps in information on current assessments that members of the subcommittees may have. The concern was that multiple requests from different committee members might create a burden and overwhelm the administration and schools staff. It was decided that requests for information would be channeled through the SAU 70 superintendent's office who would forward the requests to the relevant principals. It would be useful to have the requests be specific and in writing. Wayne would let the QEC members know how long the response would take based on the current workloads of the school staff. It was recognized that a face-to-face meeting may be more efficient in certain circumstances. Wayne was planning on discussing this issue with the principals in a meeting next week.

2. Procedures for requests from subcommittee for information on comparator schools outside SAU 70

As regards information on assessments from outside the SAU 70 school district, the co-chairs believed that it would make sense to use the same set of comparators for all three subcommittees. Wayne would provide subcommittee members with a list of school districts he drew from the Menchick study that was commissioned several years ago. Information requests should be channeled through the Superintendent's office and each subcommittee should designate one person to compile all such requests from the subcommittee. It was noted that some of the comparisons, particularly regarding financial data, would not be relevant given differences in cost of living indicators between our district and district in more affluent areas. Wayne suggested that we investigate using an economic index referenced by Hanover Treasurer Bill Brown, which may provide some information on how to adjust the financial data for differences in cost of living.

3. Revised Time-line for QEC work

It was recognized that the initial time line was unrealistic, given the scope of the QEC work. A revised timetable was discussed and suggested:

Timetable

- April 26: Subcommittee provide interim reports on work to date of status of subcommittee work including: findings to date, next steps and lingering questions.
- May 3: Full QEC meeting to discuss subcommittee interim reports
- May 7: QEC Status report providing interim summary of findings to date sent to SAU Board
- May 14: SAU Board Meeting: The QEC would present the interim report

4. **Procedures and guidelines for sharing and providing information on the QEC and subcommittee work**

The chairs discussed procedures for sharing specific types of information from the QEC and the subcommittees. It was understood that the following information should be posted on the SAU/QEC website: (i) Meetings times and locations for the QEC and subcommittees; (ii) the minutes of the meetings; (iii) the composition of the membership. The issue of too many emails was raised and the need for clear guidelines for which of these emails need to be shared with the entire QEC or between QEC subcommittees. Our group felt that issue needed to be discussed in depth with the entire committee.

5. **Clarification on the use of QEC data**

In order to build trust and consensus among the various constituencies of the QEC, the co-chairs felt it was important to clarify how the board intended to use the information in the forthcoming QEC report on assessments. While further work was needed in this area, the co-chairs agreed to work on a summary statement to help guide the process in this area. They hoped to release a statement for consideration of the full committee in the near future.

The co-chairs felt that Margaret Caldwell's statement at an earlier QEC meeting--- that the QEC should "work to make transparent the workings and complexities of our schools, celebrate our achievements and help them get better"--- would serve as an effective summary of how we plan to use the data.

6. **Parent Surveys**

The issue of future parent surveys was discussed. The co-chairs felt that the use of some outside third party with professional experience in survey design and analysis was potentially valuable in strengthening the process and moving it forward to become a routine and valuable part of the SAU assessment program.