POLK COUNTY - RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIRST YEAR 2011-2012
RTTT DISTRICT-DEVELOPED ASSESSMENTS FOR HARD-TO-MEASURE PERFORMING ARTS

Polk Project C: Performing Arts 1 – 530-RA211-2C001
Polk Project D: Performing Arts 2 – 530-RA211-2C002

POLK COUNTY - RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIRST YEAR 2011-2012

RTTT District-Developed Assessments for Hard-To-Measure Performing Arts

Polk Project C: Performing Arts 1 – 530-RA211-2C001
Polk Project D: Performing Arts 2 – 530-RA211-2C002

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The primary advisory bodies for the Polk County RTTT Projects C and D effort are the Performing Fine Arts Steering Task Force (PFASTF) and the Leadership Team. The Steering Task Force is a group of 20 music, dance, and drama education leaders from 15 counties, representing the diverse geographic regions and people of the state of Florida. The Leadership Team for this project consists of six individuals – Beth Cummings, Polk County Schools, Project Coordinator; Mary Grace Gordon, Polk County Schools, Project Manager; Dr. Timothy S. Brophy, University of Florida, Assessment Development Coordinator; Dr. John Seybert, Southeastern University, Performance Assessment Coordinator; Dr. Al Holcomb, Westminster College of the Arts at Rider University, Project Evaluator; Madalyn Walton, Polk County Schools, Project Supervisor for drama and dance; Dr. Kathleen Sanz, Tallahassee, Florida Music Educators Association Executive Director; and David Lewis, Polk County Schools Associate Superintendent for Learning, Project Director.

At a Steering Task Force and Leadership Team meeting on October 21, 2011, in Lakeland, Florida, participants were divided into four teams and asked to provide their assessment of potential risks and their proposed solutions for mitigating those risks. This draft report presents a summary of their work. The risk areas represent common concerns among the four breakout groups. These areas have been reviewed by the Leadership Team.

RISKS AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS		
	Probability of Risk Occurring *(High – H, Medium – M, Low – L)*	**Impact on the Project** *(High – H, Medium – M, Low – L)*
RISK 1. DATA LOSS.	**M**	**H**
Data – items, documents, results, etc. - are housed in various locations and could be lost due to hard-drive failure, outside incursion, power surge, weather or fire damage, or other unexpected circumstance.		
SOLUTIONS. Back up data daily, ensure secure sites and protected access.		
RISK 2. ITEM SECURITY.	**M**	**H**
Items are confidential and protected materials. They are at risk of being released without permission, or stolen. Plagiarism is a concern.		
SOLUTIONS. Writers/Reviewers should not be able to print what they write; writers should not be able to print screen or print their items from the computers they are using. Writers and Reviewers must sign a Security agreement, including verbiage about plagiarism. Another solution is to only use dedicated computers whose IP addresses are recognizable by the software program. We should use a remote server with a secure, password protected website for item writing/reviewing.		
RISK 3. WRITER/REVIEWER ATTRITION.	**M**	**H**
Because this is a three-year project, we anticipate that there will writers and reviewers who leave the project due to normal attrition.		
SOLUTIONS. We proposed to train replacements or alternates at the January 2012 training, in addition selected writers/reviewers. We propose to maintain a substitute applicant pool & prepare virtual instructional modules for training individuals who join the project after the on-site training sessions. We also recommend that the selected body of writer/reviewers receive positive encouragement from the Leadership Team and support as needed. Personal contacts from the consultants are also recommended.		

RISK 4. WRITER/REVIEWER QUALITY AND REPRESENTATION.	M	H
We anticipate that some of our writer/reviewers may not be able to produce the quality of work we anticipated at the time of application screening and selection. We also recognize that our writer/reviewer pool must be representative of the state's geographic and demographic diversity, as well as the professional sub-specialties within the arts.		
SOLUTIONS. We have already communicated via an "email blast" to all members of the state's music (FMEA), theatre (FATE) and dance (FDEO) professional organizations, all of the district Dance/Music/Theatre Supervisors, FOIL *(Florida Organization of Instructional Leadership)* and FASA (Florida Association of School Administrators). If needed, we can extend our application deadline and conduct targeted applicant recruitment based on the results of the first round of applications due November 6. Our website is up and running. To stimulate applications, we plan add FAQs page, as well as language that makes the work involved "doable" by a broad cross section of our profession. Writer and reviewer quality can be further screened via additional means including, but not limited to phone interviews with the applicants and their recommending administrator. If a writer or reviewer does not meet our quality requirements after additional support, we will replace that individual with a qualified substitute.		

RISK 5. WRITER/REVIEWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.	H	H
We anticipate a need for ongoing writer/reviewer professional development, especially since many arts teachers are just becoming familiar with the NGSSS's for the arts.		
SOLUTIONS. We plan webinars to address specific professional development needs, particularly related to the NGSSS's and assisting with time management. The January training will address this issue.		

RISK 6. MECHANICS OF FAIR/CONSISTENT SCORING OF PERFORMANCE-BASED ITEMS.	H	H
We anticipate that the fair, consistent scoring of performance-based items will require a specialized methodology, and this will have to be developed within the constraints of the project budget and DOE approved procedures for sampling. For example, ballet has two schools – French & Russian; string players have multiple correct fingerings that are taught across Florida – we want to make sure that students multiple answers are counted as correct. What is the set Statewide curriculum?		
SOLUTIONS. At this early stage, we anticipate that we will need to select and train specialized Performing Arts Assessment Audit teams to assess a sample of our performance results. To do this, we must build in resources for scoring test items. Also, we will ensure that writers cannot score/review their own test items. The January training should address this issue.		
RISK 7. CHANGES IN LEGISLATURE, CHANGES IN EOC (END OF COURSE) REQUIREMENTS.	M	M
SOLUTIONS. The only solution we can offer to this anticipated risk is to be ready to work with the FLDOE closely to accommodate legislative and EOC changes.		
RISK 8. A CONSULTANT IS NOT ABLE TO CONTINUE WITH THE PROJECT	L	L
SOLUTIONS. The Project Evaluator will make a recommendation for a replacement. The project is considering expanding our pool of consultants by January 2012.		
RISK 9. CONFORMING TO TRADITIONAL ACADEMIA FOR PERFORMING FINE ARTS	H	H
SOLUTIONS. One purpose of studying the arts is to expand possibilities, to encourage more than one "right" answer, to develop something new. Develop more open-ended test items.		

RISK 10. TEACHERS PRESSURED TO TEACH WHAT IS TESTED	M	H
SOLUTIONS. Streamline as much as possible to show growth, not necessarily conformity.		
RISK 11. ASSESSMENT IN A PERFORMING FINE ARTS CLASSROOM THAT IS ONLY PAPER AND PENCIL	M	H
SOLUTIONS. Research creative ways to assess students performance connected to creating and performing benchmarks**.**		

SPECIFIC INPUT FROM THE STF TEAMS

TEAM 1

1. Loss of Data.
    - Various locations where data is stored.
    - Back up data daily.

2. Attrition of Writer/Reviewers.
    - Training of Replacements or alternates at the January training.
    - Maintain substitute applicant pool & online instructional modules for training.

3. Item Security.
    - Writers/Reviewers not able to print what they write.
    - Security agreement.
    - Dedicated computers or software program.
    - Remote server.
    - Secure website for item writing/reviewing.
    - Tie computer to Writer and/or Reviewer computer IP address.
    - Software that stops "print" or no "print screen" possibility.

4. Mechanics of fair/consistent scoring of performance-based items.

- Audit teams
- Build in resources for scoring test items
- Writers cannot score/review their own test item

TEAM 2

5. Personal Overload
   - Personal connection between Task Force and consultants.
   - Positive Encouragement from leadership.
   - Checks and balances from the content leaders on the Task Force.

6. What if the STF chooses an applicant and they turn out to be unqualified to be a Writer/Reviewer?
   - Personal screening of applicants prior to getting them on board.

7. Follow through & retention (drop-out)
   - Personal screening of applicants prior to getting them on board.

8. Balance between teachers with various skills; perspectives & experiences as well as Urban vs. Suburban vs. Rural
   - Time extension – possibly extend application timeline and communicate to various component organizations.
   - Communicate to ALL disciplines, the importance and necessity for educators to join our efforts

9. Representation of all demographics and socioeconomic areas
   - Time extension – possibly extend application timeline and communicate to various component organizations.
   - Communicate to ALL disciplines, the importance and necessity for educators to join our efforts

10. Ballet has two schools – French & Russian. String players have fingering that may be different depending on the teacher – the fingering is still correct. How will the test item be written so that it is correct for all students?
    - This issue should be addressed in the January training.

TEAM 3

11. How to keep word out
    - Keep e-Blast coming weekly

12. Application may make people think they are not qualified

- Clarify that assessment happens everyday in classroom.

13. Concern about time commitment
    - Need to communicate clear understanding of time.

14. Concern about the magnitude of the project
    - Website language that makes it seem achievable.
    - Include FAQs page addressing various concerns.

15. Lack of familiarity of new standards
    - Professional development during training dates – breaking down the standards.
    - January Training.

16. What if the Writers/Reviewers cannot make the January training but they are not good writers?
    - Videotape training.
    - Provide webinar.
    - Web based training.

17. Are the January dates mandatory? How will it be made up? Can they apply anyway?
    - Videotape training.
    - Provide webinar.
    - Web based training.

TEAM 4
18. Number of applicants too large. Amount of time to review applications. Amount of quality applicants.
    - Instead of evaluating all applications split into more manageable groups.
    - If there are too few applicants, the STF could directly ask more people in their school district.

19. Consistency of team writing & reviewing. More people per benchmark.
    - Additional people per benchmark or alternate writing/review list.
    - Reviewers will be trained in January to look for consistency.

20. Changes in legislature, changes in EOC (end of course) requirements

- No solutions offered

21. Software costs to schools.
    - Make paper/pencil tests available to schools.

22. Time and cost to administer tests
    - SmartMusic may be able to offer some solutions to this issue.

23. One purpose of studying the arts is to expand possibilities, to encourage more than one "right" answer, to develop something new. We are starting the project by designing a test that is like the other tests. I can see that we are looking to the future to develop more open ended test, perhaps, with the create and perform items. I am concerned that we are conforming to traditional academia instead of bringing new ideas to the table.

    Writing for each benchmark separately is a concern. There is no format available to encourage one performance or response that could cover more than one benchmark.

    Most of all, I am concerned for the students. They are tested a great deal throughout the year. Now, they will have more tests. I would love to see us streamline as much as possible to show growth, not necessarily conformity. I fear that teachers will be pressured to teach what is tested formally and the creative, open-minded, problem solving artist we are helping to develop now will not be valued and nurtured.

    That said, I do not have an immediate solution to offer the writers, but I think it is important that we look at ways to assess most of what is happening in the classroom without paper and pencil tests.