

ESSA Implementation Committee Meeting

October 2, 2020
8:45 a.m. -12:10 p.m.
Zoom

Facilitator: Laurie Matzke

Note taker: Lisa Johnson

Minutes

Agenda Item: Welcome – Superintendent Baesler

Presenter: Superintendent Baesler

Discussion: The ESSA Implementation committee has calibrated North Dakota's plan since 2016-2017. Superintendent Baesler reiterated the importance of the ESSA Implementation Committee continuing to meet. The continuing conversation about improving teaching and learning is important. The current environment is an opportunity to reimagine education in our work on student engagement, assessment, and accountability.

If change is going to happen, how school performance is measured needs to change as well. One question to consider in this discussion is how our accountability systems can be used to drive the change we want to see in schools. Another question to consider is how home-school relationships can be strengthened. Going forward, Supt. Baesler suggested that despite potential changes in the administration on a national level, the committee should be poised to make improvements and changes.

Assistant Superintendent Laurie Matzke stated it is beneficial to have the core group working on the ESSA plan. There are educational challenges related to the pandemic. Today's meeting provides an opportunity to start a conversation about these challenges.

Asst. Supt. Laurie Matzke highlighted the funding opportunities which are available to North Dakota schools this year. There was an increase in federal funding this year in addition to COVID-19 related funding packages. The ESSER funds of \$33 million went out in May and are meant to address educational needs related to the pandemic. The Corps funds will enable districts to hire staff. A future COVID package probably won't happen until after the presidential election. Hopefully, the next COVID package will be determined by late fall or early winter.

Regarding future plans for the ESSA Implementation committee, we hope to have another ESSA meeting in December of 2020. We will have a better idea about funding in the federal landscape at that time.

Agenda Item: Changes to Student Engagement Survey

Presenter: Steve Snow

Discussion: Discussed updates to student engagement. The student roster needs to be submitted by December 1, 2020. Cognia has been providing online support; questions can also be directed to Steve Snow or Joe Kolosky. The goal is 95% participation in the survey, but districts will not be penalized if they don't reach this goal. The survey considers distance learning. Looking at at-home, hybrid, and in school modes of learning. The survey can be taken at home if needed.

Breakout Room Comments: Lodee: we want to make sure all students participate, including those who are at home when the survey happens. Group felt the Jan.-Feb. timeline would be fine. Interested to see the differences in outcome due to changed time of survey. Brenda: wondering if there would be some sort of distinction in connectedness. Amanda: group felt this area could be changed on the chart. Felt the piece of the pie was disproportionate. Stan: question regarding differences between old survey and new survey and this coloring comparisons between years. Stef: concerns about completing the survey and reaching the 95% participation goal. Concerns about relevancy of questions on survey. Jim: no further updates. Lea: questions regarding pilot survey, what those results might look like. Length of survey-did survey questions change across all grade levels. Will there be a dip in the engagement survey due to the changed learning environment?

Agenda Item: School Climate Subcommittee

Presenter: Jim Upgren

Discussion: School climate and engagement is 20% of the pie chart for high school and 30% for elementary. There has been discussion about changing the breakout for climate and engagement; this could be done without having to make updates to the ESSA plan. There was a June 2 subcommittee meeting with Cognia. Cognia described different ways to provide a school climate survey. They will do this if we go with the survey developed by Cognia. The ESSA committee would have an opportunity to provide feedback to Cognia in the development of this survey. Cognia is not able to provide a survey which covers both engagement and school climate. Cognia is able to link the surveys so they could be completed at the same time. Cognia described how they could measure school culture and school climate. Three decisions made at Sept. 3 subcommittee meeting which will be put up for a vote: 1) Commit to working with Cognia to create a school climate survey that will be used for ESSA accountability purposes. 2) Use ONLY our elements of school climate, and not measure school culture with the survey. 3) Give each school the choice of whether to administer school climate and student engagement back to back, or give on separate days. The recommendation to

the full ESSA Committee is that we work with Cognia for the design and implementation of a school climate survey to be used for accountability purposes.

Q & A:

- 1) This is two surveys; can it be combined into one survey?

A: No. Cognia stated that because of the psychometrics, this cannot be done. The surveys can be linked, but they cannot be combined.

- 2) When we do an engagement review every five years, is this part of the results?

A: Jim – we asked Cognia if they can share the standards for student engagement. Cognia was not able to share that information with us. Jeff Fastnacht: can we use the tools we already have rather than utilize an engagement survey? This information is already being collected in some of the districts' other processes. Greg Carlson: Cognia stated it would not be valid or appropriate to use the climate survey for accountability. It would have to be a yearly measurement. These items were developed for different purposes and processes. Luke Schaefer: comment regarding using perception and engagement surveys. If we use perception data for school climate, should we be looking at school engagement in the flesh? Cautioned against using an additional perception survey. Laurie Matzke: On next discussion, she suggested group members vote, and make recommendations for next steps. Luke Schaefer: is there an opportunity to look at other vendors? Laurie Matzke stated that committee members are welcome to make recommendations to look for a different vendor. Jim Upgren: the committee welcomes input from the larger group to look at options for the future. There was some general discussion about whether changing vendors is something the committee wants to consider. There were comments about some of the frustrations with Cognia. Some of the drawbacks of switching vendors were laid out. Vote: do we commit to going with Cognia to do the school climate survey? Is the committee going to look at options for other vendors?

Breakout room comments: Kirsten Baesler made comments to the committee to reiterate Laurie Matzke's comments that the option of looking at other providers is an option. The focus of the committee is to provide the best options to North Dakota schools. Joe Kolosky: Joe's group voted to take all of the information from the larger committee and go to the subcommittee to look at other options. Brenda: no recommendations to look at another vendor for all areas. Recommended to look at another tool for the PCBL process. Amanda: 4 no votes. No to sight unseen. Recommendation to go back to the subcommittee. Recommendation to look at our university system to see if something could be developed in state. Stan: 3 no votes. Recommendation to take some information to subcommittee. Stefanie: voted to support subcommittee. Jim: group voted no. Concerns with not being able to see survey. Aimee

expressed sentiment about finding a survey that accurately reflects what is going on in the schools. Lea Kugel: shared the comments put forth within the small group. The majority of the group voted “no”. Laurie Matzke summed up by saying it appears the consensus is to not move forward with adding climate. We will give the subcommittee all of the feedback provided at today’s meeting.

Agenda Item: Dashboard – Phases V and VI

Presenter: Ross Roemmich

Discussion: Insights Dashboard – Phase V. This is not an accountability release. NDDPI will not be administering school points nor identifying schools for targeted or comprehensive support. Ross went over the timeline for Insights. Data which will be reported on Insights for 2019-2020 will be: school support status, school results for student engagement, EL language learner growth, etc. Phase VI: NDDPI will identify new schools for targeted and comprehensive support, schools will be ranked, reporting will be released in mid-August, public report published in September. New visualizations will be included on Insights.

Breakout room comments: Joe: helps schools in preparing in planning by being able to see what other schools are doing. Brenda: who is using the site, who is aware of the site, how does this affect what is put on the sight? Felt indicators can be lagging. Amanda: thought people should share what the dashboard is capable of. Stan: talked about advertising; how do we get the word out? Stefanie: good comments about Dashboard being user friendly; very appreciative. Jim: his group echoed the other groups’ comments. Lea: counselors are using the sight to research the students in individual schools. Lodee: her group echoed some of the same sentiments.

Agenda Item: Assessment During a Pandemic

Presenter: Stan Schauer

Discussion: Secretary DeVos’ letter: do not count on another waiver for assessments. Assessments might look different this year. Cambia is looking at a remote testing option. This will be within the same test delivery system. Students will be able to interact with the proctor during testing. Training will be available for administrators and students. Discussion about remote testing for the ACT. This is an ongoing process. WIDA will not offer a remote option. Still looking at flexibilities. NAEP – no remote option; flexibilities are being offered. GED – remote testing is an option. Pearson Vue testing option is available at no cost to the students. There is a process for a parent to remove a student from testing if they so desire.

Breakout room comments: Lea: questions about time limit changes; can the teacher proctor the whole class at once? Concern about reaching 95% participation rate. Question about NAEP – what if schools go to distance learning? How will the test be administered? Stan: the test windows are the same and they can be seen on the website. Stan doesn't know what will happen regarding the 95% participation rate. Jim: appreciates the flexibility and the remote options. Stefanie: discussion on the struggle for homeschools; they do have the option to opt out of testing. Assessment is a hard sell for some of these families due to the struggles related to distance learning. Stan: liked having the option of Cambium. There is time to train teachers and become comfortable with delivery system. Amanda: questions about proctor role and what that will look like. Brenda: flexibility and grace. Is the validity still there due to present conditions? How will quarantining affect testing and how it is administered? Vendors – what are the expectations; what can we expect? Stan: if we leave the consortium, we would not be able to test this year. Quarantine: test window March – May. Lodee: how are we making sure students are getting appropriate access? Will students do their best work if the tests are taken at home? Stan: access is an issue in North Dakota; options are being considered. Engagement: we would need to look at data; we don't currently have this. Joe: validity issues with MAP testing earlier in the year. Results: are test results more valid due to increased computer skills? There are concerns about students who don't have access to technology; how do we prevent them from falling behind?

Agenda Item: Accountability in 2020-2021

Presenter: Stan Schauer/Greg Carlson

Discussion: Stan Schauer: 3 main points coming out of the discussion about proposed changes to accountability chart. Greg Carlson: the accountability index uses assessment results to calculate Student Growth Values. Some concerns about the formula are being addressed through the following proposals. Option 1: split proposed growth points by splitting evenly by subjects ELA and math; or Option 2: split proposed growth points evenly by subjects ELA and math.

Breakout room comments: Joe: his group voted to take out one of the "Achievements". Greg Carlson explained how doing this would affect the rest of the chart. The change would depend on where the emphasis would like to be placed. Joe: his group suggested option 2. They are in support of the change. Lodee: yes to the suggested change. Brenda: are test measure valid since they are constantly changing? Amanda: felt a change would be positive. Focused on lowering the pie percentage for engagement. Stan: would removing the achievement from a high achieving school be a negative for the school? Greg thought this might impact the schools which are doing well in achievement, but only for the top schools. Stan's group voted yes for a change. Stefanie: agreed to a change. They trust in the data team to decide which one. Questions on state assessment being weighted so heavily. Discussion on interim

assessments. Jim: felt it was a good adjustment to make. Lea: agreed with minor changes. Felt option 2 would be best, would like to see numbers in the options first.

Agenda Item: ACT for Accountability

Presenter: Bonnie Weisz

Discussion: Bonnie shared statistics from Junior State Test 2020. State paid vouchers were given to juniors who were not able to test. The WorkKeys state testing window was extended until July 31. Districts and schools have received junior profile reports and data files which includes data from the March, June and July test dates. This will be the last year ACT provides paper test results. Bonnie shared percentages on WorkKeys test results. Some districts used the ACT in lieu of the NDSA in 10th grade. Statistics were shared about the number of districts who did this. Preparations are being made for ACT testing for the spring of 2021. ACT is not offering a remote option. Options were discussed to account for possible difficulties in testing administration.

Agenda Item: School Improvement/Strategy Maps

Presenter: Joe Kolosky/Mark Ehrmantraut

Discussion: Continuous School Improvement: per ESSA and NDCC all public schools must participate in a continuous improvement process. This requirement is met through the Cognia and eProve Strategies platform. Strategy maps are an output of the school improvement process. The improvement process has four phases: envisioning, planning, implementing, and evaluating. The logistics of the strategy maps are due June 1 of every year. This deadline was exempted this year. Updates and resubmits are due December 1 of each year. Mark Ehrmantraut: all schools have a continuous process to improve outcomes for students. Working to align the processes of improvement for special education and general education. The goal this year is to improve graduation rates for students with an emotional disturbance. Critical initiatives include increasing staff competency in creating effective functional behavior assessments. The process might look different for different districts, but the proposed outcomes are the same. Having a process which involves working together will improve outcomes.