ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes

Wednesday October 5, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM | State Capitol – Pioneer Room

Facilitator	Note Taker	Bucket Leader
Laurie Matzke	Shauna Greff	
Meeting Convened	**Meeting Adjourned**	**Breakout Room**
10:00 am		

Attendance Planning Committee Members

☐	Sonja Butenhoff	☒	Tracy Friesen	☐	Tracy Korsmo
☐	Aimee Copas	☒	Robert Grosz	☒	Wayne Kutzer
☒	Teresa Desai	☒	Cheryl Hagar	☐	Richard Rothaus
☒	Jeff Fastnacht	☒	Julie Jaeger	☒	L Anita Thomas
☒	Jennifer Fremstad	☐	Melanie Kathrein	☒	Russ Ziegler

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

☒	Lodee Arnold	☒	Lucy Fredericks	☐	Gerry Teevens
☐	Kirsten Baesler	☐	Greg Gallagher	☐	Rob Bauer
☒	Ann Ellefson	☒	Robert Marthaller	☒	Tammy Mayer
☒	Valerie Fischer	☒	Laurie Matzke	☒	Beth Larson-Steckler

Topic: Overview of Agenda	Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Welcome and introductions:
- Bob Gross representing Standards and Assessment
- Jeff Fastnacht representing Small Districts
- Jennifer Fremstad representing high school principals
- Cheryl Hagar representing Title I Targeted
- Teresa Desai representing Schoolwide
- Tracy Friesen representing Non-public schools
- Julie Jaeger representing ND Assn for Gifted Children
- Wayne Kutzer representing Career and Tech Ed
- Anita Thomas representing ND School Boards Assn
- Russ Zieger representing ND Council of Ed Leaders
- NDDPI employees introduced themselves

Topic: Data Collection & Reporting Recap	Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Dashboard is a summary:
Reveals and reflects the school/district/state's progress toward the vision for the state education system.
Report Card is more indepth:
Detailed information and data that serves as the compliance-reporting instrument in support of federal and state regulations.
Both must be publicly available and transparent.
Reviewed required key elements on Dashboard and Report Card.
Need to consider weight given to each element within accountability system.
Greater weight must be given to academic factors.

Topic: Accountability Indicators	Presenter: Heather Kinsey

Do we want to define Indicator types/levels?
Using asterisks will be beneficial.
Need to define in the plan and be clear.
Who is our audience?
Initial audience is accountability committee.
Use an asterisk with a clear definition so it's transparent.
Plan does not need to be a long plan that no one can understand.
Simple and clear would be beneficial so parents and everyone can understand.
How do we make it visually understandable with asterisks?
It should not be cumbersome.
Need to be able to define the elements that are in the calculation.
Need to categorize:
- what is on the dashboard
- what is required
- what is not required but we want included as useful

One-page direction or interpretation guide should be very simple and then also an in depth version.
Dashboards will be created for every individual school.
How do we compare if schools are all going to be different?
Comparative data is being used now along with individual data.
They need to be able to find their data easily and needs to be user friendly.
Need to keep the data simple.
Start with what we need and it can grow from there.
Still need to categorize.
Achievement, Data, Report Cards, EL and additional school qualify factors are all required and reported.
We have informally mentioned these but do we want to come up with definitions? Formalize criteria?
Circle back to that.
States are creating a framework; does ND want to do that?
Taking what we have been talking about and putting them into categories.
The indicators need to be detailed out and we need to define those.
The template is kind of a framework already.
Really need to dig in and apply definitions to the indicators:

- Measures and metrics, the ESSA requirement and how it applies to the improvement plan.

Laurie and Heather can create a framework based on our discussions after this meeting and bring back to this committee for input.

Because of time restraints, putting something together to bring back to the committee makes sense.

AdvancED has school quality factors that are directly linked and aligned with performance standards.

All schools in ND will be hearing and learning about – this is an organizing structure.

AdvancED has done research and background on this.

This may help in defining climate and culture and also school quality.

We should link back to this so there is a connection.

Does the group want to dive into definitions or prefer a first draft that is brought back to the group? Group input is fine but group drafting doesn't necessarily work well.

Elements we know are required:

- Achievement on state assessment
- Growth
- High school grad rates
- English Learners – score on access? Can be on growth and other factors.
- School quality indicators: Climate/Culture or Student engagement? Mold together or be just one?

Smarter Balance for one more year, so will need to use Spring of 2017 for first determination of these factors.

Is the group comfortable with the subgroup of ELs being the only subgroup taken into account?

This info will not be on the dashboard but is reported.

Need to decide what is reported and what is on the dashboard.

The dashboard can have a high level and then also dive deeper if more information is being searched for.

Do we as a group want to collect information on these subgroups and put on the dashboard?

Do we want to be accountable for this data being reported and part of our accountability?

Do we put all schools in this same predicament?

Are we only being held accountable for those students that can reach growth?

What do we need to do for accountability?

What do we need and want to have on the dashboard?

What is on the report card?

Focus today on accountability.

Achievement on state assessment.

What does the law require? Law required we report on all on the report card but states can decide which they can use for accountability –the only one required is ELs.

Not just schools' perception but also a parent's perception.

Accountability will still be required for Special Ed students?

Is it our choice which achievement data we use?

Do we set benchmarks? Which subgroup in each district is determining whether they meet that benchmark?

How much do we want to dictate at the state level what those levels are?

How much do we want to use for accountability?

We can still report but will this data be used for accountability?

NCLB was all in one bucket as a total – we don't need to do this anymore.

Need to be based on continuous improvement but not used for accountability.

Still need to report on dashboard because they are important even though they are not the triggers.

ESSA must identify schools for comprehensive support and targeted support.

Need to dig into this - comprehensive will be lowest performing.

Targeted will be high performing but lower performing subgroups.

Even though not an accountability factor but do fit into improvement status.

This would be accountability for the subgroups.

To be identified for these Comprehensive supports they must be Title I Schools.

Any school can be identified for Targeted support.

Some schools did not accept Title I funds so they would not be identified for improvement in the past.

Schools still had Title I teachers, they just used local funds for them.

Need to double check on who can be identified for Targeted supports.

Funding will be an issue.

Just don't know if there will be any funds for Targeted Supports for schools.

Comprehensive Supports will use up these funds.

Conflicting information on lowest 5%:

- no guidance has been given
- not clear what it is based on

- is it set by the state?
- is it based on all of our indicators?

Do we want to add accountability factors for other subgroups? Or just for ELs?

Economically disadvantaged will be reported but doesn't need to be used.

Race – do we just pick out one race to report? Need to discuss.

Students with disabilities – will there be concern if we report on ELs but not students with disabilities?

Under ESSA – states must incorporate all of these subgroups for accountability and report on these subgroups.

The formula for identifying the schools for comprehensive supports is determined by the state.

Based on this formula, the lowest 5% are identified.

Need to decide what is reported for accountability and what is on the dashboard?

What is important for parents to be able to see?

We need to decide on the formula because they are all reported and the dashboard can come later.

Which indicators are important?

What is the math behind the scenes to calculate this formula?

Difference between EL performance which is reported and EL proficiency assessment which is what is required on ESSA.

Are there states that have determined the math?
- Draft from SC
- CA has it but Heather has no details
- KY incorporated the most with a nonacademic piece: achievement, growth, GAP accounts for 70%

We can get really deep on this formula.

All of details need to be discussed with regard to the formula.

We can define indicators and how to display, but we need to dig into the measures and how we are using them as part of the formula.

ND doesn't have anyone in staff to do this formula. For NCLB this was contracted out. We currently don't have that. Maybe we need to contract with someone to run scenarios regarding this math.

Summative rating:
- Every school would have a summative rating
- Math behind the scenes, and they will be identified but we are not going to rate each school
- Will the USDE allow all of these indicators without a rating?
- Should we push to not have that rating?
- Will the legislature let us not have a rating?
- Does it have to be a rank?
- Can it be proficient and not proficient rather than a number?
- Could we use categories or different term for growth model?

Again, this is all coming from the formula.

Do not want to see a list in rank order but ok with some type of summative rating.

Not hearing consistency. Some would ok to have a soft rating, while others saying no summative rating.

Ranking means something for accountability. Need to be able to rank the schools.

What is the difference between school 1 and school 21? What would be the difference? They may be so slight and is that necessary?

Some crave the ranking but others tear it apart.

People make large decisions and spend lots of funds with regard to these rankings even if the difference is small. Not sure rankings work.

Would the higher ranked schools be complacent?

Do we rank schools or label schools? NCLB labeled schools.

Need to figure out the formula, do we need to use this formula to label/rank schools.

In each class, students are proficient and not ranked 1-20. Why can't we use schools this way instead of ranked?

Don't need to know which ranking you are but need to know which schools are proficient.

Package we choose to use is important.

Percentages are messy.

Is there consensus on what we don't want:
- percent
- letter grades
- colors

Can we use words as a summative rating with behind the scenes numbers?

The math behind the words might still be subject to open records so the data will be there if someone wants to rank if they so choose.

KY labeled their schools as: distinguished, proficient, and needs improvement based on their formula. They then define which schools labeled as needs improvement are identified for supports.	
Topic: Non-Academic Indicators	Presenter: Heather Kinsey
Move to next agenda as we didn't get to this at this meeting.	
Topic: Achievement & Growth	Presenter: Dr. Mark Eggert

Low growth, low achieving will be where the 5% will come from.
To calculate the learning index: Start from where they are at currently.
How do we measure this?
Growth matters more than achievement for bottom half of state.
Maintaining achievement but still showing growth for top is important.
Student Learning Earning index determines the impact and allowable under ESSA.
Formula must be applied to all schools equally.
You then can differentiate by what you choose to measure.
Easy to determine achievement data.
The growth data would be a year behind.
You can set it up fall and spring as intervals to measure growth or the spring to the following spring.
We will need to use this spring's data (2016-2017 for growth and 2017 for achievement).
Need to use the learning index number to determine overall accountability.
ESSA requires majority of weight must be on assessments not achievement which includes achievement and growth.
Don't revert back to NCLB – move forward and use multiple measures for accountability.
You can choose to do achievement and growth separately but the learning index number combines them.
There are different models. ND needs to identify the model under which you want to operate.
What makes the most sense to schools and districts that will guide continuous improvement.
To determine where the school starts is based on achievement data but then that data is not used to go forward.
Going forward, use the specific formula based on that schools starting point.
What is the formula to determine the starting points?
Take an achievement score and provide a value point.
Mean achievement score from prior year is then used.
Then ranked from top to bottom – this rank will determine which quartile they fit into and therefore which formula to use to determine achievement and growth.
Based on the prior year data to see where each school's starting point is.
How do you handle different configured schools?
Law requires annual testing in grades 3-8.
If you have odd grade configuration, could rank all individual by grade then aggregate your total.
This will identify bottom 5% of schools.
Every student has value points.
Is there a perfect formula for each school? No but this is much better.
Using the growth factor assists low achieving schools.
If we want to use this process, need to discuss all of the issues including grade configuration in using this.
Could use ranking based on grade configuration. Needs to be fair and consistent.
Achievement data is state assessment? Growth achievement can it be on other assessments.
Can use one assessment to determine achievement and growth.
Can use multiple assessments: one for growth, one for achievement
Assessments must pass peer review at Federal level.
NWEA growth assessment as a standalone will not pass peer review.
State will pay for interim assessment for each school.
Could say ACT makes up a percentage of indicator for high schools.
Keep it as simple as possible.
Need to report by subgroup on the report card but don't have to give weight to it.
One formula is applied to every subgroup throughout the school – you must use a consistent formula.
Ok with a summative rating if its works and not a ranking, subgroups are not really a part of the summative rating. They tie in based on the overall score.
ACT grade 11 – no growth data included.
ACT just apply standard deviation to receive point value.
High School has no growth measure.

If I am a low performing school, I am not using ACT because there are no points for growth.
The assessment is used to determine the point value to revert it to a common value.
It is possible but both must pass peer review by the feds.
Need policy guidelines for using a certain assessment.
Why would a high school ever choose to use the ACT?
Great policy question – would need to create an incentive to use ACT rather than state assessment.
Supt Baesler doesn't want an incentive but wants districts to have the ability to choose.
Test grades 8 and then not until 11. At the secondary level there is never any growth data.
High schools will never benefit from this.
Still being measured on grad rates and achievement so not moving forward. Schools data is then based on Junior testing data.
Could add in a college and career ready option.
Redefining "Ready" does this.
Achievement data based on 11th grade, so wouldn't it need to be same cohort. Measuring readiness by senior level should be included.
Need to consider a vehicle to consider college and career readiness for high schools.
Many other states are using this factor.
Graduation is not synonymous with being ready.
Need to create a system for those schools that are graduating career ready and not just for those who are college ready.
Will there be options for schools to use different measures?
Introduce certain metrics to show career readiness versus college readiness.
Value points would be different based on what they are pursuing.
Add to next agenda: full discussion on the college and career ready option.
Elementary level – do we like this student learning index model or do we want to look at another model that separates growth and achievement?
Information is valuable so seeing the other model would be helpful.

Topic: Presentation on Subgroups within ESSA	Presenters: Lodee Arnold – EL Sandra Peterson – Migrant Beth Larson-Steckler – Homeless

Subgroup Handout
Things we need to be thinking about for subgroups:
Accountability, What do we want in our pie (elementary, high school), Report Card, Dashboard
English Learners Report:
PowerPoint ESSA and Title III
Is there any subgroup that makes up entire EL population with one language? Spanish might be the only one. 30% is by state not by district.
What tests to use for accountability – is there any way that the tiers were determined with an earlier test? Scores are taken from the previous year. Access is taken in the spring but is there a different time they can take that test? They have been a 1, new child, if took it in the fall, those kids would be shown as lower and fall on Tier one which would be more funding. Access test must be used but it doesn't say when that test has to be given. Could use model score if they don't have previous years' data. First year kids are the most work but they are not being placed in the correct tier, and therefore, not receiving the correct funding.
If went to an earlier test what would be a funding impact? Not sure but it would be more at Tiers 1 and 2. Could have Jerry Coleman come to discuss with subcommittee. Reasons it can't be changed would be insightful. They want to be paid for the level at which they entered the district, not at the level they are currently at when tested.
There will be a lot of administrative items but this group needs to weigh in on:
- goals
- accountability weight
- how soon to include ELs in the account system
- N Size
- level of growth.

Why is the word ambitious included? This is because of our goals and we can't be lax.
Migrant Report: Handout
ND has been very proactive with this program.
Need to be more proactive with dropouts but Grafton has started an online program.
There are not many changes as ND has been proactive.
Many people don't know a whole lot about this program.
Do parents of these children need to provide documentation?
Yes, they do. If they are from Mexico they must provide green cards.
They must have this documentation or they will not receive services.
They must also provide proof of moving to receive services.
There used to be quite a bit of fraud, therefore, quite a few requirements in order to receive services.
Because of the fraud, we are required to re-interview the families and reports need to be verified.
Homeless/Foster Care Report:
PowerPoint
Homeless includes preschool age if the district currently has a preschool program.
Working on development of policies and procedures.
Foster care students and military are required to be reported but not for accountability.
How to determine when they are in foster care? Guessing it will be the same as it is for homeless which says if they were homeless at any time throughout the year, they are considered homeless.
There are lots of questions that need to be answered with regard to ESSA.
We need to know what the questions are from the field? This is important for us to know going forward.
Foster care can be for just one night – would they need to be identified for the year? At this point, yes.
Clarification with regard to foster care and who needs to be reporting it.
If entire school population is military, how is that considered a subgroup?
Military is not for accountability but needs to be reported.
Gifted and Talented – this should also be reported and monitored but not necessarily for accountability.
Trouble is how do you determine or define this? If they are in the top 5%.

Do we need to come up with a standard definition of gifted and talented? Gifted in what? Music, math, etc. This only looks at academics.

Fargo is tracking gifted and talented and it is really being discussed throughout the state.

This will be put on the agenda for our next meeting.

Top 5 is against the national norm.

What does the report mean because there is no funding?

What was the basis for bringing the Gifted and Talented issue forward?

NDDPI does hear from both sides from parents of kids that are gifted and talented. Other states are hearing about it also.

Run into roadblocks for reporting out of this data.

Is public education out there to make sure every child reaches 110%?

Might need statistics on how many students fall into this category before we include it in our ESSA plan? Possibly do a study but not under ESSA.

Topic: Student Group & School "N" Size	Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Handout

ND has always historically used 10 which is the lowest.

Only have 10 sizable districts.

Many schools are too small to be a part of our accountability system.

Do we want to look to go above 10 because at 10 there are already a lot excluded?

If we determine accountability, we do not need to say by how many students.

The raw score is reported but not the number behind the scenes.

No state funding support for ELs and when they do not show growth, they harm the overall picture.

NCLB we used up to 3 years for data.

Do we want to recommend N size of 10 or larger?

Recommendation for 10 from the subcommittee.

How many years do we want to include?

Group recommended using at least 2 years possibly up to 3.

If we use 3 years, if those kids are not still there, the data is just harming the district.

If we did use 3 years, it would only be for the first year because then we would start over and not have it again for the next 3 years.

If reporting out every year, larger schools' factors are different than the smaller ones and small ones may never report out.

Need to make sure no particular students are being identified. If you only have 1 student within that subgroup, everyone will know which child it is.

Topic: Establishing Long Term Goals Under ESSA	Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Packet of information:

Handout: Measuring Progress

If this criterion is used, it would be based solely on high school.

We need decide on benchmarks and in how many years?

Proficient includes all accountability factors.

Do the goals have to be aligned with the accountability factors?

We do need a goal for each indicator and broken down by subgroup?

Define progress.

If end goal is 100% proficient in15 years, is there a negative impact on those schools if they don't make it?

We continue to look at accountability factors but it is different than the long term goal.

Chiefs for Change is also working on this issue of goals.

Need to continue to close the gap.

Why do they want a starting point and end point?

States are setting different years as their goals. Each state can choose and if our goal is continuous improvement, there would be no end goal.

Need to get more information – no guidance from the USDE on this issue.

Goal is to make sure every student is choice ready when they leave high school.

They will want to see the benchmarks in-between.

We will reach out to CCSSO for information and also see what other states are doing with this issue.

Next Steps:

Need a one page summary:

Discussion on Accountability Indicators: Key elements

- Really is about the formula - then we can define
- Keeping the dashboard simple so it's easy to understand

Discussion on Achievement and Growth: Key elements

- How will it look for different school configurations?
- Growth is not an option for high schools
- College or Career readiness options
- Can we use readiness as growth?

Talked about Gifted and Talented and acknowledged it but need additional information and do not believe at this time it should be included in the ESSA plan.

Report on subgroups

Student group size and N Size will make recommendation.

Long term goals – need more clarification.

Needs to be peer review approved by the Federal government.

College and Career ready used to a bigger element but it has now fizzled.

Hard to define.

Use WorkKeys as assessment for career readiness – optional for scholarships.

Redefining Ready has benchmarks that may be beneficial.

Give students options like AP but also career ready opportunities.

If school chooses ACT then WorkKeys would not qualify.

Students need different levels of readiness.

This committee determines factors to use.

District chooses which indicator and has to use only 1 and can't use different indicator.

ACT is not accommodating or flexible.

It is hard to show growth.

If alternate assessment is optional, what options are available for high schools?

Add a component of College and Career readiness to discuss further at the next meeting.

Why can't we use every grade level testing to show growth? Comes down to funding.

If required in 11th grade, is that the only one that has to be peer reviewed? Need to be comparable, if using a different assessment. The growth model would need to pass peer review regardless of which assessment is used.

ACT is not aligned to state standards so is not a for sure that it would pass peer review.

Most districts want just one test, and ACT is paid for so they chose that but didn't think about the fact that it doesn't include a growth model.

Are we getting enough done in our meetings?

We have talked about a lot of issues so hoping it all comes together.

Still believe we are ahead of many other states.

We are moving ok – once the final regulations are out, we can get answers but now, we have no answers. In the meantime, we are trying to make decisions where we can and discussing all the issues.

Next meeting will be focused on Assessment.

Bring back the other issues we talked about today that need more discussion.

Are we revisiting the work of the assessment taskforce?

- No but are we in agreement and looking at those recommendations or do we have other items that need considering?

A lot of the plan is housekeeping/administrative issues.

There are some big things to decide but there aren't that many.

Whole group meeting in December will be a meeting where answers are provided because the final regulations will be out.

What about the formulas? This is a big issue that we want to discuss. Heather should have some examples of other states formulas.

Are there any concerns of this data going to a third party interest out of state?

Supt Baesler is very concerned about what the committee's interests are.

Timeliness is the biggest issue.

Want to see what our options are. How long and what is the cost?

This group can then make a recommendation as to where we want to go with it.

Concerns about security of student data.

Pros and cons to going with outside group and also with using instate.

No actual contract if we go internally within the state where if we use third-party, we have a contract and if they don't reach the benchmarks, they don't get paid.

Cost is also a factor.

Lots of questions.

Should be negotiable regarding funds.

There was a data system created for the REAs from Sam – would we like a preview of these 2 data sources to see what they look like and are available.

Sam will give presentation on REA dashboard and will ask Tracy to do one on the Parent dashboard.

Will send out one-page summary to this group for feedback and then out to the large group.

Reporting out on the 25th?

Heather do a brief summary on indicators.

Achievement and Growth – Jeff Fastnacht will give brief recap of discussion.

Recap of subgroup.

N Size – recommendation and discussion -Jeff Fastnacht.

Goals – Jeff Fastnacht

Large group is the 24th with viewing of Most Likely to Succeed and meeting on the 25th.

| **Date:** | November 22, 2016 | **Location:** | Pioneer Room | **Time:** | |