



ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes

Wednesday, January 18, 2017 | 8:30 AM | Comfort Inn, Bismarck

Facilitator	Note Taker	Bucket Leader
Laurie Matzke	Shauna Greff	
Meeting Convened	Meeting Adjourned	Breakout Room
8:30 AM	3:13 PM	

Attendance Planning Committee Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sonja Butenhoff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Friesen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Korsmo
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aimee Copas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robert Grosz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wayne Kutzer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Teresa Desai	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cheryl Hagar	<input type="checkbox"/>	L Anita Thomas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jeff Fastnacht	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Jaeger	<input type="checkbox"/>	Travis Thorvilson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Fremstad	<input type="checkbox"/>	Melanie Kathrein	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Ziegler

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

<input type="checkbox"/>	Lodee Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lucy Fredericks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gerry Teevens
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kirsten Baesler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Greg Gallagher	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rob Bauer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ann Ellefson	<input type="checkbox"/>	Leah Kugel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tammy Mayer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Valerie Fischer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laurie Matzke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Beth Larson-Steckler
<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Marthaller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ross Roemmich	<input type="checkbox"/>	Joe Kolosky

Topic: Welcome and Overview of Agenda, Update On ESSA Plan Rollout	Presenter: Laurie M
<p>Present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bob Gross representing Standards and Assessment • Sonja Butenhoff representing EL • Jennifer Fremstad representing High School Principals • Cheryl Hagar representing Title I Targeted • Teresa Desai representing Schoolwide • Tracy Friesen representing Non-public schools • Aimee Copas representing ND Council Ed Leaders • Jeff Fastnacht representing Small Districts • Julie Jaeger representing ND Assn for Gifted Children • Tracy Korsmo representing ND ITD • Wayne Kutzer, representing Career and Technical • Russ Zeigler, representing ND Council Ed Leaders • NDDPI employees 	
Topic: Assessment	Presenters: Greg G, Jennifer F
<p>Moving testing out of Junior year was the big issue More comfortable with 10th grade with very little comment or concern No concern about losing remediation in college Goal is to get you through college not to get you in to college Prefer spring testing Would like to include Science Need to finish Science standards Legislature is perceiving housekeeping bill as moving testing to grade 12 - political policy question Was there any discussion on projection from grades 8 through 10? Decrease in student performance so Choice Ready is a very popular option Do we want to include growth component on state assessment from grades 8-10? If it is left, it might represent some districts Growth isn't based on individual students; more it is a comparison from cohort to cohort All states are being very vague and very broad Include in our language that we are considering options and not lock us into something Very hard for Administrators to think past NCLB Multiple measures in ESSA will be used which is eye opening Need discussion points so we can begin to have discussions Someone from the NDDPI be in the networking room at the Administrator's Conference to answer questions on ESSA Number of NDDPI employees will be attending so it is very doable Key is to get message out regarding ESSA How do we get the information to the administrators? Series or video clips on different areas within ESSA Continue to brainstorm on how to get the word out on the plan Suggestion to create Fast Fact If video clips were to be created, what topics should be included? All applicable Moving state assessment to grade 10 in the spring ACT will stay, will write into plan the option for individual districts to use this in lieu of state assessment with details to be determined Growth will be through Choice Ready process and still interested in growth extension model between grades 8 and 10 Colleges will not accept 10th grade scores on tests A 12th grade test could be retaken for placement so they wouldn't need to take remedial courses Create a new section in part three regarding assessment, to be presented to large group on the 8th Jennifer agrees to present Hope we will be allowed the flexibility they said states would have so we can be vague in our plan now but once we decide we want it concrete in the plan, we could resubmit with additional information Discussion on alternate high school assessment design: multi-grade assessment and achievement banking model Need to define this model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align all test content to state academic content standards • Divide and administer assessment content components at grades 9,10,11 • Prepare annual test strand reports; bank, compile, and report summative college and career readiness results in grade 11 • Design test maps of English language arts/literacy content presented in grade-specific strands, 9-11 	

- Design test maps of mathematics content presented in domain strands
- Ensure assessment strands follow typical curricular offerings

Designing the mode:

- Grade-level designs
- Test map
- Item augmentation
- Alignment study
- Standards setting
- Vertical scaling
- Quality assurance
- Data banking and accountability
- Training

Precedent setting with this multi-year assessment but it can be doable

Technical issues and financial issues

Possible to do a split in a rough way but to do it properly, you build a system to move in that direction

Broad level design

Drafted an RFP

This would be best to be treated as a stand-alone RFP without compounding the current RFP with this information

Won't be able to venture into until 18 months to 2 years and implemented within 3 years

Recommendation to build in a separate RFP approach

This has been talked about and has merit but technical and financial challenges

In long-term interest of the state needs to be taken into consideration

This model has a lot of potential

Financial key is concerning and this is a time of unknown regarding funding

Topic: Plan for Differentiation

Presenters: Laurie M

Taking off the word improvement

Instead of identify, we are selecting schools

Would like districts to look at this as an awarded grant for supports

Look at this as an opportunity to support schools

All schools are in a growth model and focus on the positive

Goal is for this to be easily communicated, understandable and transparent

Dashboard will be positive as well as show areas where support is needed

North Dakota was selected to pilot a new student engagement tool

Should add NDSA/NDAA which implies the alternate assessment to all areas where assessment is listed

May get pushback from our cap of Targeted supports of 10%

All schools are in General support and then schools are selected for additional Comprehensive and Targeted support

If school is not selected for Comprehensive or Targeted, they are still working on improvements and receiving supports

Topic: Establishing Long-Term Goals

Law requires us to have a progressive approach

Academic achievement based on proficiency on annual assessments

High school graduation rates

Progress in achieving English language proficiency

Timeline for achieving goals must be the same for all students and subgroups

We must pay attention to lower performing subgroups and expect more progress from those groups that are further behind

Two basic models:

- growth based on current performance
- goals set on long-term outward limits

35% feels reasonable

EL is a new group with inherent needs

The other groups are stable

What is realistic and what expectations are out there?

For EL, are exited students included?

EL students who have exited are still in for four years

Hoping for clarification in DC next week regarding how these goals are aligned into the whole accountability plan

No punitive action if goals are not met but need clarification on this

We need to be fair and reasonable and realistic

Striving for improvement but being fair

We need to decide today but it is not set in stone and will be taken to the larger group

The decision today will allow the plan to be updated and discussion to take place

We want high achieving goals; however, if unattainable or unachievable, they won't be used

They will not be used for accountability so how will they be used?
They can be used comparatively for growth as a possibility
This data would be used by staff for root cause analysis for curriculum development
District and building level more than specific teacher level
What are our expectations for our students and how is it viewed by parents and students?
They need to excel and progress, however, it must be attainable
It sends a political message
Any gains are good gains and need to weigh reasonableness versus rigor
35% gains over 6 years is considered rigorous
The messaging is important
We could use analogy to help with the message
This is a state goal so need clarification as far as what is required
There would be less pressure if state reported but should have access to individual percentages and progress for districts to see where they are at
Need to make a recommendation to get the conversation started at the next level
25% seems small
Could EL be put into different categories; those that are currently receiving services and another category for those who have exited
Does it matter how we articulate this percentage?
Percentage is the reduction of the non-proficient
If we have anything that looks similar, administrators will compare to NCLB
View this more positively if we approach it from reducing rather than increasing the percentage
Rather than focusing percentage on students needing to become proficient we can focus on the percentage of non-proficient students needing to be reduced
Will revise the language
Give full committee three options 1/4 25%, 1/3 33%, 1/2 55%
Subcommittee recommends 1/3 or 33%

Topic: Discussion on Subgroups

If using three-year averaging, that could be the same 3 kids repeatedly
When applying confidence interval, N size of 10, you would not be reportable
Rollup is the effect of all three years and not of just one year
This gives protections
We must help the administrators to understand and operationalize it
Greg said there is a mathematical concept table on paper that can be made public to help with understanding
Confidence interval against percentage of proficient students
Greg provided the chart/table and an explanation of it
If you raise the N size, are we excluding certain subgroups?
Would only the large districts be included? Yes
Need to explain this confidence interval to everyone
Validity – you must report on where you are with achievement
Reliability – don't report if you can't do it responsibly and with low N values
Should we keep it at 10 or move to 15?
Would it adjust the fairness? It would cloak schools from being reported
Not the size of the school, it is the size of the subgroup
How do you help to mitigate across the state?
If bump beyond 10, and run the data, things start cutting out
We need clarification on whether the USDE will allow the confidence interval
If it is not, we have issues with the N size of 10
If the issue of sampling does not apply, by regulations, 10 is defensible for reliability
Should make language link between N size and confidence interval and not ask permission
How many schools would not have been reported last year if didn't use the confidence interval and used an Nsize of 15?
How many subgroups and how many districts would have fallen off?
This would give us data to show districts what changing the Nsize does and the schools that would not need to report for accountability
We could have this data prior to the February 8 meeting so we could get it out to members to be able to make a recommendation to the large group
Every student in every year should be counted
When used for accountability, is it fair to use small number of students to represent the entire school's accountability and, therefore, select them for supports?

Topic: Choice Ready

We just need to get specific on details

Three different graphics for Choice Ready

Kirsten met with military representatives who were very helpful

ASVAB score of 31 is the lowest score required

Deemed physically fit could be left up to local school discretion

Minimum GPA is 2.0

Liked attendance, work-based learning and community service

NDSA was not a requirement but can be an additional factor

Minimum composite ACT score

Physically fit and quality citizenship is informational rather than something a district should verify

Possibly include these in the statement prior to the listed requirements

Jeff presented a graphic that was very appealing

We don't want to "Pigeonhole" our students into one pathway or another

It ensures students have options and will be ready for whichever pathway they choose

Ideally, students should be qualified in multiple pathways

Need to portray this positively and thoughtfully

This gives students choices and we can't be narrow minded

Redefining Ready is working on Life Ready/Community Ready and including 3-8 grade readiness

Academic Ready rather than College Ready which would include technical areas

GPA of 2.8 in concentrated area?

Career Ready – develop a career education plan rather than advisement on career ed path

Military Ready

Required:

- 2.0 GPA or GED diploma
- ASVAB score 31

Options:

- ACT score of 15 or 17
- 98% attendance
- 25 hours community service
- Proficient on NDSA

Career Ready

Required:

- GPA 2.8 within concentrated area
- Develop a career education plan
- Identify career cluster

Options:

- 98% attendance
- 25 hours community service
- 75 hours work-based learning
- Industry credential
- Two or more co-curricular activities
- Dual credit course and Work Keys
- Career ready pathways
- Proficient on NDSA

Academic Ready

Required:

- 2.8 GPA or GED diploma

Options:

- 98% attendance
- International baccalaureate
- Advanced Placement exam score 3+
- Advanced Placement course grade A, B, C
- Dual credit college English and/or Math
- College development/Remedial English and/or math
- ACT score in specific concentrated area
- NDSA proficient

Soft skills could be included in information language since they are hard to determine

Box chart in narrative form and then also include the graphic as a workable document

Ann and Val will work on getting this in narrative form and make changes to Jeff's graphic and get it out to this committee for comment before presenting to the full committee

Instead of Pathway A-D, use the symbol that is already on each specific pathway

Instead of All Kids should say All Students

Topic: Elements to Include in Accountability System

Agreeable to leave Climate/Engagement to be a significant piece?
 Do we want to change the amount in each piece of the pie?
 Leave it as it is reasonable and it can be changed later
 Elementary:
 Achievement 30%
 Growth 30%
 Climate/Engagement 30%
 EL 10%
 Are we being consistent?
 Same at Elementary as at High School
 High School:
 Climate 25%
 Graduation (10) and GED (5) combined at 15%
 EL 10%
 Achievement 25%
 Growth 25%
 Shift colors so they match if the same:
 Yellow encourages agreement, red encourages anger
 Climate and/or Engagement

Topic: Review Draft ESSA Template – Applicable Sections

Since significant changes have been made in this meeting we will hold off on this agenda item

NEXT STEPS

We made significant changes to the plan in this meeting so we will update the plan and then get the updated version of each section out to committee members:
 Assessment
 Goals
 Subgroup
 1.0 and 4.0 would encompass all the work from this subgroup to review before full meeting on February 8
 Report out on 2/8:
 Choice Ready – Jeff
 Assessment – Jennifer
 Goals – Bob
 Pie - Aimee

Next Meeting:	February 8, 2017	Location:	Ramada Hotel Bismarck	Time:	8:30am-4:30pm
---------------	------------------	-----------	-----------------------	-------	---------------