



ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes

Monday, February 6, 2017 | 3:00 PM | Conference Call

Facilitator	Note Taker	Bucket Leader
Laurie Matzke	Shauna Greff	
Meeting Convened	Meeting Adjourned	Breakout Room
3:00 PM	4:05 PM	

Attendance Planning Committee Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sonja Butenhoff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Friesen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Korsmo
<input type="checkbox"/>	Aimee Copas	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	Julie Jaeger	<input type="checkbox"/>	Travis Thorvilson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Fremstad	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Melanie Kathrein	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Ziegler

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lodee Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lucy Fredericks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gerry Teevens
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kirsten Baesler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Greg Gallagher	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rob Bauer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ann Ellefson	<input type="checkbox"/>	Leah Kugel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tammy Mayer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Valerie Fischer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laurie Matzke	<input 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	Presenter: Laurie M
---------------------------------------	---------------------

On the Call:

- 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
- Jeff Fastnacht representing Small Districts
- Tracy Korsmo representing ND ITD
- Wayne Kutzer representing Career and Technical
- Russ Zeigler representing ND Council Ed Leaders
- Melanie Kathrein representing Curriculum Coordinators
- NDDPI employees

Topic: Overview of Feedback from CCSSO Sponsored ESSA Meeting

7 educational experts read and gave feedback on the plan
 Received good feedback and it was helpful
 Experts were very qualified
 Discouraging part was we received nothing in writing
 Comments were in very few sections and not detailed about subgroups
 Will get a larger overview of all comments at large meeting on Wednesday
 Today will share feedback on the four areas this subcommittee is responsible for
 Would like to see if this changes anything regarding our focus

Choice Ready Initiative
 Feedback - very complimentary to include this in our plan
 Overall comments were they didn't feel it was rigorous enough
 We have required elements and then a minimum of two
 Why only two? Shouldn't they need all areas?
 Not all schools offer all of them
 Creates options for students who don't have all of them
 General advice not to pigeon-hole students
 Clear to parents and students that they can jump areas any time and can be ready for all
 We would like them to be ready in all areas so maybe not the term "pathway"
 These experts really did not tailor their review with regard to North Dakota specifically and our demographics
 Jeff thinks there is a lot of positive interest from administrators, but, there are a lot of questions that we will need to deal with
 Anything we want to change before the large group votes on Wednesday?
 We can still make changes
 It still appears there will be state flexibility moving forward so we can be vague
 Are we okay with this document to present to the group?
 Need to portray to schools that students can and should use more than one track
 Still need to figure out how to set goals for schools to earn points in the pie chart
 One element of the pie chart for accountability – all are okay

English Learners
 How we were doing on our growth to target model
 Interim progress
 Weren't on board with increment
 The main feedback was that it was not rigorous enough

Establishing Long-Term Goals
 Reaffirm that everyone feels the long-term goals don't fit in with the rest of the accountability system
 Had an idea for connecting the goals with plan
 Use it as one of the exit criteria for schools selected for Comprehensive or Targeted support
 Comprehensive support – what got you in, could also get you out lowest 5% or 67% grad rate
 And/or you met your long-term goals for two consecutive years
 Group recommendation was 33% gain over six years
 They supported the idea of flipping to say decreasing the goal of nonsufficient students rather than all schools reaching the goal of sufficient students
 Annual of 2.71%

Could look at using this for exit criteria especially for Targeted schools which would be at the subgroup level
 Is this realistic? The percentage is higher for subgroup and the increase would need to be sustained
 Is it legitimate to look at for exit criteria?
 Might be an option to use proficiency level which would make more sense
 It would correlate with the State Assessment according to their English proficiency
 It makes sense for comprehensive – another way they could exit
 Targeted percentages are more rigorous and more challenging criteria
 Can there be more than one way to exit?
 This would be just one option to exit but not the only one
 Targeted selection is done annually/Comprehensive selection is done every three years
 This is not an annual percentage required to improve – if use the confidence interval and interim interval goal – it will be relatively low identified – this percentage of goals provides sufficient safeguards to exit
 Even the large schools would be protected
 Need to get schools to think improvement
 Need to make good identification of interim goals
 Giving schools multiple options to exit is important
 In small cohort of 10 that are submitting early so really can't view other states to see what they are doing
 Are we in agreement to use this as one of several measures to use to exit? Yes, all are in agreement
 Work to reduce the number of nonproficient by 33% over six years – all agreed

Assessment

Nothing really said regarding moving assessment to grade 10 from 11
 More discussion regarding using ACT rather than NDSA
 CCSSO is going to help states in this regard if they want to pursue this as an option
 They would get states together and offer technical assistance and support
 Wouldn't be entrance information
 Peer review would be the issue
 Deferring to peer review which is a separate requirement in the law, has to have comparable design to the assessment
 It might be challenged
 Not sure high schools will choose this option after they weigh the pros and cons

Topic: Overview of February 8, 2017 Agenda

Overview and confirmation of those who will report out on 2/8:
 Choice Ready – Jeff
 Assessment – Jennifer
 Goals – Bob
 Pie – Aimee

Topic: English Learners

Recommendations discussed regarding ESSA considerations
 These will be presented on Wednesday to the large group for a vote

Next Meeting:	February 8, 2017	Location:	Ramada Hotel Bismarck	Time:	9:00 am - 4:00 pm
---------------	------------------	-----------	-----------------------	-------	-------------------