

ESSA Continuous Improvement Subcommittee MINUTES

Thursday, September 22, 2016 | 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM | State Capitol – Sakakawea Room

Facilitator	Note Taker	Bucket Leader
Laurie Matzke	Shauna Greff	
Meeting Convened	Meeting Adjourned	Breakout Room
1:00 pm	4:10 pm	

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amy Arness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rosemary Hardie	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jill Louters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marc Bluestone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Jaeger	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Riehl
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cheryl Hagar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marcus Lewton		

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

<input type="checkbox"/>	Kirsten Baesler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lea Kugel	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kay Mayer
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tara Bitz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gwyn Marback	<input type="checkbox"/>	Kevin McDonough
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nancy Burke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robert Marthaller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lauri Nord
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ann Ellefson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laurie Matzke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stefanie Two Crow

Agenda Items

Topic: Welcome	Presenter: Laurie Matzke
<p>Introduced Joe Kolosky who will lead this subcommittee once he begins his employment with NDDPI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosemary Hardie – representing Special Education • Amy Arness – representing PTA • Cheryl Hagar – representing Title I Targeted Schools • Marcus Lewton – representing Principals • Marc Bluetone – representing Mid-Size Schools • Russ Riehl – representing Administrators Large Schools • Julie Jaeger – representing ND Assn of Gifted Children • DPI staff present introduced themselves 	
Topic: Overview of Agenda	Presenter: Laurie Matzke
<p>Clarify Roles and Responsibilities of subcommittee members. Overview of all sections on template that this group is tasked with. Team of NDDPI staff went to Atlanta to a CCSSO meeting – recap of that meeting. Discuss how this group will report out – asking for volunteers. Informal so want it to be conversational.</p>	
Topic: Subcommittee Roles, Responsibilities/Expectations	Presenter: Laurie Matzke
<p>Roles as facilitators is to serve as a guide but look to team members to report out on the topics discussed. Facilitator’s main responsibility is to listen, take minutes, facilitate discussion, set realistic agendas, and stay on task. We ask that everyone be respectful of everyone’s opinion. There may be some homework. Subgroup member responsibility is to address specific sections of the state plan, make recommendations to the large ESSA group. Superintendent Baesler does have the final decision but this group makes recommendations to the larger group who then makes recommendations to Superintendent Baesler.</p>	
Topic: Overview of Sections	Presenter: Laurie Matzke
<p>One accountability system for ALL schools. ND uses AdvancED statewide so uniform improvement for all schools. Overview of all sections this subcommittee is responsible for:</p> <p>4.2 Identification of Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous Improvement for all schools • Identification of Schools for Comprehensive Support • Identification of Schools for Targeted Support <p>4.3 Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of School Improvement Resources (7% setaside) • Interventions • Direct Student Services <p>4.4 Technical Assistance for Improvement of Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Improvement Schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approval of Plans ○ Data Collection ○ Monitoring <p>6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students • Early Childhood Education • Parent & Community Engagement • Statewide System of Support <p>6.2 Supporting All Students</p>	

- Title IV Part A
 - Plans
 - Data Collection
 - Monitoring

Topic: Discussion of Workgroup Timeline

Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Timeline handout overview.

USDE will distribute final recommendations the middle of December.

DPI staff will be going to DC to meet regarding final USDE regulations.

Do what we can and after final regulations – make changes if needed.

30-45-day comment period.

Based on comments, do we want changes?

Submit by March 7, 2017

Recommendation from Atlanta indicated those that submit first will probably be able to get more things approved so that is our plan.

Agreement on timeline proposed - no further discussion on timeline.

Topic: Continuous Improvement for all Schools

Presenter: Heather Kinsley

PowerPoint:

All should be engaged in an improvement journey.

Gathering survey data on Climate/Culture, Student Engagement – gathering experience data.

*Does it make sense to start with explanation of AdvancEd plan before we get into identification of schools?

- USDE is not asking for this information, this would be ND providing details of what we are doing as the first layer
- Many states require letter grades for each school, they will have two systems because that does not meet ESSA
- Fortunate with local control so we can address how we meet the federal law but we have the ability to infuse our philosophy on school improvement for all schools

Discussion:

Concerns on what this will look like on the bottom end?

How important is school in certain places?

Things you can do now are just Band-Aids because of no community support. Fear of what the list of improvement schools will look like.

These concerns are for all Native American schools.

ESSA does not have punitive sanctions like NCLB had. If not improving in scores, what happens?

ESSA is vague and just indicates you need to do a plan.

This group needs to recommend what happens if you are identified.

Schools that choose not to accept federal funds would still be in the improvement plan through the AdvancED system.

MTSS – Schools need to stop talking about consequences and talk about interventions instead.

Need to focus more on interventions rather than consequences, which align better with AdvancED.

This group will be brainstorming the interventions that schools could choose from. USDE will want to see what we are doing if schools are in improvement. No mandates but list supports.

Provide transparency for all schools and systems.

Which schools are most in need of supports and interventions?

Where is the system broken and how do we support?

Need to identify where they are struggling and what they need.

Important to say if this is what this group supports and recommends.

NCLB created historical trauma so will have pushback from some schools even though continuous improvement is how all feel.

October 21st meeting on ND Indian Ed Advisory Committee: Schools that have a significant number of Indian students, Marc Bluestone will be informing on this topic at that meeting and hopes to come with a common theme to indicate that continuous improvement is the right way to go so we can move forward. Meeting will hopefully make people at ease on the process.

A summary of that meeting will be provided at the group meeting the end of October.

Perception of AdvancED as an improvement system. How will this be approached?

ESSA School Improvement Handout: School Identification

*Do we go strictly by the math and go by a number or look at a natural cut point?

- Consider the current assessment (smarter assessment) data when making this decision.
- How would more schools effect the funding? This will influence decision dramatically.
- Also take into consideration graduation rate. This won't be very many but we need to be aware of this indicator. Very likely these may also already be included in the lower percent.
- Another consideration is to use one year of results or three years? Strong likelihood we will be going with a new state assessment. If this happens, this would not work and we could not use that data. We would need to use the current data under Smarter Balanced.
- Are we only using achievement for this factor? Lowest 5% based on the factor the state decides to use.
- State Assessment, graduation rate, additional school quality, EL – there has been no decision made on whether to bring in other factors? Discussion on growth has taken place.

Discussion:

We need to step away from punitive and should look at more schools we can help. More on a scale system – going to support your plan but how can we spread it out?

It is going to come down to USDE and their decision with funding.

Under NCLB there are dissemination requirements, would this continue?

- Yes, ESSA requires transparency so this will continue to be required.

If information goes out, how does the public not get a perception that the schools are crappy on reservations? Is there a chance that the bottom 24 or quartile will be just like it is under NCLB and be Native American schools? Community perceptions are hard to overcome. How do we counter that? Another cycle of people to be productive members of society and remains a cycle of poverty. Could GED be part of the completion rate? This would help all over the state. Need to have a conversation on what we want in our plan. Under NCLB, schools were already eligible before considering graduation rates.

Small schools will be more protected under Targeted supports. While large districts will not be under Targeted.

Special needs, minority, ELs would still be able to use subgroups.

*Funding for School Improvement Activities:

- This would roughly be 2.5 million.
- ESSA law does not state this – USDE overreaching says they are concerned that states will water it down to spread out funding. They say they must give \$500,000. Of the 24 schools, only 5 would receive help and no funding for Targeted schools. ND pushed back and said this makes no sense for ND. In Atlanta the question was asked if this will be changed, answer was they may bend but it doesn't appear to be going away.
- Asked for state to decide amount based in need. They did not feel that flexibility will be given.
- USDE under ESSA is supposed to be less control. They are able to do it because their authority is limited on only four areas. Accountability, Assessment, Supplement not Supplant, Pilot Projects.
- There still are areas they have the authority to do this.
- We have a proposal as to how this might work. Break it out into a 3-year period.
 - Take 24 and chunk it out into 3 years so it would be 8, 8 and 8.
 - Tiered approach – receive grant and diagnostic review.
 - The others would do their diagnostic review so they can receive funds the following year and again for the 3rd year. It would be \$250,000 for the first year 8 schools.
- If USDE allows to give less than \$500,000 and if we are allowed to use a tiered approach, what are thoughts?

Discussion:

Might we be able to carry it out to year four? Not with funding but still have supports? Sustainability is needed. If look at systems approach then it is not just interventions, it is a change in systems and will continue.

When we review plans, we need to look at sustainability of these interventions. So they can continue if funding is no longer there.

MTSS, Student Support Strategist, REAs, etc., need to be addressed in the plan to be included in the exit plan for schools.

Diagnostic review is based on how to build capacity and sustainability.

Needs to be a 4 to 5 year improvement process.
 Also contains a leadership component within. Evidence based capacity of the leader to accomplish this.
 Changing and reshaping the conversation.
 All 24 will have diagnostic review. Would like to provide all with resources.
 They will have flexibility to use other Title funds to supplement interventions.
 Leadership option is vastly different than the NCLB model of replacement of leadership.
 Would it be helpful to create a chart to show what this tiered approach would look like?
 We don't get anywhere when we suggest what we are thinking right now with the USDE, but we have been told that if we don't like what we see on the final regulations, we should fight back and use our congressional leaders.
 What happens if it completely changes? Laurie M does not feel this will happen.
 The best guess after Atlanta is there will be minor flexibility and will consider alternative plans if it is justified.
 For next meeting a chart or two will be provided to show how this funding might work.

Topic: Direct Student Services Provision	Presenter: Laurie Matzke
--	--------------------------

CSSO has been providing support, AdvancED has also been assisting.
 *Chiefs for Change has offered to form a workgroup on DSS. They are having a meeting in October and we need to decide if we want to incorporate in our plan.

- 2 handouts: Direct Student Services and Expanding Equity.
- This is taking the place of Supplemental Services from NCLB.
- If chose to do this – set aside 3% of Title I funds for this purpose and they would be made available to comprehensive and targeted improvement.
- Need to have list of tutoring providers but districts/parents could use their own.
- Pros:
 - Already had discussion these schools have serious needs – any supports are a benefit
 - Amount of funds for improvement is not enough to help all schools – this would be additional funding and supports for these schools
- Cons:
 - A lot more work at the state level (vast majority of states are not onboard)
 - Using Title I funds for this so reducing districts allocations. Already taking 7% for improvement. This would be an additional 3% on top of that.
- NDDPI is ok with the work if we want to do this.
- The big question is the funding. We could ask our grants manager to run some estimated numbers to see how this would affect allocations if this is something we are interested in pursuing. Comparing the 7% required to the 10% if we want to do this.

Discussion:
 How would these funds be disseminated?

- It would be a school based decision on where the need is. Not just for free-reduced lunch. There would be an application process – need to identify what they want to do.
- Comprehensive and Targeted schools would be eligible but we could limit it to just comprehensive if we want to. These funds could be used in those eligible schools and not just to Title students.

Are there other elementary options beyond tutoring? There should be other opportunities, not just tutoring.
 If we used the tiered approach, could these funds go to all 24 or just the 8 that are getting funding each year?
 Comprehensive schools will be the ones receiving these funds primarily.
 Taking 3% of funding from districts that have interventions that are working, would create a problem and may affect what is currently working.
 Question the rules that would be in place for these funds.
 Taking this funding off the top is an issue for districts. Currently have no evidence that the supplemental services under NCLB made a significant difference.
 So much negativity from SES and states have this concern.
 Comprehensive schools are probably rural so where would they go to get this tutoring.
 Would a spreadsheet help? NO
 Unanimous recommendation to the large committee is to not take the additional 3% for Direct Student Services.

Topic: New Title IV Block Grant		Presenter: Ann Ellefson	
<p>PowerPoint:</p> <p>This will be for the 2017-2018 school year.</p> <p>Received little to no guidance from the USDE other than the ESSA law.</p> <p>Consolidated a number of programs.</p> <p>Purpose to help improve academic achievement.</p> <p>Have an application process through STARS.</p> <p>Need to include equitable services of private school in community.</p> <p>What supports do our schools need?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A survey is out there to see where schools would possibly use these funds. <p>Will there be a reallocation of Title IV? Will be structured the same and allow for this but because of the flexibility, probably won't have many funds available for reallocation.</p>			
Topic: Q & A and Next Steps		Presenter: Laurie Matzke	
<p>For sections 4.4 and 6.2– the administration of these programs is what we need to include so it won't take a lot of work from this committee.</p> <p>Reporting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four key areas: • Concept of continuous improvement – Heather's presentation – she could give an abbreviated presentation to group – anyone to jump in and give summary of comments and recommendations of our subgroup. <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Could dissemination letter have additional information included? The concern is the transparency from the state identifying these schools because the community perception is not good and will hurt Native American schools. Social media is bad regarding perception of Native American schools. Administrators in the large group need to hear these struggles. Need a better representation of the good things that are going on in Native schools. Montana is in the same situation; Laurie will reach out to Montan to see what they are doing.</p> <p>Marc Bluestone will report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying schools – pass out 1 page – who will summarize our conversation and talk about our concerns along with the charts of what our approach will look like? Marcus Lewton Not using school improvement to identify schools and will not be included on the dashboard. • DSS – Provide the handout – Rosemary Hardie will report out • Title IV – Ann will give brief overview <p>Follow up email on Monday with minutes and Doodle for future meetings:</p> <p>Do we want full morning or afternoon like this or full day?</p> <p>Full days are hard so ½ days are better</p> <p>Need to talk about funding for school improvement</p> <p>MTSS</p> <p>Is ½ day doable? Yes – choices of morning or afternoon but just half days in October, November, December</p>			
Date:	TBD	Location:	Time: