

# ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

**Monday, August 14, 2017 | 8:30 AM – 12:30 PM | Bismarck Capitol-Coteau Room**

Facilitator	Note Taker
Laurie Matzke	Shauna Greff
Meeting Convened	Meeting Adjourned
8:30 am	11:30 am

## Attendance

### Planning Committee Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nick Archuleta	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Friesen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Andrea Noonan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Levi Bachmeier	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Grosz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larry Nybladh
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Marc Bluestone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Nikkie Gullickson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rebecca Pitkin
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jeffrey Brandt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cheryl Hagar	<input type="checkbox"/>	David Richter
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tanja Brown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rosemary Hardie	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Riehl
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sonja Butenhoff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Jaeger	<input type="checkbox"/>	Richard Rothaus
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aimee Copas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rod Jonas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Amy Arness
<input type="checkbox"/>	Scott Davis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Melanie Kathrein	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Steckler
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Teresa Delrome	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tracy Korsmo	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jim Stenehjem
<input type="checkbox"/>	Teresa Desai	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wayne Kutzer	<input type="checkbox"/>	L Anita Thomas
<input type="checkbox"/>	Kirsten Dvorak	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert Lech	<input type="checkbox"/>	Travis Thorvilson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mary Eldredge-Sandbo	<input type="checkbox"/>	Marcus Lewton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Russ Ziegler
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jeff Fastnacht	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mike Nathe		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jennifer Fremstad	<input type="checkbox"/>	Amy Neal		

### NDDPI Ex Officio Members

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lodee Arnold	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lucy Fredericks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gail Schauer
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kirsten Baesler	<input type="checkbox"/>	Joe Kolosky	<input type="checkbox"/>	Gerry Teevens
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rob Bauer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robert Marthaller	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Stefanie Two Crow
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ann Ellefson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laurie Matzke		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Valerie Fischer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kay Mayer		

**AGENDA**  
**ESSA COMMITTEE**  
**AUGUST 14, 2017 8:30 AM – 12:30 PM**  
**CONFERENCE CALL: (800) 832-0736 DIAL \*6662790#**  
**ADOBE CONNECT: <https://nddpi.adobeconnect.com/rq33lrbbnm3a/>**

**Welcome:**

Superintendent Baesler welcomed all members and thanked them for taking time out of their busy schedules to participate in this meeting.

U. S. Department of Education (USDE) was incredibly impressed by the level of commitment of our stakeholders in this process. There is authority and responsibility written in this law that has never been there before.

Roll call taken of attendees.

**Overview of Agenda:**

Laurie Matzke gave an overview of agenda.

**PowerPoint presentation:**

- Recap of plan process.
- USDE call – The call lasted two hours and many questions were asked, several areas we were able to provide clarification which satisfied the USDE therefore the issue would not be included in the letter. The tone was very pleasant and accommodating and they needed clarification on some issues.
- Timeline – The call was held on Monday, Tuesday we received the letter from the USDE, peer review comments, and a chart of issues that need to be addressed. Official due date is Monday, August 21 but we will work to submit it Friday, August 18. It will be sent to all committee members hopefully on Wednesday for a quick purview and then submit Friday. All changes will be in red font so you will be able to see the changes easily.  
August 28, the USDE must submit plan to Secretary of Education for approval. If we cannot meet the timeline, the USDE will not have time to review so if submission is on the 18, this should meet the deadline. September 2 should be the date our plan will be approved.  
Validates we made the right decision in submitting in the first cohort.
- Summary of Feedback:
  - Big wins:
    - Use of the GED in accountability pie and as an additional indicator
    - Process for reporting on ineffective teachers – do need clarification for Title I vs. Non-Title I reporting but okay on process
    - Accountability system – no concerns with Choice Ready, commended North Dakota on process, just a few things to address
  - Required Changes:
    - This document is a step-by-step document from the USDE call. All of the issues we were able to clarify over the phone, they did not put in



the official chart. This is a transcript of our conversation and some are small while others will be larger and all will be in red so you will easily see the changes we have made.

➤ **USDE Chart – Items to Address:**

- **Elementary/Middle school Growth Model – They knew we were going to use the Student Learning Index; they needed further clarification on this process and our vision. We were too vague in the plan on this process; they were comfortable with it but needed to be more specific with details regarding this process. No input from the committee is needed here, just need to give more information and specifics.**
- **Weighting of Accountability Indicators – Academic indicators have to have more weight than the others. We will need to adjust so academic is more heavily weighted. Choice Ready is more for school growth rather than student growth so it is not considered academic and GED is not counted.**
- **Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation (small schools) – ESSA focuses on the school level and not district level like NCLB. Need to have a process for small schools to have a dashboard and accountability determination. Reviewed other plans and we think we have a potential solution.**
- **Comprehensive Support – 5% lowest performing schools and then continue the process and add all of the high schools that do not have a graduation rate of 67%. We need additional language so this process is clear. Will need input from committee on this.**
- **Targeted Support Schools – This was probably the most disappointing section. USDE is not in favor of capping. There may be a solution to this, we will need to do this a little differently but should be able to make it work.**
- **Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators – Need to differentiate between Title I and Non-Title schools. Need to show equality among all schools.**

➤ **Issues Silent On:**

- **Nationally Recognized Assessment in lieu of State Assessment in High School – no discussion on this issue. There are many questions on the logistics of this however, we will ask for clarification once our plan is approved. We would like to allow schools to use ACT and do the peer review after it is used. North Dakota is the only state moving forward with this. There are still assessment guidelines that will be most helpful, as they were not repealed. What is the score that will be used so that it is comparable to assessment score? Information will be disseminated in early September to administrators. This will need to be**



a joint decision with the superintendent, principal and possibly school board. They need to know the pros and cons and make the choice of what all high schools in their district will be using.

- Gap Year – High School Assessment going from grade 11 to grade 10. Nothing was brought up regarding this. This is a large issue to address for North Dakota however; the USDE is silent on this issue.
- Reporting on School Dashboard – This was surprising as Critical Friends thought this would be an issue. States do not have to come down to a summative rating. In ESSA plan, we will have our report cards with all detailed information, but our dashboard will be open-ended. Need an informative dashboard to get an overall view and not be distracted from the academic progress. Highlight strengths and show weakness and be balanced.
- EL Students with Disabilities – A lot of faith is put on the IEP team. This continues this process and is in the best interest of the student.

USDE took the approach that they looked at the peer review comments however; they have their own list of issues they felt needed to be addressed.

➤ Issues Needing Committee Input:

- Definition of Graduation Rate for comprehensive identification. Will need to be a two-step process:
  - 5% lowest performing
  - Look at ALL high schools that have less than 65% graduation rate
- Should we use a six-year cohort? NDDPI is currently a seven-year cohort and the cohort year will affect the GED results. A six year would give more flexibility. For federal reporting, we use four, five, six but we do calculate seven year. USDE only gave option of four, five, or six year. Governor's office has concern in using anything other than a four year. The playing field is not level especially for Native American students so the four year would not be beneficial for them. Historic trauma and poverty are huge and education is not stressed on the reservation. If we move to a four year, it may do more harm than good. There are kids that need extra time and if we have the flexibility, we should use it. This would be an option for schools, teachers, and administrators to rethink how they can best help the students. The intent of ESSA is not to be punitive or shameful. Superintendent Baesler believes a five or six year would be more beneficial than a four year. Reporting and what is displayed on the dashboard are two separate discussions. When will you use the four-year calculation? USDE was trying to help us find options. The amount of funding North Dakota will receive will be limited, so we will need to be creative with



the use of these funds. The dashboard will have the clean four year but for the Targeted Support schools, we have the flexibility to use more information.

- **Accountability for very small schools or those with untested grades.** Some schools flip it; instead of rolling up into the district, use the district and roll it back to the elementary to give each school an accountability score. This would only use information that it is fed in to. The data element on this can be done. What happens if a student moves to a new district? This can be done, as the data is statewide. This is only a handful of schools but we do need to address this in our plan.
- **Adjust weighting of High School Accountability Elements.** GED and Choice Ready are not included in the academic piece so we are only at 48% and need to be at 51% to be compliant. We can do it equitably or can take it all from one piece to another. The Governor's office believes that low achievement schools, need to show growth for assessment. Add another slice that would be 9% for student achievement in academic. Today is not the day to add a completely new slice to this pie. There needs to be more discussion before we do that. Suggestion to leave GED as is, take two percent from climate engagement, one percent from Choice Ready, and add those three percent to Graduation Rate to make it 16%.
- **Definition of Persistently Underperforming Schools.** The critical friends thought it would not be an option to cap these schools. An option would be to identify schools that are consistently underperforming schools as 10% lowest performing schools (around 45) and then select targeted from this number so can keep our numbers small so we have the resources to fund these.

The two options:

- **Define consistently underperforming schools and select targeted from this number or;**
- **Select targeted from ALL schools.** This option has the potential to have a very large number of schools. This would require the grants to be competitive and the amounts would not be large.

The definition would be similar to what has been used for current SIG schools. Would this definition be posted? All schools are in continuous improvement. Each school would have an indicator depicting whether they were selected for Continuous or Targeted Support. Nothing in the law says we have to post the process to identify these schools. The question is to decide which option to use to select these schools.

- **Redefine criteria for Targeted Support – will be determined based on**

**Table discussions on four issues that will need a vote tomorrow morning with a survey.**

**Val Fischer asking for committee representation to come together for a four-hour timespan to identify the criteria for consistently dangerous schools. Very important to look at many different data sets to come up with this. This past year, ND came within 2 points of two schools being identified. If it happens, it is very detailed and the corrective action is time consuming. This is a very important issue and members of this committee are invited to participate.**

**Superintendent Baesler presented on the overall view of requirements for the ESSA plan. There were many issues that were not specifically asked for, however, they are important and should be included. We need to take our responsibility seriously so we as states can keep our flexibility. LEA's need to take their responsibility in submitting information seriously.**

**Adjourned**