

field. This occurs on a regular basis. Also, Food and Nutrition Division at NDDPI also offers technical assistance to districts in regard the laws and regulations protecting students experiencing homelessness.

Resources

The SEA provides and highlights various resources to assist liaisons in properly identifying students experiencing homelessness. Resources that are provided include, but are not limited, to the following

- Notification of NACHE resources and webinars
- Website providing resources and information on dispute resolution
- Newsletter created and dispersed to liaisons, administrators as well as other key stake holders
- Eligibility Manual for School Meals
- Administrative Manual for Food Service
- Summary of Special Milk Program
- Community Eligibility Provision (CEP)
- Civil Rights Training Access
- Professional Standards Civil Rights
- Letter to Households
- Application for Free and Reduced Price Meals

Assessment of Data Element

The SEA monitors districts with high poverty count and does a comparison analysis to the enrollment of students experiencing homelessness. If a district has a high poverty rate but does not have a high homeless rate and or free lunch enrollment SEA will reach out to the liaison and provide technical assistance and support.

- vi. **Describe the SEA’s strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with sections 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Act.**

Process

Students experiencing homelessness transferring into a new school district are enrolled immediately and begin attending classes and fully participating in activities regardless of the lack of documentation which may include vaccination information, credit information or other critical documents. The liaison works with the parent, student or unaccompanied minor to acquire these documents from the previous school; however, this does not stand in the way of enrollment. LEA’s are required to develop, revise and review policies to remove barriers to enrollment and retention of students experiencing homelessness.

Professional Development

Professional development is provided to local liaisons and administrators on various topics related to ensuring students experiencing homelessness are enrolled immediately and retention is addressed. The topics addressed with professional development include, but are not limited to the following

- McKinney-Vento the Law
- Strategies for ensuring full academic and extracurricular participation
- Waiving fees
- Transportation

- Comparable services
- Development of resources to support extracurricular activities
- Strategies for obtaining documents such as birth certificate and other vital records
- Defining enrollment
- Immunizations

Technical Assistance

The SEA provides on-going technical assistance to the field. The SEA encourages liaisons, administrators and other staff through webinars, memos, and newsletters to contact the NDDPI directly with any specific issues. A good deal of the SEA's time is focused on answering calls from the field to provide technical assistance in specific situations inclusive of identification of students experiencing homelessness.

Resources

The SEA provides and highlights various resources to assist liaisons in properly identifying students experiencing homelessness. Resources that are provided include, but are not limited, to the following

- Notification of NACHE resources and webinars
- Website providing resources and information on dispute resolution
- Newsletter created and dispersed to liaisons, administrators as well as other key stake holders

Monitoring

The SEA has a self-monitoring tool which is displayed on the NDDPI website and professional development is provided on the tool. This tool provides liaisons and administration information as to the necessary actions to implement in order to meet McKinney Vento. One of the components in the tool ensures that students experiencing homelessness are immediately enrolled.

Accountability System:

Process

Students experiencing homelessness are recorded in two different data collection systems; STARS and Powerschool. Once a student is identified as experiencing homelessness the designated individual records this in both STARS as well as Powerschool. Proficiency as well as graduation rates are linked identifying disaggregated information such as homelessness. The assessment division at NDDPI ties data to students experiencing homelessness to determine the rates of proficiency, involvement in North Dakota State Assessment as well as graduation rates.

A description of how homeless youth will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

North Dakota's support for students spans from early childhood educational settings through elementary school, middle school, high school and transitions into partnerships for college and career readiness. Supported through a long tradition of local control, the continuum of education in North Dakota is primarily determined at the LEA level. The NDDPI has

established frameworks and processes to provide support to LEAs through this PreK-12 experience as well as preparing students to be choice ready upon graduation.

Process

All districts are required through North Dakota Century Code 15.1-06-19, to provide a school counselor for grades 7-12, at the ratio of one full time equivalent counselor for every three hundred students. Guidance for school counseling in grades K-6 is set forth as best practice and is an area of accreditation monitored within the advanced process. The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction supports the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program that is based on the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) Model. The "ASCA Mindsets & Behaviors for Student Success: K-12 College- and Career-Readiness Standards for Every Student" describes the knowledge, skills, and attitudes students need to achieve academic success, college and career readiness, and social/emotional development. The ASCA Mindsets and Behaviors should be aligned with initiatives at the district, state, and national level to reflect the district's local priorities. North Dakota's leadership has displayed strong resolve towards ensuring career readiness for all students. School counselors play an essential role in providing advice and guidance to homeless youth who prepare and improve their readiness for college.

Key benchmarks, which are set through legislation, must be met. The strong position of the state to mandate the creation of individual education plans, individual consultative reviews of education plans, require interest inventories, ACT or WorkKeys assessment, and selecting high school courses appropriate to their educational pursuits and career interests help assure that all students are prepared to be choice ready upon graduation.

Barriers to educational success may include but are not limited to:

- Graduation options
- Credit recovery options
- Lack of opportunities to dual credit or Advanced Placement courses due to cost
- Loss of educational records, resulting in potential loss of academic credits and time
- Cost of either the ACT or Workkeys (is also addressed through legislation)
- Lack of college scholarship awareness
- Completion of college information/FAFSA
- Cost of sending transcripts to colleges
- Cost of applying to college

Professional Development

SEA provides regular professional development to liaisons and administrators on assisting youth experiencing homelessness to navigate through high school and preparing for college or career readiness. Counselors will also be invited to attend the professional development that is focused on this area and recorded webinars will be provided to counselors on this area. The professional development provided includes a variety of critical elements related to college and career readiness.

- Educational Challenges for Youth Experiencing Homelessness
- Barriers to College Access and Success

- Making Student Status Determinations
- FASA
- Waiver Eligibility Requirements for ACT and SAT
- College Application Process and Fee Waiver
- Factors to Consider When Choosing a College
- Paying for College
- Supporting Student Success in College

Technical Assistance

The SEA provides on-going technical assistance to the field. The SEA encourages liaisons, school counselors, administrators, and other staff through webinars, memos, and newsletters to contact the NDDPI directly with any specific issues. A good deal of the SEA's time is focused on answering calls from the field to provide technical assistance in specific situations inclusive of identification of students experiencing homelessness. The SEA also provides memos on specific issues to provide more clarification to the field. This occurs on a regular basis.

The SEA will provide information to counselors on a regular basis about scholarships and resources for students experiencing homelessness who are pursuing college and career opportunities. The National Center for Homeless Education provides a resource page on resources and scholarships. This will be provided to counselors as well as liaisons on a regular basis.

Resources

The SEA provides and highlights various resources to assist school counselors in properly guiding students experiencing homelessness through their educational career.

Resources that are provided, include but are not limited, to the following:

- Field visits to rural and high poverty schools to promote scholarship awareness, financial aid information, college application information, and career information
- FAFSA Week Information such as PowerPoints and announcements will be provided to help ensure that ALL eligible students complete the FAFSA as unaccompanied homeless youth and receive financial aid for college
- Obtaining Waivers for College Entrance Examinations and Application Fees
- Scholarship options for students experiencing homelessness
- Newsletter created and dispersed to liaisons, administrators and counselors as well as other key stake holders
- Website providing resources and information on student preparation for college and career as well as helpful resources

Consolidated State Plan Assurances

Instructions: Each SEA submitting a consolidated State plan must review the assurances below and demonstrate agreement by selecting the boxes provided.

- Coordination.** The SEA must assure that it coordinated its plans for administering the included programs, other programs authorized under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Rehabilitation Act, the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, the Head Start Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002, the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act, and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
- Challenging academic standards and academic assessments.** The SEA must assure that the State will meet the standards and assessments requirements of sections 1111(b)(1)(A)-(F) and 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA and applicable regulations.
- State support and improvement for low performing schools.** The SEA must assure that it will approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans consistent with requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B)(v) and (vi) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(e).
- Participation by private school children and teachers.** The SEA must assure that it will meet the requirements of sections 1117 and 8501 of the ESEA regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.
- Appropriate identification of children with disabilities.** The SEA must assure that it has policies and procedures in effect regarding the appropriate identification of children with disabilities consistent with the child find and evaluation requirements in section 612(a)(3) and (a)(7) of the IDEA, respectively.
- Ensuring equitable access to Federal programs.** The SEA must assure that, consistent with section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), it described the steps the SEA will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs as addressed in sections described below (e.g., 4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools, 5.3 Educator Equity).

[Click here to enter text.](#)

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

| APPENDIX LETTER | PAGE NUMBER | DOCUMENT TITLE |
|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| A | 152-154 | State ESSA Planning Committee Members |
| B | 155-158 | State ESSA Planning Subcommittee Members |
| C | 159-166 | NDDPI Communication Plan and Timeline |
| D | 167-307 | State ESSA Planning Committee Meeting Minutes |
| E | 308-309 | Assessment Task Force Members |
| F | 310-312 | Letter in Support of GED |
| G | 313-319 | Recommendation for the Arts |
| H | 320-321 | Measurements of Interim Progress |
| I | 322-326 | Student Learning Index |
| J | 327-328 | Choice Ready Indicators |
| K | 329-330 | Determination of Educator Effectiveness |
| L | 331-332 | Educator Equity Extension Plan and Differences in Rates Tables |
| M | 333-334 | ESSA Flow Chart |
| N | 335-338 | ESSA Goals – Interim Steps |
| O | 339-371 | Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators |
| P | 372-381 | ELPAC Meeting Minutes |
| Q | 382-384 | Home Language Survey |
| R | 385-388 | Student Engagement Survey |
| S | 389-398 | EL Self-Monitoring Tool |
| T | 399-416 | Public Comment Feedback |
| U | 417-418 | Equitable Access to, and Participation in Programs |
| V | 419-420 | Out-of-Field and Inexperienced Teachers |
| W | 421-423 | Psychometric Summary for Engagement |
| X | 424-425 | Elementary/Middle Sample Accountability Index System |
| Y | 426-427 | High School Sample Accountability Index System |
| Z | 428-431 | State Equity Reporting |

Appendix A

(43 Members)

State Superintendent

Kirsten Baesler
(701) 328-4570
kbaesler@nd.gov

Office of the Governor

Levi Bachmeier
(701) 328-1048
lebachmeier@nd.gov

North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission

Scott Davis
(701) 328-2443
sjdavis@nd.gov

North Dakota Council of Educational Leaders

Aimee Copas
(701) 258-3022
aimee.copas@ndcel.org

Russ Ziegler
Russ.Ziegler@ndcel.org

North Dakota Department of Career and Technical Education (NDCTE)

Wayne Kutzer
(701) 328-2259
wkutzer@nd.gov

North Dakota Regional Education Association

David Richter
(701) 609-5681
david.richter@k12.nd.us

North Dakota University System (NDUS)

Richard Rothaus
(701) 328-4136
richard.rothaus@ndus.edu

North Dakota United

Nick Archuleta
(701) 223-0450
nick.archuleta@ndunited.org

North Dakota Education Standards and Practices Board

Rebecca Pitkin
(701) 328-9641
rpitkin@nd.gov

North Dakota Parent Teacher Association

Amy Arness

(b)(6)

Nikkie Gullickson

(b)(6)

Parent Group

Kirsten Dvorak

(b)(6)

North Dakota English Language Learner Teacher

Sonja Butenhoff
(701) 499-1066
sbutenhoff@west-fargo.k12.nd.us

North Dakota English Language Learner Representative

Travis Thorvilson
(701) 746-3235
Travis.thorvilson@gfschools.org

North Dakota Elementary School Teacher

Amy Neal
(701) 857-4665
amy.neal@minot.k12.nd.us

North Dakota Middle School Teacher

Andrea (Noonan) Fox
(701) 356-2090
anoonan@west-fargo.k12.nd.us

North Dakota High School Teacher

Mary Eldredge-Sandbo
(701) 725-4334
meldreae@minot.com

North Dakota Targeted Assistance Teacher

Cheryl Hagar
(701) 857-4400 Cell (701) 833-6888
cheryl.hagar@minot.k12.nd.us

North Dakota Schoolwide Teacher

Teresa Desai
(701) 662-7630
teresa.desai@dlschools.org

North Dakota School Boards Association

L. Anita Thomas
(701) 255-4127
anita.thomas@ndsba.org

Special Education Representative

Rosemary Hardie
(701) 642-5499 Cell (701) 640-2464
rosemary.hardie@k12.nd.us

North Dakota Association for Gifted Children

Julie Jaeger

(b)(6)

North Dakota Information Technology Department

Tracy Korsmo
(701) 328-4134
tkorsmo@nd.gov

North Dakota Legislative Representative:

House

Mike Nathe
(701) 319-1500
mrnathe@nd.gov

Principal:

Elementary

David Steckler
(701) 751-6508
dave.steckler@msd1.org

Tanja Brown
(701) 965-6324
tanja.brown@k12.nd.us

Middle

Russ Riehl
(701) 323-4600 Cell (b)(6)
russ_riehl@bismarckschools.org

Marcus Lewton
(701) 456-0020 Cell (b)(6)
mlewton@dpsnd.org

High School

Jennifer Fremstad
(701) 356-2050
jfremstad@west-fargo.k12.nd.us

Jeffery Brandt
(701) 445-3331
jeff.brandt@k12.nd.us

Superintendent – Large District

Larry Nybladh
(701) 787-4880
Larry.nybladh@gfschools.org

Robert Lech
(701) 252-1950
robert.lech@k12.nd.us

Superintendent – Midsize District

Marc Bluestone
(701) 627-6350 Cell (701) 421-0865
marc.bluestone@k12.nd.us

Superintendent – Small District

Jill Louters
(701) 595-2880
jill.louters@k12.nd.us

Jeff Fastnacht
(701) 349-3232
jfastnacht@ellendale.k12.nd.us

Standards and Assessment

Robert Grosz
(701) 446-1073
groszr@fargo.k12.nd.us

North Dakota Association for Colleges of Teacher Education

Rod Jonas
(701) 355-8097
rjonas@umary.edu

Nonpublic School Representative

Tracy Friesen
(701)-751-4883
tfriesen@lightofchristsschools.org

Curriculum Coordinator

Melanie Kathrein
(701) 456-0002
mkathrein@dpsnd.org

ND LEAD Center

Jim Stenehjem
(701) 258-3022
jim.stenehjem@ndlead.org

Tribal College

Teresa Delorme
(701) 447-7826
tdelorme@tm.edu

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

Robert Marthaller – Assistant Superintendent
Laurie Matzke – Assistant Superintendent
Gerry Teevens – Special Education Director
Gail Schauer – Teacher & School Effectiveness Director
Greg Gallagher – Assessment Director
Valerie Fischer – Safe & Healthy Schools and Adult Ed Director
Ann Ellefson – Academic Support Director
Lucy Fredericks – Indian/Multicultural Director
Lodee Arnold – ELL/Bilingual Director
Stefanie Two Crow – Federal Title Programs Director
Kay Mayer – Information Communications & Research Director
Joe Kolosky – Deputy Director, Student Support & Innovation
Ross Roemmich – Director, Management Information Systems

Appendix B

ESSA Planning Committee

Subcommittee: Continuous Improvement

Lead – Joe Kolosky jkolosky@nd.gov

Team:

NDDPI Staff

| <u>NDDPI Staff</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Email</u> |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ann Ellefson | Director, Academic Support | aellefson@nd.gov |
| Stefanie Two Crow | Director, Federal Title Programs | stwocrow@nd.gov |
| Kevin McDonough | Special Education Regional Coordinator | kcmcdonough@nd.gov |
| Laurie Matzke | Assistant Superintendent | lmatzke@nd.gov |
| Tara Fuhrer | ECE Administrator | trfuhrer@nd.gov |
| Gwyn Marback | Assistant Director TSE | gkmarback@nd.gov |
| Nancy Burke | State Personnel Development Grant Coordinator | njoburke@nd.gov |
| Robert Marthaller | Assistant Superintendent | rvmarthaller@nd.gov |
| Lauri Nord | Program Administrator, Federal Title Programs | lnord@nd.gov |
| Kay Mayer | Director Information, Communications, Research | kmayer@nd.gov |
| Lea Kugel | Special Education Regional Coordinator | lkugel@nd.gov |

Committee Member

| <u>Committee Member</u> | <u>Representing</u> | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Amy Arness | ND Parent Teacher Assn | (b)(6) |
| Marc Bluestone | Superintendent - Midsize District | marc.bluestone@k12.nd.us |
| Nikki Gullickson | ND Parent Teacher Assn | (b)(6) |
| Cheryl Hagar | Targeted Assistance Teachers | cheryl.hagar@minot.k12.nd.us |
| Rosemary Hardie | Special Education | Rosemary.hardie@k12.nd.us |
| Julie Jaeger | ND Assn for Gifted Children | (b)(6) |
| Marcus Lewton | Middle School Principal | mlewton@dpsnd.org |
| Russ Riehl | Middle School Principal | russ_riehl@bismarckschools.org |

ESSA Planning Committee

Subcommittee: Standards, Assessment, Accountability, and Reporting

Lead – Laurie Matzke lmatzke@nd.gov

Team:

NDDPI Staff

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Ann Ellefson | Director, Academic Support |
| Lodee Arnold | EL Administrator |
| Valerie Fischer | Director, Safe & Healthy Schools/Adult Ed |
| Lucy Fredericks | Director, Indian Education/Multicultural |
| Rob Bauer | Assessment Assistant Director |
| Tammy Mayer | Special Education Regional Coordinator |
| Robert Marthaller | Assistant Superintendent |
| Gerry Teevens | Director, Special Education |
| Greg Gallagher | Director, Assessment |
| Beth Larson-Steckler | Homeless Administrator |
| Ross Roemmich | Director, Management Information Systems |
| Joe Kolosky | Deputy Director, Student Support & Innovation |

Email

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| aellefson@nd.gov |
| laarnold@nd.gov |
| vfischer@nd.gov |
| lkfredericks@nd.gov |
| rgbauer@nd.gov |
| tmmayer@nd.gov |
| rvmarthaller@nd.gov |
| gteevens@nd.gov |
| ggallagher@nd.gov |
| esteckler@nd.gov |
| rkroemmich@nd.gov |
| jkolosky@nd.gov |

Committee Member

Representing

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Sonja Butenhoff | ELL Representative |
| Aimee Copas | ND Council of Educational Leaders |
| Teresa Desai | Schoolwide Teacher |
| Jeffrey Fastnacht | Superintendent – Small District |
| Jennifer Fremstad | High School Principal |
| Tracy Friesen | Non-Public School |
| Robert Grosz | Standards and Assessment |
| Cheryl Hagar | Targeted Assistance Teachers |
| Julie Jaeger | ND Assn for Gifted Children |
| Melanie Kathrein | Curriculum Coordinator |
| Tracy Korsmo | ND Information Technology Dept |
| Wayne Kutzer | ND Dept of Career and Tech Ed |
| Richard Rothaus | ND University System |
| L. Anita Thomas | ND School Board Assn |
| Travis Thorvilson | EL Representative |
| Russ Ziegler | ND Council of Educational Leaders |

| |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| sbutenhoff@west-fargo.k12.nd.us |
| aimee.copas@ndcel.org |
| teresa.desai@dlschools.org |
| jfastnacht@ellendale.k12.nd.us |
| jfremstad@west-fargo.k12.nd.us |
| tfriesen@lightofchristschools.org |
| groszr@fargo.k12.nd.us |
| cheryl.hagar@minot.k12.nd.us |

(b)(6)

| |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| mkathrein@dpsnd.org |
| tkorsmo@nd.gov |
| wkutzer@nd.gov |
| Richard.rothaus@ndus.edu |
| Anita.thomas@ndsba.org |
| travis.thorvilson@gfschools.org |
| Russ.ziegler@ndcel.org |

ESSA Planning Committee

Subcommittee: Teacher/Leader Effectiveness

Lead – Gail Schauer gschauer@nd.gov
Stefanie Two Crow stwocrow@nd.gov

Team:

NDDPI Staff

Laurie Matzke

Peg Wagner

Gwyn Marback

Mary McCarvel-O'Connor

Robert Marthaller

Matt Scherbenske

Joe Kolosky

Title

Assistant Superintendent

Assistant Director Academic Support

Director, Safe & Healthy Schools/Adult Ed

Special Education Regional Coordinator

Assistant Superintendent

Assistant Director, Academic Support

Deputy Director

Email

lmatzke@nd.gov

pswagner@nd.gov

gkmarback@nd.gov

moconnor@nd.gov

rvmarthaller@nd.gov

mscherbenske@nd.gov

jkolosky@nd.gov

Committee Member

Nick Archuleta

Jeffrey Brandt

Aimee Copas

Russ Ziegler

Teresa Delorme

Mary Eldredge-Sandbo

Rod Jonas

Robert Lech

Larry Nybladh

Rebecca Pitkin

David Richter

Richard Rothaus

David Steckler

Jim Stenehjem

L. Anita Thomas

Representing

ND United

High School Principal

ND Council of Educational Leaders

ND Council of Educational Leaders

Tribal College

High School Teacher

ND Assn for Colleges of Teacher Ed

Superintendent - Large District

Superintendent - Large District

ESPB

ND Regional Education Assn

ND University System

Elementary Principal

ND LEAD Center

ND School Board Assn

nick.archuleta@ndunited.org

jeff.brandt@k12.nd.us

aimee.copas@ndcel.org

russ.ziegler@ndcel.org

tdelorme@tm.edu

meldrae@minot.com

rjonas@umary.edu

robert.lech@k12.nd.us

Larry.nybladh@gfschools.org

rpitkin@nd.gov

David.richter@k12.nd.us

Richard.rothaus@ndus.edu

Dave.steckler@msd1.org

Jim.stenehjem@ndlead.org

Anita.thomas@ndsba.org

Appendix C

NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ESSA PLAN & TIMELINE

| MONTH | MEETINGS | OUTREACH | MILESTONES | DECISIONS |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| JAN. 2016 | Jan. 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WebEx Training to School Personnel ▪ Information Posted on NDDPI Website | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Every Student Succeeds Act-- general comments regarding the new Federal Law, Key changes in Assessment and Accountability, and the Transition process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recommendations from Assessment Task Force ▪ State Plan Process ▪ ESSA Planning Committee ▪ Regional Training Mtgs. |
| FEB. 2016 | Feb. 19 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WebEx Training to School Personnel ▪ Information Posted on NDDPI Website | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guidance ▪ Changes ▪ Transition Process ▪ McKinney-Vento Reauthorization | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Future Regional Trainings to be held in April and locations. |
| MARCH 2016 | | | | |
| APRIL 2016 | <p>West Fargo</p> <p>April 12 in Minot, ND</p> <p>April 13 in Mandan, ND</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional Trainings for School Personnel ▪ Information Posted on NDDPI Website | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Title 1 Homeless ▪ Title III/EL & ESSA ▪ Title IV ▪ What teachers need to know Parent & Family Engagement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School districts informed about upcoming decisions regarding standards, ESSA and assessment. ▪ ESSA Q & A |

NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ESSA PLAN & TIMELINE

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| MAY 2016 | <p>11 Cities in 13 days Listening Tour. May 9-25th.</p> <p>May 17- State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg. (External Communication)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School Administrators & Teachers. ▪ Legislators & school board presidents ▪ Information Posted on NDDPI Website ▪ Media Releases & interviews in the 11 cities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Standards Revision of English/LA & Math ▪ First Session of Planning Committee, Hope & Fears, and 7 buckets to focus on for state plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change of Direction. ▪ Strong Vision and System need to be created, and the amount of buckets narrowed to form a cohesive plan. ▪ Clarity on state ESSA committee outcomes and duties. ▪ Propose having a state dashboard and identify information that could be included for a continuous school improvement model. |
| MONTH | MEETINGS | OUTREACH | MILESTONES | DECISIONS |
| JUNE 2016 | <p>June 27th Core Steering Comm. mtg. & phone conf. w/ AdvancED. (Internal Planning & Comm. decisions)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Core Steering Comm. (Internal) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create a rough draft of state vision, system, dashboard etc., ▪ 1st standards rewriting committee meets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working groups ▪ Proposed Regulations ▪ Start discussion on our state dashboard for continuous school improvement |
| JULY 2016 | <p>July 5th Core Steering Comm. & Conf. call w/ AdvancED. (Internal Planning & Comm.)</p> <p>July 19th Core Steering Comm. & Conf. call w/AdvancED (Internal Planning & Comm.)</p> <p>July 25th State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg. (External Comm.)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior & Post Planning Mtg. Agenda & Update/Recap to July 25th - second advisory mtg. for School Personnel & stakeholders via list serv, social media, dpi central website. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed federal Title I regulations are published, & comment period begins ▪ Set up ESSA Workgroups & chairs ▪ 2nd standards rewriting comm. meets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Share State Vision ▪ Share revised buckets and work groups. ▪ Have planning committee restate which bucket they will do work. ▪ Healthy Continuous Improvement system is needed. ▪ Gather feedback on key Quality School Performance Indicators. ▪ Student learning index. ▪ School Dashboard ▪ Agenda for July 25th. |
| MONTH | MEETINGS | OUTREACH | MILESTONES | DECISIONS |
| AUG. 2016 | <p>Aug. 16th & 25th Core Steering Comm. (Internal Communication)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aug. 3-5th Update on ESSA at the | <p>8/1: ESEA flexibility waivers expire</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State Planning & Advisory Committee finalizes vision for ND. |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>August 30th State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg. (External Communication)</p> | <p>Administrator's Conference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recap to Stakeholders via list serv, newsletters, web, dpi central | <p>(August- 2016-17 school year begins.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative/Outline for roles and responsibilities--shared with the group prior to sign-up. Bucket work groups formed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Teacher/Leader Effectiveness, *Standards/Assessment/Accountability/Reporting and *Continuous Improvement. Inform Advisory Committee to sign up to be in one or two groups. Work groups will be responsible to produce work products Sept.-Nov. & report to full committee on end of month dates. |
| <p>SEPT. 2016</p> | <p>Core Steering Comm. Mtg. & Phone conf. Sept 6th & Sept. 15th (Internal Communication)</p> <p>Subcommittees meet for 1st time on Sept. 8, 19, and 22nd. (Internal & External Communication)</p> <p>Sept. 30th State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg. (External Communication)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update of work completed on August 30th to List Servs, & Stakeholder groups Media Release to list serv on Supplement vs. Supplant. Provide districts with an update of work completed thus far. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USDE Template for ND ESSA State Accountability Plan shared with ESSA Advisory Comm. CCSSO Template to be shared with ND ESSA Advisory Committee on Sept. 30th | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Steering Committee will share updates regarding Fed. ESSA proposed regulations, timelines, subcommittee work and input opportunities. Subcommittee representatives will report discussion and progress to Full ND ESSA Advisory committee. Ask subcommittees to solicit feedback from their members and gather input/feedback. |

NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ESSA PLAN & TIMELINE

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| OCT. 2016 | <p>Core Steering Comm. Mtg. & phone conf. (Internal Communication)</p> <p>Oct. 5th Standards & Reporting Subcommittee Mtg. (Internal Communication)</p> <p>Oct. 21st 1st Tribal Stakeholder Engagement Mtg. (External Communication)</p> <p>Oct. 25th State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg.. (External Communication)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESSA Summary Email Release ▪ Oct. 5th ESSA Update to AdvancED Attendees ▪ October 12-14 ESSA Update to Fall Conf. Attendees ▪ October 20-21st – NDCEL conf. ▪ October 27-28 ESSA Update to new school board members. Update presentations given at conf. ▪ Use Social Media to give status updates on subcommittee work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESSA Advisory committee comment on 1st draft for CCSSO. ▪ Share shell draft plan with subcommittees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have a CCSSO shell draft plan formed for full committee to see. ▪ Discuss subcommittee work and feedback received from the field to their respective committee representative. ▪ Solicit feedback on subcommittee recommendations ▪ Meaningful Tribal Consultation Discussion. ▪ Tribal Stakeholders give recommendations for ND ESSA Plan. ▪ Tribal Stakeholders give recommendations for development of ND policy regarding tribal consultation for both state and LEAs. ▪ Gather input on feedback on Supplement not Supplant Letter to ▪ Revisions and input updated in the state ESSA plan. |
| MONTH | MEETINGS | OUTREACH | MILESTONES | DECISIONS |
| NOV. 2016 | <p>Core Steering Comm. Mtg. & phone conf. (Internal Planning & Communication)</p> <p>Nov. 4th UTTC Mtg.</p> <p>Subcommittee Mtgs. November 3rd, 16th & 21st</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Op/Ed on ESSA state plan. ▪ Continue to brand & update “Choice Ready” on social media | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 11/8: Presidential election. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supt. Baesler will travel to each of the four tribal reservations in ND. ▪ Discuss the state ESSA plan with United Tribes Technical College and gather feedback of items they would like to see in the plan. ▪ Subcommittees work this month—No full ESSA Advisory Planning Committee Mtg. this month. ▪ Draft legislative bills |
| MONTH | MEETINGS | OUTREACH | MILESTONES | DECISIONS |
| DEC. 2016 | <p>Core Steering Comm. Mtg. & phone conf. (Internal Planning & Communication)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State Student Council Conf. on Dec. 11-13th. Update on status | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dec. 5th -7th ND 65th Legislative Assembly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key members of the ESSA Core Steering Committee share updates from CCSSO regional state meeting in Minneapolis, MN. ▪ A student obtaining their GED is a success story. |

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>Dec. 5th, 16th & 21st Subcommittee Mtg.</p> <p>Dec. 13th Tribal Consultation</p> <p>Dec. 20th- State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg.</p> <p>Dec. 22nd – ND ESSA Tribal Stakeholder Engagement Mtg.</p> | <p>of ESSA plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to have subcommittees gather and disseminate updates ▪ Continue to post all meetings on social media | <p>Orientation & Organizational Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Final Title I regulations are published by the end of 2016. ▪ Letters of Support received, read & response ▪ First gov. to gov. Tribal Consultation ▪ 2nd Tribal Stakeholder Engagement mtg. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Redefine graduation rates to include GED. ▪ ND ESSA Tribal Consultation with Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians & Turtle Mountain Community School Board. ▪ Keep Tribal Consultation on going. ▪ Discuss & Report Effective Teaching, not Ineffective Teachers ▪ Commitment to Tribal culture and language ▪ Include ND Native American Essential Understandings in our ND ESSA Plan. |
| <p>JAN. 2017</p> | <p>Core Steering Comm. Mtg. & phone conf. (Internal Planning & Communication)</p> <p>Jan. 4th Continuous Improvement Subcomm. Mtg.</p> <p>Jan. 17th Tribal Consultation</p> <p>Jan. 18th Standards & Reporting Subcomm. Mtg.</p> <p>Jan. 19th NDIEAC Mtg.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NDASA Midwinter Cont. Jan. 29-31st. Give update & solicit feedback on status of ESSA Plan. ▪ Media & Social Media release for public comment on initial ND ESSA draft plan ▪ ND Indian Education Advisory Council Mtg. Give update & solicit feedback | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ North Dakota 65th Legislative Assembly Convenes. ▪ Third draft work begins on ND ESSA Accountability Plan ▪ Members of the State Core Steering Comm. Attend a CCSSO Critical Friends Mtg. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initial first draft of ND ESSA Plan-released for 30-day public comment. ▪ Take initial draft to CCSSO Critical friends meeting and gather constructive criticism, and adjust ND plan. ▪ North Dakota ESSA Tribal Consultation with Standing Rock Sioux Tribe ▪ No Advisory Planning Committee Mtg. Subcommittees will work to make final recommendations. ▪ Start to hear a theme for language immersion as a necessity to preserving Native American Tribal culture. |

NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION ESSA PLAN & TIMELINE

| | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>FEB. 2017</p> | <p>Feb. 2nd Core Steering Comm. Mtg. & phone conf. (Internal Planning & Communication)</p> <p>Feb. 7th Tribal Consultation</p> <p>Feb. 8th - State ESSA Planning Committee Mtg.</p> <p>Feb. 15th Tribal Consultation</p> <p>Feb. 16th -3rd Tribal Stakeholder Engagement Mtg.</p> <p>Feb.27th -28th</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Media Release to public for comment ▪ Social Media ▪ Send out notification on email list serv. NDDPI & Stakeholders ▪ Radio talk shows ▪ TV ▪ Editorial Board Mtgs. ▪ School Visits | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US House votes to block Proposed Regulations for ESSA ▪ Betsy DeVos becomes news Secretary of Education. ▪ ND Official Draft for public comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Share out the information with internal team gathered from CCSSO critical friends meeting. ▪ North Dakota ESSA Tribal Consultation with Mandan Hidatsa Arikara Three Affiliated Tribe ▪ Last ND Advisory Planning Committee Mtg. before we submit our state plan for official public comment. ▪ Spirit Lake Tribal Consultation Mtg. ▪ Make updates and fine tune plan ▪ North Dakota ESSA Tribal Stakeholder Engagement Mtg. ▪ Feb. 15th to March 15th 2017 is Official 30 day Comment Period. ▪ CCSSO review plan |
| <p>MARCH 2017</p> | <p>March 14th March 20th -24th</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Media ▪ ND 2017 STEAM Conf. in Minot! ▪ NDEarly Childhood Conf. ▪ ND Secondary Principal's Conf. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ First Submission Date for ND ESSA Accountability Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leadership Summit on ESSA Tribal Local Education Association Consultation ▪ Review Public Comments ▪ Make revisions to ND State Plan ▪ Possible Committee Mtg. |
| <p>APRIL 2017</p> | <p>April 3rd</p> | | <p>First Submission Date for ND ESSA Accountability Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 65th North Dakota Legislative Assembly Ends. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Submit North Dakota ESSA Plan to United States Department of Education |
| <p>MAY 2017</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rest & Get Ready for a busy summer |
| <p>JUNE 2017</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ *NDCEL Summer Conf.-Bismarck | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What Administrators Need to Know ▪ What Teachers Need to Know |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Video Clips & Flyers ▪ Regional Trainings | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What Parents Need to Know ▪ Accountability ▪ Teacher/Leaders ▪ English Learners ▪ Well Rounded Education ▪ Consolidated Applications |
| JULY 2017 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ND Indian Education Summit-Bismarck ▪ <i>Laying the Foundation</i> Conf. in Minot! | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New Fiscal Year Begins | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What Administrators Need to Know ▪ What Teachers Need to Know ▪ What Parents Need to Know ▪ Accountability ▪ Teacher/Leaders ▪ English Learners ▪ Well Rounded Education ▪ Consolidated Applications |
| AUG./SEPT. 2017 | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Media Release ▪ Social Media | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Second Submission Date for state Accountability Plans ▪ 2017-2018 School year begins | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approval of North Dakota State ESSA Plan? ▪ Implementation of ND ESSA Plan? ▪ ESSA Advisory Planning Committee |

Appendix D

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Tuesday, May 17, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM | State Capitol – Pioneer Room

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Facilitator-Shelby Hubach | Note Taker-Shauna Greff | Bucket Leader |
| | | |
| Meeting Convened 10:05 Meeting Reconvened 2:45 | Meeting paused 12:05 Meeting Adjourned 3:00 | Breakout Room |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Nick Archuleta | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Fremstad | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mike Nathe |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amy Arness | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jody French | <input type="checkbox"/> | Amy Neal |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marc Bluestone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Friesen | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Andrea Noonan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sara Bohrer | <input type="checkbox"/> | David George | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Larry Nybladh |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Merle Botone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jon Godfread | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Richter |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeffrey Brandt | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Grosz | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russ Riehl |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tanja Brown | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Nikkie Gullickson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Richard Rothaus |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amiee Copas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cheryl Hagar | <input type="checkbox"/> | Wendy Sanderson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Delrome | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rosemary Hardie | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Steckler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Desai | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rod Jonas | <input type="checkbox"/> | Jim Stenehjem |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Kirsten Dvorak | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Melanie Kathrein | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Kayla Effertz-Kleven | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Wayne Kutzer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Janet Welk |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mary Eldredge-Sandbo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Lech | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input type="checkbox"/> | Marcus Lewton | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tim Flakoll | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jill Louters | | |

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

Agenda Items

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Topic Welcome & Introductions | Presenter Shelly Hubach |
| <p>Welcome</p> <p>Self-introductions with their individual hopes and fears of the planning committee</p> <p>There is an enormous task ahead</p> <p>A fear that it becomes overwhelming and the result is reverting back to what we have known because it's comfortable</p> <p>Objective is not to add on a new layer but augment what we are already doing and truly breakout to measure what we want to accomplish</p> <p>Members have high expectations and hopes for clear communication throughout the entire process</p> <p>Shelby's role is to support NDDPI in their goals and challenges and to facilitate movement to stay on task and on point</p> | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Topic Logistics | Presenter Laurie Matzke |
| <p>Bring binder to all meetings</p> <p>Contents of binder: Agenda – official member list – map of broad representation for planning committee – travel reimbursement – powerpoint – list of buckets – open meeting fact sheet</p> <p>All handouts and minutes will be posted on ESSA website because the goal is to be as transparent as possible</p> | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Topic Open Meeting Laws | Presenter Sandy Depountis |
| <p>Holds open records and open meetings portfolio</p> <p>These planning committee meetings are subject to open meeting laws</p> <p>Quorum rule means post notice and keep minutes which includes all subcommittees</p> <p>Serial meeting – collective involvement of members separately to form a quorum – forming a consensus – be careful about informal discussions</p> <p>Email – you can set a meeting date – provide information by email</p> <p>Be cautious hitting reply all. When you start sharing opinions and ideas it should not be through email and should be through open meeting discussion</p> <p>Handout available on ESSA website</p> | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Topic Highlight of the New ESSA Law | Presenter Shelby Hubach |
| <p>Powerpoint presented available on ESSA website</p> | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Topic NDDPI's vision for education | Presenter: Kirsten Baesler |
| <p>Timeline's are continually being adjusted by the USDE</p> <p>Portions of the rules are out now for public comment</p> <p>Working backwards with goal of having a plan to submit by January 2017</p> <p>USDE doesn't expect to have proposed rules until June of 2017</p> <p>Heard conflicting messages from USDE, but were told to go slow because they don't know what regulations will be</p> <p>After meeting with Sec King: States build and submit plan and Secretary of Education has very little authority to send it back to request change</p> <p>Vision for where we go for our next generation of learners</p> <p>This education plan will be established by the stakeholders of education in North Dakota</p> <p>(Superintendent Baesler's presentation available in next issue of ConnectEd)</p> | |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Topic: Continuous Improvement | Presenter Dr. Mark Elgart President CEO AdvancED |
| Powerpoint presented available on ESSA website | |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Topic: Strategy and 7 buckets | Presenter Laurie Matzke |
| <p>Overview of buckets</p> <p>Leads for each bucket with overview of area of interest</p> <p>Committee members can be a part of 2 buckets if interested</p> | |

| |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Topic: Breakout Sessions |
| <p>7 breakout sessions with discussions from 1:00-2:45</p> <p>Individual breakout minutes available on the ESSA website</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Topic: Going Forward & Next Steps | Presenter Laurie Matzke/Shelby Hubach |
| <p>Shelby's powerpoint will be posted on ESSA website</p> <p>AdvancED powerpoint will be posted on ESSA website</p> <p>Kirsten's presentation will be in next ConnectEd newsletter</p> <p>Will send email when minutes and handouts are on the website as the goal is to be as transparent as we can so everyone has access to the information</p> <p>Full committee will meet on monthly basis</p> <p>NDDPI subcommittee leads will determine those meetings in between full committee meetings</p> <p>Mark and Shelby will work on timelines</p> <p>January 2017 backmap on timeline</p> <p>NDDPI had a thought or idea but needed stakeholder input to set forth the agenda moving forward</p> <p>The buckets give a sense of direction of areas those are interested in but there may be shuffling</p> | |

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Monday, July 25, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM | State Capitol – Pioneer Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Shelby Hubach | Shauna Greff |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned |
| 10:05 am | 3:00 pm |

Attendance of Planning Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Nick Archuleta | <input type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Fremstad | <input type="checkbox"/> | Jill Louters |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amy Arness | <input type="checkbox"/> | Jody French | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mike Nathe |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marc Bluestone | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Friesen | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amy Neal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sara Bohrer | <input type="checkbox"/> | Jon Godfread | <input type="checkbox"/> | Andrea Noonan |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeffrey Brandt | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Grosz | <input type="checkbox"/> | Larry Nybladh |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tanja Brown | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Nikkie Gullickson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rebecca Pitkin |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Sonja Butenhoff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cheryl Hagar | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Richter |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amiee Copas | <input type="checkbox"/> | Rosemary Hardie | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russ Riehl |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Scott Davis | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Richard Rothaus |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Delrome | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rod Jonas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Wendy Sanderson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Desai | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Melanie Kathrein | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Steckler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Kirsten Dvorak | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ashley Kelsch | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jim Stenehjem |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mary Eldredge-Sandbo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Wayne Kutzer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Lech | <input type="checkbox"/> | Janet Welk |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tim Flakoll | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marcus Lewton | | |

Attendance of NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

Agenda Items

Topic Update and Overview if Agenda: Shelby Hubach, Presenter

Accountability system is main priority
Shift in strategy
All will be involved in accountability portion then split into buckets
Interactive meeting

Topic Key Elements of a State Accountability System: Heather Kinsey, Presenter

Who are those kids and how can we serve them
This plan is not a NDDPI plan
This is a huge opportunity to work together to create the accountability system-a continuous process of feedback
Provide a framework where all pieces fit and work together
All stakeholders provide feedback and own this plan
Key questions that need to be answered to drive the accountability plan
Need to agree and get buy-in on these answers
What do we know about the past in education?
Accountability is not new
ESSA was intended to provide new resources and funding
PowerPoint
Table Discussion Notes #1

Topic School Dashboard and Rating System: Heather Kinsey, Presenter

What does it look like to provide data transparency?
Key questions again to decide what data do we show and how to represent it so it is meaningful?
Thinking about a data davenport.
A website available to the public
Who is this dashboard for?
What purpose does it serve?
Accurate, honest but complete list of what is happening in our schools
What does school quality data look like?
How is it used to create an accurate picture of what is happening in our schools?
How do we communicate that we are moving in the right direction?
Achievement marries achievement and growth
Needs to be sustainable
Learning index
Growth index – quadrants
Formula
State assessment is used for the formula
Only one factor of accountability measurement
Need to keep in mind schools' needs assessments

Topic School Dashboard and Rating System: Heather Kinsey, Presenter

Data is not just state assessment

What is our vision? Where are our schools now and where do we want them to be?

Setting parameters for the questions and working group works through answers

Communicate what is absolutely important

Define learning index

PowerPoint

Table Discussion Notes #2

Topic Review Proposed Regulation and USDE Letter: Laurie Matzke, Presenter

Overview of July 29, 2016 letter to the USDE from Superintendent Baesler

Topic Additional School Quality Factors: Heather Kinsey, Presenter

Need to determine at least one school quality factor that can be measure and provide meaningful differentiation

Potential factors are: school climate/culture, student engagement, rigor of coursework

Students within Supt. Baesler's cabinet offered ideas for a school quality factor: community engagement, access to courses, learning environment, post-secondary plans, preschool availability, extracurricular activities, access to school counselor

Need to consider the weighting of all indicators in the accountability system; academic indicators need to be given greater weight

PowerPoint

Table Discussion Notes #3

Topic School Improvement System: Heather Kinsey, Presenter

Need to design a statewide system of continuous improvement that includes monitoring and support to schools and districts

Provide schools with three years to implement continuous improvement and set data points to progress over the three-year period

Start with an assessment to inform a comprehensive improvement plan; then, implement the plan using data to monitor and adjust implementation; align improvement tools, supports, and services to the improvement plan

PowerPoint

Table Discussion Notes #4

Topic Synthesize Main Discussion Points: Heather Kinsey, Presenter

Offered main discussion points based on table discussions held throughout the meeting

Topic Timeline, Next Steps, and Q & A: Shelby Hubach, Presenter

ESSA implementation begins July 2017 and submission of the ND ESSA Plan occurs March 2017. Between now and March 2017, the ESSA Steering Committee will begin drafting the ND ESSA Plan and gather feedback from the ESSA Advisory and Planning Committee. It will be an iterative process with numerous revisions made to the ND ESSA Plan and several occurrences of gathering feedback from ESSA Advisory and Planning Committee members.

Doodle polls will be sent to the ESSA Advisory and Planning Committee members to schedule meetings for September, October, and November. The next meeting on August 30 will focus on accountability. Future meetings this fall will focus on getting feedback on drafts of the ND ESSA Plan.

No questions were asked during the Q&A portion.

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Next Meeting |
| Date: August 30 |
| Location: To Be Determined |
| Time: 10:00am-3:30pm |

Key Elements of a State Accountability System

Discussion on Vision, Goals, and Key Accountability Presentations

What key takeaways do you have from the presentation?

- Need to be aware of the law; need sustainability
- Who are we building this for? The first word is students-community.
- We have a lot of lagging indicators
- The purpose, make sure system works. Is funding making a difference?
- It will be different for different stakeholders
- Can we come up with different levels of accountability or systems? (ex. rural vs. urban)
- Accountability, can we have flexibility?
- It has to understand the complexity and still be fair
- Different agencies come up with different a perceptible – is there funds? Need resources for what is important.
- We want student success prepared after school
- Technology is changing fast
- Want critical thinkers, as now we seem to take that away
- Kids learn differently – there is no one way – every kid has a different hook
- Those with disabilities need SPED
- Curriculum – should it be based on tests?
- Need transition plans for starting at age 14; as long as the plan is aimed at all students’ potential, it is okay if it changes over time.
- Make is easy to measure
- Key elements – time is a factor – most effective teaching
- Balance between local control vs. everyone being accountable – cannot sit back and do nothing
- Growth
- System recognizes strength vs. a deficiency model
- Collaboration (Fosters)
- Purpose to support schools in growth of key factors
- Do what is right for ND and best for kids
- System Accountability – new system is often the fact – too late
- What is reported now is easy numbers, not necessary. What is happening in school or quality indicators?
- 100% no realistic - became punitive
- How can we move to meaningful data in a timely manner to help kids? Improvement system/focus.
- Accountability definition:
 - Funding, legislation, boards
 - Ownership belongs to the locals, but how do we do that?
 - How do we make it understandable?
 - Role of stakeholders in system
- Need to supply resources where needed and continually evaluate and reallocate resources
- Need a user-friendly system
 - Students
 - Teachers
- Move away from “business model” approach – we deal with real humans and education is a unique system
 - Funding formula
 - Spending regulations
 - Resource allocation
- Need flexibility, programs that work
- Need to educate all levels of the “system” to ensure they understand education is not a “business”
- Will the recommendation of this committee be taken to heart or will outside stakeholders determine the system?

- Need to support project-based learning
- What is driving instruction?
- Using test results to evaluate programs does not necessarily tell the success of programs
- Challenging that others/special interest groups add to curriculum/school
 - Bullying
 - Civics
- Scripted programs are not always the best for education
- Improvement takes time
- Every school is at a different starting place
- It takes time – programs, people, students need time to adapt and see results
- Schools are trying everything – but test scores still may not move
 - NDSA means nothing to the student
 - How do we change the conversation?
- Discourse on how guidelines/law end up
- Long-term solution to gaps (for students)
- Strength of ESSA – family involvement
- Differentiation – need to get back to embracing improvement
- Skills – teachers need to engage students
- Purposeful, meaningful to students and teachers
- Student growth – other measures besides standardized tests
- How do you design a system that honors multiple pathways?
- State must respect local voice
- How does accreditation play into this?
- How will the opt-out option affect the accountability system?
- What's the intent of our state assessment under ESSA?
- Success looks different – student
- Do Not measure in the same way for every student
- Key components for every student
 - Choice
 - Ensure students are growing (check points)
 - Relevance
 - Motivation
- Profiles of learning/competency
- System allows-ensures-encourages-measures student growth
- Afraid of the system becoming an assignment – make sure our purpose is about kids
- Make sure systems mesh
- Leading the lagging
- Where do we see students not growing across the spectrum/state?
- Figure big state framework
- All students have equal opportunity
- Building capacity as the lead driver
- System flexibility – ala carte, needs are different
- Resource library
- Students should have multiple ways to show choice-readiness
- Flexibility to schools to ensure LEA priorities are included
- Built upon a growth model
- System that supports innovation and capacity building
- Are we leveraging what other states are doing with ESSA?
- Relationships are critical
- Question one size fits all
- Less punitive, more flexibility
- Values must be shared and supported

- Sustainability?
- Stakeholder roles?
- Teacher prep/preservice/recruiting
- Affordable tuition/salary
- Focus on the law
- Compliancy
- Achievement

School Dashboard and Rating System

Driving Continuous Improvement through Data Transparency

- Must be communicated effectively to parents
- Parents should understand so they can be part of the process
- Data for presentation versus data that staff can actually use
- Include 21st century skills as a qualitative measure on dashboard
- Content measure should be embedded in the 21st century skills
- Need a standardized measure for creativity. How do we do this?
- Define the skills and also the rubrics for measuring the skill across the state
- Need a common assessment track
- Graduation rate should include GED. People learn different way and GED
- With ESSA we are hopeful we can get back e to what we love about education
- The four Cs:
 - Creativity
 - Critical thinking
 - Collaboration
 - Communication
- Who is it for- Any one, business, parents, the state to decide services and support
- Purpose-yet to be determined depending on data on it
- Simple enough for parents/others to use
- Concern:
 - Will people think of it as only data (may not understand)
 - Would/should show schools growth/achievement
 - Categories on it may be limiting
 - If parent has special education child it may be more important
- Translate dashboard into other languages (different cultures). What is the culture of the school is it welcoming to all
- We want to treat all students as individuals not masses
- Concern with tests and struggling children
- This is majority average how do we factor in lower struggling children?
- Do we want to concentrate more on growth or achievement?
- There may be focus on struggling and a focus on gifted-What about middle group?
- Be Standards Based (How close are we achieving the standards?) versus Ranking
- Data should answer:
 - How are we doing for ourselves? Student groups to longitudinal data
 - How are we doing similar groups? Middle school to middle school
 - How are we doing overall meeting the standards?
 - What processes are important?
- What growth needs to be recognized?
 - Real time
 - Assessment parameters
 - Student value of testing
 - Meaningful data
 - Fidelity of testing process
 - Stoplights/colors-good
 - Change metrics-standard data-baseline
 - Small school reports

- Dashboard
 - Who: Parents, legislators, business and industry, higher education, and teachers
 - Reports: should/could look different for constituents
 - Purpose: Communicate to constituents
 - What are you trying to communicate? Basic school performance

Additional School Quality Factors

Identifying Additional Factors of School Quality

- Focus on student achievement
- Approaches to curriculum and instruction
- Use of evidence for planning, organizational learning and accountability
- District-wide sense of efficacy
- Building and maintaining good communications and culture
- Investing in instructional leadership
- Commitment to school improvement
- Job embedded professional development
- Infrastructure alignment/resource allocation (reference: Leithwood 2010)
- Student remediation is an issue at all levels (elementary school, middle school, high school, and college)
- Providing student guidance on coursework options and future choices is a challenge
- Schools with system of MTSS for those that are struggling or/and those that need more challenge
- Do AP courses equal Dual Credit courses? Some policies are making districts pick between offering both types of advanced coursework options
- Parents need to be engaged, involved, and invested in education and their child's future
- How do K-12 processes align or enable kids for future experiences? (i.e., allowing students to retake exams until successful – does this prepare them for experiences outside school?)
- Why are students disengaged?
- What can we do?
- Many AdvancED districts already use surveys – ELEOT – the surveys that are used could be used for multiple purposes (locally, accountability)
 - How can ELEOT criteria/research be used to train staff on effective practices?
 - If ELEOT data elements are used, the expectation of districts will be for AdvancED to provide training and share ELEOT resources
- What does effective instructional design look like?
- What schools are teaching with 21st century skills?
- How can these elements be measured?
- How can interventions be provided in an accelerated environment?
 - Schools need to shy away from remediation and pull out environments as kids miss out and it is not effective.
 - Are there ways to provide flexibility in scheduling, school start times (junior high starting later), etc. as options?

Key Takeaways - Communication

- Who is this for? Communities in general
- What purpose? Communication/public
- State dashboard with local component (can't incorporate all local components initially.)
- What communication? We have workable, viable schools students growing school is working.
- What is considered achievement?
- What is considered growth?
- An Individual Learning Plan (ILP) has to be taken into consideration
- What indicators of school quality should we use?
 - School facilities (libraries, computers)
 - Class sizes
 - Teacher qualifications/quality
 - School connectedness – climate
 - School discipline policies
 - Extra-curricular activities (Are there opportunities for students to get involved?)
 - Meaningful professional development

- School Quality Indicators should include, but not be limited to:
 - High levels of student engagement
 - Positive school culture
 - Safety and Security schools
 - Early Childhood Program as prevention
 - Students should have a sense of belonging
 - We should identify a list of initiatives proven to work and place them in a clearinghouse.
- PLC's are effective. If we impact what adults are doing through PLC work than we will see positive student growth and achievement.
- Quality leader activities serve as leading indicators of lagging data.
- Professional Development should be embedded in a continuous school improvement plan or serve as an indicator.
- Research supports that opportunities for fine arts, STEM, and CTE programs indicate a high quality school and success for students.
- How do we gauge if students are successful after graduation?
- Climate and culture are important, but how do we measure this?
- When looking at culture, it's important to include all student populations with different languages and different cultures
- Parent Involvement is critical –
 - Type of parent involvement activities should be identified and defined
 - Think about what kind of engagement - school activities or at home – that we want to measure
 - Could measure attendance/activities/conferences of parents – however, parent may have specific needs – they may never attend, do not feel welcome, don't get needs met, think it's waste of time
 - ELL students are more challenging
 - Statistics show those that graduates make more money
 - National PTA School of Excellence – form a measurement to identify areas of strength/weakness, involves all stakeholders, schools enroll in this program so not all schools have this
 - Ensure there are resources available (i.e., PTA, PTO, etc.)
 - Use a survey
 - Assure parents understand importance - Culture matters because some don't understand
- Family Engagement is a measure to be looked at – how is this defined and how do we measure this?
 - Climate and culture measures
 - School of Excellence - school enroll for this program
- Need something comprehensive
- If measuring student engagement, how is this defined?
- Impact of instruction – different modalities of learning and demonstrating learning

Common Benchmarks

- How to really measure?
 - Grade specific
 - Multiple measures
 - Balance of all students
- Parental role/involvement
 - Rigor/growth
- Blur (?) the line
 - Graduation

School Improvement System

Identifying Schools for Improvement under ESSA

- Would it be appropriate for teachers to use ELEOT more often?
- Does it cost the school more to use?
- What does continuous improvement look like?
 - Have base line and in the future should increase
 - Annually review
 - Continuous updating
 - Sharing information with parents, stakeholders in a common language
 - Alignment of survey data
- Parent involvement is important
- Laws on the number of hours per day – seat time = credit
 - Create barriers
 - How can we be more flexible?
 - CBE
 - What is the constant/more important?
 - Time?
 - Knowledge?
- Does our traditional schedule currently work?
 - What data supports this?
- Governance:
 - School board role
 - Multiple boards
 - Not familiar with the process/system of education
- School system can only be as effective as its board
 - Politics are involved at some levels
 - Teachers want to teach and coaches want to coach
- Transfer/transition between schools/districts
 - Districts/boards communication with each other is same areas
- Principal/Superintendent relationship with board
 - Open lines of communication
- Variations within one system
 - People on different ends of the spectrum
- Potential consistency between factors
 - ELEOT
 - Surveys
 - Not just accountability
 - Using some things in place that drive/connect to improvement
 - System has school improvement plans that have direct connections to data
- State needs to understand that each school/district is at a different starting point
 - Logistically – within cycle
 - Strategically – interventions/support
- We need a good/great support system for students
 - How can we help kids before we lost them?
 - Non academic
 - More resources & support
- What community supports exist for students?
 - Mental health – mental well-being for our students!
 - Students have real needs – unmet

- Difficultly hiring people
 - Need financial flexibility
 - Teachers
 - Social Workers
 - Psychologists
 - Counselors
- What are the support services?
 - Define – allow flexibility
- Identify student needs
 - Find resources for those needs
 - Coordinate services
- Each community has its own unique needs and challenges
 - How can we measure?
 - How can we give “credit” for other options?
- Flexible scheduling
 - Start time/end time
 - Teens – research says mid-day best function
 - How can we better provide services/flexibility?
- Emphasis on sustaining accountability
- Whatever we end up with must be:
 - User friendly and transferrable
 - Meaningful and relevant to the teacher and community
 - Able to meet students where they are
- How are we going to pull this together?
- How are we going to prevent this from feeling like “one more thing” for teachers and schools to do?
- How can we fit in principal effectiveness?
 - Teacher leaders effectiveness
- Takeaway for continued improvement
 - Use the score from AdvancED as the secondary score (color coded)
 - It is measured nationally
 - Go with standards based instead of one score at the end
 - On accreditation/site visit and dash board, eliminate the overall rating
 - Color coding or wording for dash boarding
 - Instructional coach in every school
- Integrated momentum
 - Remove “2030” from vision
 - Still asking:
 - Where are we going?
 - Set vision
 - Select common priorities
 - High school diploma is not enough
 - 2-year/AA degree at a minimum
 - Learning structures
 - Workplace
- What are the takeaways?
 - If student engagement is used, the concern is how we effectively and cost effectively use and measure without compromising AdvancED?
 - Adding the element of accountability into the system potentially impacts the process.
 - Most team stated that this is the first time hearing about ELEOT, except one team member.
 - Review base line data & review trend data annually!
 - Need to build capacity to sustain improvement through the use of resources
 - Discussed use of ELEOT at school level

- Discussed use of iobservation
 - What specific topics/areas do you still have questions about?
 - Would it be appropriate for teachers to use ELOET more frequently?
 - Currently, can be used as a formative tool but above and beyond ND accreditation contract, additional \$400 per year.
 - Is ELEOT adaptive to ELs, SPED, other student populations?
 - Yes, also adaptive to STEM schools
- ◆ Notes for next meeting: More diverse seating, report time out & cookies

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Tuesday, August 30, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM | Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Shelby Hubach | Shauna Greff | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 10:00 am | 3:00 pm | |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Nick Archuleta | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Fremstad | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marcus Lewton |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amy Arness | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jody French | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jill Louters |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marc Bluestone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Friesen | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mike Nathe |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeffrey Brandt | <input type="checkbox"/> | Jon Godfread | <input type="checkbox"/> | Amy Neal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tanja Brown | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Grosz | <input type="checkbox"/> | Andrea Noonan |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Sonja Butenhoff | <input type="checkbox"/> | Nikkie Gullickson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Larry Nybladh |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amiee Copas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cheryl Hagar | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rebecca Pitkin |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Scott Davis | <input type="checkbox"/> | Rosemary Hardie | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Richter |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Delrome | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russ Riehl |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Desai | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rod Jonas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Richard Rothaus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Kirsten Dvorak | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Melanie Kathrein | <input type="checkbox"/> | Wendy Sanderson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mary Eldredge-Sandbo | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ashley Kelsch | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | David Steckler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Wayne Kutzer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jim Stenehjem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tim Flakoll | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Lech | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| | | | | | |

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

Agenda Items

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|
| Topic: Welcome and Overview if Agenda | Presenter Shelby Hubach |
| Review of Agenda Logistics overview | |
| Topic: Working Group Roles, Responsibilities, Expectations | Presenter Heather Kinsey |
| Review of ESSA planning committee chart Role is to advise and inform and we own Support and guidance provided by ESSA Steering Committee Workgroups will produce work products and report to full committee | |
| Topic: Work Group Timeline/ESSA Plan Structure | Presenter Heather Kinsey/Laurie Matzke |
| Powerpoint: Significant time commitment and each workgroup will have additional meetings separately Optional to be part of a subcommittee workgroup Will have opportunity to hear from them and provide feedback if not in a particular workgroup Workgroup 1: Teacher/Leadership Effectiveness group <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Educator support and improvement• Educator effectiveness – Teacher and principal evaluation\ not mandated• Title II Part A• Support and align• Equity Plan• Key data points & definitions Alignment across all work groups Workgroup 2: Standards, Assessment, Accountability & Reporting <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standards and assessments• Key performance indicators• Accountability• Data definition, reporting, transparency• Continuous improvement• Improved use of resources Critical and will take the most time as it is the meat of the plan Workgroup 3: Continuous Improvement (Not just Title) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Statewide system of Continuous Improvement• Comprehensive and targeted supports & interventions• Strategies and best practices• Program alignment & Coordination• Progress monitoring, evaluations improvement Overview of timeline of workgroups and full committee Needing to identify any legislative changes – Dr. Rebecca Pitkin and ESPB board will lead ESPB is collecting feedback regarding changes needed Definition of effective teachers will be critical Highly qualified vs highly effective teachers Table discussion on content reviewed Laurie Matzke: Further review of buckets and what they will entail and encompass Details that will need to be decided and included in each workgroup Will be able to sign up at end of meeting Tomorrow those who signed up will receive email and doodle to setup subcommittee meetings Questions on buckets? | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Topic: Summary USDE Meeting, USDE ESSA Plan Template, CCSSO Questionnaire | | Presenter Laurie Matzke | | | |
| <p>Schools will have 1 school improvement process with AdancEd Message from USDE is there will be dramatic changes because they are listening to states regarding proposed regulations ND plan based on continuous improvement model Not filing out USDE plan template – instead working with AdvancED to create continuous improvement plan CCSSO meeting/will be able to hear what other states are doing AdvancED is also helping other states with their plans so will hold meeting to discuss Questionnaire to provide feedback so all states can see where they are all at with development of plans A lot left unanswered which is ok as no decisions have been made/preliminary information</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Meeting #2 Table Discussions | | Presenter Shelby Hubach | | | |
| <p>Table discussion notes overview Key elements of a state accountability plan/Handout Need to think about data infrastructure and presentation Want transparency but also realistic view</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Vision Survey Results/Dashboard Survey Results | | Presenter Shelby Hubach | | | |
| <p>Results of surveys: Equal support for each vision statement Created a vision statement with some more detail for understanding Liked the idea of dashboard Did not like rank order – it is a proposed regulation to have one but a lot of pushback across the nation</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Additional School Quality Factors Survey Results | | Presenter Shelby Hubach/Heather Kinsey | | | |
| <p>Review of survey results Table Discussion Activity: Analyze the Recommendations</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Table Discussion/Report Out | | Presenter Heather Kinsey | | | |
| <p>Table Discussion Notes on School Quality Factors What's important? Is it a measure of accountability? Do you include on dashboard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate and Culture/multiple stakeholder surveys • Good School Leaders/Struggling on ways to measure – survey is common • Student Engagement/Survey • Parent and Community Involvement <p>Caution in using these as a measure of accountability</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Selection of Work Groups | | Presenter Shelby Hubach | | | |
| <p>Subcommittee working group list of members</p> | | | | | |
| <p>Q & A/Next Meeting</p> | | | | | |
| <p>What is important to some may be cut Need to do a good job of measuring</p> | | | | | |
| Date: | September 30, 2016 | Location: | Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan | Time: | 10:00-3:30 |

Additional School Quality Factors

- Student engagement
 - ELEOT collected but could collect internally more often
 - Need to define
 - Experience – does this include participation in extracurricular?
 - Student scholarships?
 - Rigor – post secondary measures
 - Access to counselors
 - Usable
 - Student growth
 - Teacher growth
 - Short specific feedback
 - Not used for punishment
 - Training
 - What about supports for students lacking engagement? Those with outside influences
- Strong positive school climate and culture
- Teacher quality
 - Define what it is
 - What does a successful teacher look like?
 - Difficult because of credentials vs. quality
 - Difficult to get into teacher ed program –trickle down to small schools
 - Have quality but not effective
 - Are effective but not HQ where you want them
 - Can principals recognize quality instruction?
 - Teacher evaluations
 - Principals need to be capable of follow-up and coaching
 - Look at Finland
 - Gold standard
 - Good interactions with students
 - Relationships
 - Caring
 - Connection with teachers
 - Ineffective teachers – support teachers – all about relationships
 - It would look different in every school
 - There is a lot of data on teacher prep but don't know how that computes to teacher quality
 - Collaboration (college prep there is no collaboration)
 - Moving to 12 month school year may improve teacher quality
- Commitment to School Improvement – We are good but can be better
 - Most of indicators are already covered by AdvancEd
 - Effective leaders help
 - Work to keep teachers – reframe mentoring program with this in mind
 - Mentoring program required or atleast accessible to all
 - Feedback: too many days out of school
 - Maybe years 1-2
 - Reform? Too many requirements
 - Improvement goals
 - Student growth alignment
 - Meaningful professional development
 - Innovation
 - Climate/Culture creates creativity and communication

- Good things are happening in schools
- PLC's: Let them decide what to do instead of telling them what to do
- Develop people: not micromanage – provide resources and support
- AdvancEd for internal data
- Dashboard for external data
 - Report out by something other than a number
 - Concerned about what these factors (indicators) mean to the public
 - Would they be useful to others besides school system?
 - What's the end gate we are trying to get to with improvement?
 - False perception with number – use color range
 - “Commitment” is not measurable
- How do you measure effectiveness?
 - Quality of teachers
 - Ongoing professional development
 - PLCs are ongoing (models)
 - Improvement (dashboard) – School improvement plans – rational
 - More purposeful, thoughtful questions – survey teachers
 - Teacher prep
 - Student centered (student access and student voice)
 - Arts – restructure the arts into curriculum
 - Systemic approach = all lead to student engagement
 - Students need to have access to qualified teachers and equipment
 - Equity issue
- Professional development
 - Statewide initiatives, training
 - Job embedded, meaningful
 - System to generalize
 - Does it allow the making of assumptions
 - Connecting school quality and academics is hard
 - Measuring PD doesn't reflect on a “1 day” school who embed time into strategic implement across the board
 - Does number of hours matter?
 - What is measured and how?
 - How is it being used?
- 21st century skills – opportunity
- MTSS
 - Systems in place
 - Culture
 - Reporting out
- STEM/CTE courses
 - What's important
 - Finding a way to do it
 - Can't revert back to NCLB
 - Great opportunity that can't be passed up
 - Maybe hard to find something across the board for all schools
 - Not state implementation – shift to a compliance issue
 - Need choice of 3 measurement tools
 - Correlation studies in measurement tools
- Standards based grading
- Respect and responsibility – reporting out to parents
- Staff and leadership who hold students and community accountable
- Non-revenue – if they don't want to work with kids and have a passion for teaching

- Risk to non-renew
- Change perspective of the face of the “problem child”
- Shouldn't have to settle for “ok” staff that are happier when kids don't show up

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Friday, September 30, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM | Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Heather Hume/McREL | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 10:00 am | 3:30 pm | |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- ❖ Provide updates regarding federal ESSA guidance, requirements, timelines and opportunities for cross-state collaboration
- ❖ Learn about the progress and recommendations of each subcommittee
- ❖ Solicit feedback on subcommittee recommendations

AGENDA ITEMS:

10:00AM **Welcome**

Overview of Agenda

10:10AM **Summary of AdvancEd and CCSSO meetings in Atlanta**

- team from NDDPI attended the meeting
- looked at school dashboards
- focused on accountability
- sessions by topic: ESSA lead; Title II; Title III; school improvement
- 4 areas regulated by ED; Assessment; Supplant/Supplement; Pilot Projects
- Election impacts: new people no matter who is elected
- Sen. Alexander has requested that all federal agencies report on the creation of permanent positions and passage of admin rules
- more support with implementation ESSA than with NCLB; CCSSO is a big support; AdvanceED as well

10:30AM **Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings**

Teacher and Leader Effectiveness

- 5% set aside from Title II
- Equity Plan updated in August 2016
- looking at elements that already align with our state vision
- Sept. 8 meeting and October 17 - p.m. Nov. 16 - a.m. meeting at the Capitol

Discussion on PTESS and Mentoring

- ✓ **PTESS** - principal credential process is being looked at and coordinating the prep programs ISLICC stds
- ✓ AdvancED is the umbrella that the PTESS system is being implemented
- ✓ surveyed educators about how it was going; mostly positive; 90% principals are positive; 60% of teachers say it's positive; more observations are happening
- ✓ the system is about improving and supporting; when you published the rating it takes away from the idea of growth
- ✓ **Teacher Mentoring program** - highly effective; fortunate to have this program; work with the Natl Center on Teacher Mentoring; full release mentoring is ideal but not realistic in ND;
- ✓ 313 teachers and 313 mentors
- ✓ Mode number is 1 - a lot of new teachers in schools
- ✓ state legislature funds the program through a grant
- ✓ Principal Mentoring: 17 principals in the program - there may be more - first time in the profession candidates
- ✓ Mentors are retired administrators; meet weekly with new principals weekly via videoconference; visit 2 times early on; coaching - what's hot on your plate
- ✓ seek funding for the principal mentoring
- ✓ 1 grade or rating should not be on the report card
- ✓ growth should consider the students but there are many variables
- ✓ student growth should be included but not at the 50% level; student growth data might not be on the dashboard but should be part of the evaluation
- ✓ some discussion of improvement plans
- ✓ keep your plan flexible and do not get too tied down to details - demonstrate you have a system; the connection to equity is still being worked on
- ✓ 57% graduation rate for Native American students compared to 89% overall graduation rate
- ✓ What will be on the dashboard to show what we are doing to ensure effective teachers?
- ✓ Look at states with ESEA waivers for examples

✓ **Summary Report – Jim Stenjhem**

Title II Funding

- ✓ 10.6 million budget; set aside - 2.6% for statewide initiatives
 - ✓ REA grants for PD; teacher training on writing and arts; turnaround arts initiative; para professional trainings; ND Dropout Prevention Summit - these are all statewide initiatives including admin costs to oversee
 - ✓ changes from NCLB - to provide low income/minority students more access to quality teachers
 - ✓ ensure the equity of opportunity to students
 - ✓ key areas: 1% set aside - see chart in notes for estimated allocations
 - ✓ concerns about having money taken away from districts to fund statewide initiatives
 - ✓ the Teacher Effectiveness subcommittee needs to provide input on the way in which Title II funds are distributed (5% is part of the ESSA recommendations)
 - ✓ Subcommittees are providing recommendations
 - ✓ ND DPI is going through a process of looking at efficiencies
 - ✓ provide your input on this issue - contact a subcommittee member
 - ✓ subcommittee can make a recommendation on what the percentages should be; some districts don't need the state level supports while others do
- **Continuous Improvement**
 - this kind of system adapts to the realities and complexities;
 - systemic approach
 - a process not an event every 5 years
 - meet schools where why are; partnering with the state
 - an improvement journey not a onetime event - all schools should be engaged in, not just low performing schools
 - moving away from punitive things
 - ✓ **Discussion on:**
 - **Identification of Schools for Improvement**
 - Comprehensive support or targeted support - ESSA required states to identify schools in each category
 - Comprehensive supports = 500K grant required; 5% of schools - budget means we could only help 5 schools
 - This situation would mean we could not provide any support to Targeted
 - ND DPI sent a letter to US ED to say that the requirement for Comprehensive support does not work in a rural state like ND
 - AdvanceED recommended a tiered approach so all the schools can be served
 - subcommittee addressed the issue of sustainability once the funding is no longer available
 - build capacity of the school leaders
 - NCLB revisited: most of the schools designated as low performing had significant populations of Native American students
 - concern about addressing the issue of historical trauma
 - generational poverty; it's not a level playing field
 - apathy; local governments won't work with kids about chronic absenteeism; kids in poverty - need to address these issues or you are not going to get off the list
 - October 21 - tribal consultation meeting - very important
 - school quality factors will help
 - talking to kids about what would motivate them to do well on the state test - otherwise it doesn't matter ACT matters to kids
 - need to make sure schools and tribes are personally invited
 - **Direct Student Services**
 - keep something in ESSA that is similar to Supplemental Supports to get tutoring; AP classes; credit recovery
 - **New Title IV Block Grant**
 - Grants for arts, etc; safe and healthy schools; supporting technology; minimally funded 10K; districts estimated allocations are available - district choice to use these funds

12:30PM

Lunch

1:30PM

Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

● **Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting**

Work on standards had already begun; ND is already doing SmarterBalance;

✓ **Discussion on:**

- **Additional School Quality Factors**
- looked at the top ten additional school quality factors; needed to apply statewide
- narrowed to 4
- **school climate/culture** - how is this defined?
 - + critical to school quality
 - +actionable and meaningful data - that is used
 - -perception data
- **attendance**
 - +important
 - +cost effective - currently collected
 - -limited school/district control
 - -potential to falsify data due to pressure
- **student engagement**
- +driving factor of student success
- _hard to measure
- **Summary Report – Robert Grosz**
- Committee put absenteeism to the side - feel like it is not in the control of the school or district
- culture - rituals, behaviors in a school
- climate - is it the academic climate, physical climate, social climate
- group has a lot of work to do; need to meet more often and longer to tackle these issues
- **School Dashboard**
 - looked at a lot of examples of dashboards
 - meeting on Wed., Oct. 5 of this subcommittee from 8-5
 - how to we manage the designation of the lowest performing schools so it's a not a negative thing
 - dashboard is an opportunity to change the conversation and focus on strengths and weaknesses
 - taxpayers also need to be considered
 - value of transparency with the public - help frame and change the conversation; ESSA is strong on transparency
 - focus on strengths; focus on growth
- **Advanced Subgroup Conversation**
 - foster care; military families - some new subgroups
 - Gifted and Talented subgroup
 - suggestion by Supt. Baesler
 - should we explore it?
 - yes, we should look at it; devil will be in the details; having a growth model for all students will allow us to see
 - fist to five - we should explore it - consensus of the group

2:45PM

Discussion – Call to Action Memo

- asking for your help in communicating the message of this committee to your constituents
- more intentional communication to stakeholders
- executive summary of progress so far; talking points from each subcommittee
- Supt. Baesler wants to be sure to get feedback from the stakeholders; asking committee members to get input and bring it back; we need to talk to people to represent them well
- Agenda will include an item for receiving feedback

3:00PM

Discussion on CCSSO Questionnaire

- Meeting in Minneapolis on October 27- this state plan review will be an opportunity to receive feedback from other states; opportunity to meet with other states and get some peer review
- ND is contemplating letting high schools choose another assessment
- ND needs to redo its science standards after the ELA and Math are done
- RFP for new assessment will be forthcoming
- Document outlines what has been done historically and things that might be taken under consideration
- Lots of discussion on school quality factors - two will be part of the dashboard
- you have a week - please provide any ideas you have
- Consider adding the GED
- ELL - issue of aging out needs to be included
- ESSA memo to president from US ED
two regulations - fiscal supplement not supplant; accountability flexibility for states

3:15PM

Q&A and Next Steps

3:30PM

Adjourn

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Tuesday, October 25, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM | Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Shauna Greff | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 10:00 am | 3:30 pm | |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- ❖ Gather feedback on Supplement not Supplant letter
- ❖ Provide updates regarding federal ESSA guidance, requirements, timelines and opportunities for cross-state collaboration
- ❖ Learn about the progress and recommendations of each subcommittee
- ❖ Solicit feedback on subcommittee recommendations

AGENDA ITEMS:

10:00AM **Welcome** –Laurie Matzke

Overview of Agenda – Laurie Matzke

Stakeholder Engagement – Kirsten Baesler

- Video Clip from USDE
- Superintendent Baesler’s ESSA PowerPoint
 - ✓ Will make updates as needed
 - ✓ Can disseminate to all that want it to show their stakeholders
- Stakeholder Table Discussions (5)
 - NDCEL has done a great job of disseminating information
 - NDCEL conference presentation
 - NDASA Meeting, NDASS Meeting, NDSANS Meeting, Private Schools Meeting, ELPAC Meeting, Regional SBLT Meetings (local)
 - PPT will provide a consistent resource to share with stakeholders
 - NDACTE (Colleges of Teacher Education)
 - Dialogue with tribal entities; education leaders and tribal government
 - Tribal stakeholder meeting
 - GNDAs; daily email to members, encourage member dialogue, Most Likely to Succeed showings and discussions, NDDPI presentations
 - CTE; administrator list serve, how work here impacts CTE, staff meetings
 - Curriculum directors; ongoing small group discussions
 - Middle School principals; staff conversations, schoolwide principals group
 - NDSBA; conversation this week
 - NDPTA; Facebook posts, monthly state ESSA conference call with National PTA, disseminate detailed information to state NDPTA board (20 members), one on one conversations with people in education, politics, parents
 - Large school districts; meetings with ND study council, input from school superintendents, comprehensive memo to school board, newsletters both internal and external
 - Midsized school districts; teacher survey, presentations to staff with updates, presentations to administrators
 - List serve updates on ESSA to state education leaders
- Teacher Survey
 - Survey sent out through the REAs distributed across the state to all educators and some administrators in all districts with over 400 responses so far
 - Survey is still open
 - 101 have requested emails on ESSA updates
 - Comments:
 - ✓ Fewer assessments
 - ✓ Throw out Smarter Balanced
 - ✓ In favor of mentoring
 - ✓ NO letter grades for dashboard

- ✓ In favor of GED counting towards graduation rates
- ✓ Concerns of using ACT for state assessment

10:10AM

Review of Supplement Not Supplant Letter to USDE – Laurie Matzke

- Need to have letter in by November 7, 2016.
- The more people the USDE hears from the better.
- Use this as an example and create correspondence to the USDE.
- At the large districts, how does this effect you?
The letter from the NDDPI covers their main concerns – teacher transfers.
This is important from the standpoint of student-teacher relationships and also teacher –teacher relationships and communication for a team effort.
- Is there more of an opportunity to share the delegations view of the overreach?
Supt Baesler will reach out to see if they could independently or jointly get more communication outreach to share their concerns about regulation overreach.
If the regulations come out and there is major overreach, we will be reaching out to the delegation for their support so we do not just accept.

10:30AM

Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

- **Teacher and Leader Effectiveness**
 - ✓ ESPB Update on Effective Teacher Definition – Mary Eldredge-Sandbo
With the removal if the Highly Qualified requirement, needed to review and decide how to make sure our teachers are qualified.
Indicated four non-negotiables and seven passed motions - report out to committee.
Discussion on Kindergarten being kept separate: received strong recommendations to keep it as is –such a crucial time for students to get started with their learning.
Supt Baesler commented that nationally, developmental needs are dramatically different for Kindergarten than they are for older grades.
They need a specialized skill set to meet the needs of the 0-5 year olds.
Seems more burdensome to put additional requirements to receive the ECE endorsement.
NDDPI does have funds to help teachers receive this endorsement.
 - ✓ Leadership Academies – Gail Schauer
Multi-Tiered Leadership Academy to provide professional support, professional development, and career ladder opportunities. An update on mentoring, cost, and the critical skills of the Missouri Model. This model supports new principals, practicing principals in the field, and ongoing needs of all principals/leaders through modules of training. An idea is being explored to offer credits and advance degrees with the program as career opportunities.
Discussion on cost, time, and importance of mentoring leaders. Confirmed that leadership mentoring is important. Discussion also included the importance and continued support for teacher mentoring.
 - ✓ Recruitment and Retention – Rod Jonas
Task force
 - data was reported out regarding openings
 - rural ND were those with the highest needs
 Teaching perception survey results
 - Reasons for going into teaching
 - Wanting to make a difference
 - Inspiring teacher in their lives
 - Love subject matter
 - Were they satisfied with their profession? 86% yes
 - Would they go into education if they had to do it all over again? 63% yes
 - Does the public respect educators? 73% no
 - Would you encourage your child or students to into education as a profession? 58% no

- Have you thought about leaving the education profession and why?
 - 16% salary/benefits
 - 14% student behavior
 - 13% school administration
 - 10% lack of respect for the profession
 - Teachers with 0-5 years of experience, 30% cited either salary/benefits, 16% student behavior
 - ESPB reported out on licenses issued in 2015-2016
 - Schools/administrators have been creative in filling teaching positions
 - Options used:
 - Long term substitutes
 - Creating larger classrooms
 - Offering more electives to fill the student's schedules
 - Allowing teacher overloads
 - Combining grade levels
 - Using more Paraprofessionals and teachers in the Teacher-in-Residence program
 - To Recruit, administrators use:
 - Job service
 - Career fairs
 - Local newspapers
 - Online employment programs
 - Contact teacher education programs
 - College visits to meet with education students
 - Offer "low" rent for housing, provided scholarships for graduate courses, moving expense vouchers, paid transportation for out of state applicants
 - Many of the schools have accessed retirees
 - The following solutions were suggested:
 - Statewide marketing campaign promoting teaching profession (found this to be very expensive)
 - Expanding loan forgiveness and signing bonus program
 - Compensation of student teachers
 - Develop a teaching pathway for high school students
 - Enhance school climate and culture
 - Develop a pool of traveling teachers similar to traveling nurses to incentivize working in high need areas
 - Task force is in process of developing a more detailed action plan to implement solutions
- ✓ Title II Set-aside – Stefanie Two Crow & Robert Lech
 An overview and update on the Title II Part A program, provided estimated funding to support Title II Part A programming, fiscal duties, statewide initiatives, professional development, and school leadership with the optional 3% set-aside. This committee is prepared to make a final recommendation to the large ESSA Planning Committee regarding the set-aside of Title II Part A funds and optional 3% for school leadership.
 Range is 0-8% that can be set-aside.
 1% Admin, 2.6 additional for a total of 3.6% is recommendation.
 Vote; all but one member was in favor of the 3.6% recommendation.
 Agenda of topics that will be discussed at next meeting in November.
- **Continuous Improvement**
 - ✓ Meeting will be held October 31, 2016 so nothing to report out
 - ✓ Agenda of topics that will be discussed at next meeting on October 31, 2016

CCSSO Training on Accountability – October 27, 2016

- ✓ Two state Questionnaire (SD and WI)

12:00PM

Lunch

1:00PM

Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

- **Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting**

- ✓ Accountability Presentation – Jeff Fastnacht
 - Survey to get a sense on climate within the school at both the beginning and the end of the school year.
 - To be able to use it for accountability, we need detailed data for each student specifically.
 - All agree growth should be in the program.
 - ACT does not show growth – not geared for kids with special needs.
 - ACT is a college readiness, not high school accountability.
 - Need to work on the determination of growth in high school.
 - Index gives credit for the growth that is occurring in schools.
 - The dashboard has an opportunity to be a sales pitch for each school.
 - Will allow schools to display the good things that are going on at schools.
 - Vote on recommendation of N Size of 10 with multiple year average:
 - 27 in favor
 - None not in favor
- ✓ High School Assessment (options for growth)
 - Conducted a survey and results showed fifth graders are hit hard and 11th graders are slammed for testing.
 - Student Cabinet had a discussion was dedicated to going over survey results and assessments. They feel like they are checked out after 11th grade. Since they do not count for accountability, we do not test or check in with them on how they are doing.
 - What is best for our kids? 8th grade to ACT there is no reconnect with kids.
 - Can we do something in the 9th and 10th year to prepare them for the testing that takes place in the 11th grade?
 - How well did we do in the 12th grade to help students to be choice ready?
 - Not about the number of times tested but is the data meaning?
 - Having the flexibility of using the Work Keys option is important.
 - Want credit for growth – if ACT will not show that, it probably would not be the best choice.
 - ESSA requires testing once in the secondary level.
 - Qualifying indicator could be Redefining Ready.
 - Progress monitoring can be displayed on the dashboard and will show growth but does not need to be used for accountability.
 - There is value in every test given. How do we value and place weight on the different ones?
 - What is the negative with testing in 9th?
 - First year of high school is your last year of assessment.
 - Ninth graders tested to represent how the entire high school is doing.
 - You are not adding a test; you are moving the testing from 11th to 9th for assessment.
 - We have to acknowledge the sensitivity to assessments.
 - What is the true value of the standards you set, and does the measure provide every student the best opportunity for growth?
 - What about testing in 12th?
 - What would that do for those students? Factor for admission into certain colleges – won't need remediation course their first year of college. Would provide students and parents feedback on whether they are choice ready.
 - About 24% of ND students that went to ND Universities required remediation courses.
 - Each university uses their own placement criteria.
 - Discussion needs to be continued in this issue.

Relationship between assessment and culture/climate: There is a dilemma between time out of the classroom and having good opportunities for our kids. There are things that impact children other than academics.

There are things we can do that are valuable if we test in 9th grade. They can still use the ACT and Work Keys to monitor the high schools progress but not used in accountability.

Agenda of topics that will be discussed by this subcommittee.

Gifted and Talented Topic

Gifted and talented in what? Academics? Math and English only? Science? Arts?

Need a better terminology than gifted and talented – maybe highest group of academic achievers?

Is it worthy of shining a light on those students who are not being served the best we can?

A presentation will be given at the Continuous Improvement subcommittee regarding this issue.

Potentially if we include this subgroup, does it open the door to other subgroups?

Where do draw the line to include?

There are options as far as where this information can be displayed.

Pieces of the presentation that is going to be given on this issue will be brought back to the large group in November.

3:15PM

Q&A and Next Steps

- Topics each subcommittee need to discuss and make recommendations on
- Next Meeting – November 30, 2016

3:30PM

Adjourn

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Tuesday, December 20, 2016 | 8:30 AM – 4:15 PM | Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Kathleen Dempsey | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 8:30 am | 3:45 pm | |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

**NORTH DAKOTA ESSA PLANNING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2016, 8:30 AM – 4:15 PM
PIER ROOM, BAYMONT INN & SUITES, MANDAN, ND
AGENDA**

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Provide an overview of Final Regulations
- Provide updates regarding federal ESSA guidance, requirements, timelines, and opportunities for cross-state collaboration
- Learn about the progress and recommendations of each subcommittee
- Solicit feedback on subcommittee recommendations

AGENDA ITEMS:

8:30 AM Welcome

The meeting began with a welcome from Laurie Matzke and a review of the meeting's agenda. To inform all meeting participants, each table group compiled and reported on the actions taken and questions/concerns of stakeholders. [KD1]

- What will the high school assessment be?
- How will growth be measured?
- Elementary like the idea of growth with achievement scores (same cohort)
- What will the dashboard look like? What will it say about our school?
- How do you measure student engagement? Like the idea but question how it will work
- What will be the overall school quality factor?
- The discussion on ineffective teachers is very concerning to all stakeholders
- Discussed assessment options with NDCEL
- Discussed how to define teacher effectiveness and the complexities of the definition
- Discussed what it means to be "Choice Ready" (college, career, and/or military)
 - What does Career Ready mean?
 - How do we "beef" up career, college, military readiness?
 - What tools do we use?
 - How do we record results?
- Meetings with stakeholder groups:
 - Informational
 - Direct people to NDDPI ESSA website
- Discussion with colleagues about assessments
- Discussion on definitions of teacher effectiveness
- Growth vs. Accountability
- Presented to NDREAs (GNWEC) to give them updates
- Email updates sent to approximately 111 teachers who wanted updates
- Conducted a survey of North Dakota teachers in October with 452 responses – sent results of the survey, encourage them to follow updates and notes
- Maintained contact with community members to keep them informed
- Presented to the Great Northwest (REA) consortium
- Wrote a letter to Fort Berthold reservation leaders
- Met with superintendents at a Vegas conference about GED counting as part of graduation rates
- Communicated with district administrator and with teacher education groups about how to define teacher effectiveness
- Learned that teachers wanted more information about the dashboard
- Indicated that some stakeholders feel the that "engagement" could be a school indicator but are uncertain of how to measure it
- Learned that elementary school stakeholders indicate interest in considering student growth as a factor
- Continue to update administration on and at the local levels
- Update Title Staff
- Continue communication with stakeholders
- MTSS – updates after meeting with continuous improvement presentation
- Visit with building level administrators in districts
- Visit with district level administration
- Email correspondence sent to curriculum directors

- Email correspondence sent to Special Ed directors
- Visits with Higher Ed/Teacher Ed
- NDDPI communicated with various subgroups such as Special Ed and EL
- NDDPI related the information obtained at the combined Federal Programs meeting and its usefulness – meeting with ED program officer was most useful

9:15 AM Overview Highlights of Final ESSA Regulations – Laurie Matzke

Final ESSA regulations were released on November 28. Some of the major changes include:

- New submission dates – The first submission date is now April 3 (rather than Mar.) and the second submission is Sept 18, 2017. NDDPI plans to submit in April.
- States must use the ED provided template for their ESSA plan due to the peer review process. ED allots 120 days for peer review.
- States will identify Comprehensive Support schools by start of 2018-2019 school year.
- States will identify Targeted Support schools by the start of 2019-2020.
- States must assure that their academic standards meet the requirements in the law
- Accountability
 - Don't need one summative rating/only identify among three categories (Comprehensive, Targeted, or Not identified)
 - Dashboard – no prescribed percentages are required
- Report cards
 - Must be disseminated by December 31 of each year
 - Must collect post-secondary data
- School improvement
 - Must set aside 7% even in first year to establish a base in 2017-2018 even though no schools have been identified. States may bank these funds or may use the funds to support schools under NCLB.
 - Targeted Support schools may receive a \$50,000 grant and Comprehensive Support schools may receive as much as \$500,000 (may give smaller amounts).
 - All public schools should be included in the pool for Targeted Support calculations, not just Title I.
 - States may allot funds to non-Title I schools to support improvement needs.
- Graduation rate
 - EL in the grad calculations
- LEA Consolidated Application
 - SEAs may approve LEA applications without having their state ESSA plan approved
 - Assurance document must be submitted by April 3
- Appropriations for 2017-2018
 - Allocations may be late June or July – districts must know that these are coming late

9:40 AM Equity Presentation – Ann Ellefson

Ann Ellefson provided an update about equity expectations under ESSA. The equity areas of focus in ESSA include:

- Teacher Equity
- Fiscal Equity and Transparency
- Equitable Access to Educational Opportunities

Ann presented information about each focus area and then invited meeting attendees to discuss how these areas might look in North Dakota.

Teacher Equity: In ESSA, states and districts must ensure that low-income students and students of color are not taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers.

- North Dakota has a high rate of qualified teachers in classrooms across the state
- In a 2016 Gallop Poll of North Dakotans, 89% of survey respondents indicated that they believed their schools were either “excellent or good.”

Fiscal Equity and Transparency: In many places, schools serving the most vulnerable students get less funding. ESSA requires transparency in fiscal reporting to insure that equitable funding is maintained for the most vulnerable students. ESSA

- Maintains the Title I funding formula and increases the role of poverty in Title II.
- Requires reporting on actual per pupil school level spending.
- Requires reporting on equity measures including rates of student discipline, chronic absenteeism, pre-school, and advanced coursework.

- Supt. Baesler discussed how this might impact small schools and indicated that both Republican leadership and Civil Rights groups supported fiscal transparency processes. She reminded meeting attendees that NDDPI is committed to a continuous improvement process.
- Joe Kolosky discussed reporting on fiscal transparency processes (fiscal workgroup) indicating that districts will need clear guidance on the type of data to collect

Equitable Access to Educational Opportunities

- ESSA focuses on a well-rounded education
- ESSA is less punitive and more transparent empowering the community and the school board to make decisions that are most meaningful for the district.

10:00 AM Update on Tribal Collaboration – Lucy Fredericks

Lucy Fredericks provided an update on consultation activities with tribes and highlighted the following points.

- Consultation is a government to government relationship and may mean different things to different tribes.
- Tribal consultation should occur early in the planning process so that tribal views are integrated into the plan.
- Meaningful tribal consultations must occur between LEAs and tribal education leaders, as well as between the SEA and tribal education leaders.
- A combined meeting with tribes occurred on October 21 in Bismarck with meeting facilitation by the North Central Comprehensive Center at McREL International.
 - Approximately 50 participants attended the meeting.
 - Participants indicated the need to meet individually with tribes and so Lucy Fredericks and Supt. Baesler scheduled meetings at tribal locations to discuss ESSA.
 - Some meetings occurred in November and December with additional consultation meeting scheduled for January.
 - December 13: Meeting with Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa
 - January 2017: Meeting scheduled with Three Affiliated Tribes in New Town, ND
 - January 2017: Meeting scheduled with Standing Rock
 - January 30, 2017: Meeting scheduled with Spirit Lake Nation
 - A second whole group tribal consultation meeting is scheduled for Dec. 22 at Bismarck.
 - NDDPI will work with LEAs to help them how to conduct their own tribal consultation meetings.

10:15 AM Recommendations from ND Council on the Arts

- Laurie discussed the letter from the North Dakota Council on the Arts regarding their recommendations for the ESSA plan.
- Beth Larson-Steckler offered comments about the state of the arts in ND indicating that smaller school districts have difficulty funding arts programs such as visual arts, dance and/or media arts in the schools.
- Multiple meeting attendees expressed their concern and support for funding arts opportunities.
- It was expressed that guidance should not push one type of program over another, but should identify the multiple options for use of the funds.
- One meeting participant shared how arts can be incorporated into the regular content and not only as an extra program.
- The school culture indicator may partially address the concerns expressed by the ND Council on the Arts
 - Given that ND respects local control, NDDPI doesn't plan to dictate how the arts should be included in LEA plans but can provide guidance about the arts

10:25 AM Break

10:35 AM Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Report

- This subcommittee meets December 21 to continue its work.
- Graduation Rate Update – Jeff Fastnacht
 - Recommends keeping the calculation for graduation rate the same as it is in NCLB
 - Discussion with South Dakota about the GED extender and how that state has used this extender to measure graduation rate
 - Must continue to report on four-year standard but wants to consider a seven-year report. May use national database to track students that move to other communities. Extending the time frame for graduation may impact the way that the student dropout is reported. Questions about how to link attaining a GED or diploma after leaving a ND school to the initial contributions made by ND schools are being investigated.
- Climate/Engagement Update – Jeff Fastnacht

- The subcommittee likes the school climate option, but is unsure how this factor might be measured. The subcommittee will identify a measurement tool in the upcoming meeting and is considering whether the AdvanceEd effective learning environments observation tool (ELEOT) may be appropriate. Discussion about the frequency of assessing school climate using ELEOT occurred. One participant commented on how the yearly AdvanceEd climate survey (student, parent, teacher, etc.) may be the best option for measuring school climate.
- Assessment Update – Jennifer Fremstad
 - Because of the consistency across K-8 academic courses, measuring growth is more straightforward at this level.
 - Measuring student growth at the high school level is more problematic as there are multiple academic pathways for students to take
 - The subcommittee sent out questions regarding assessment options to HS principals and requested feedback.
 - Concerns about the length and long wait for the assessment report from NDSA were expressed – Principals would prefer a test that could give information/results back more quickly.
 - When asked whether NDSA should be administered in the sophomore year, 57% of responding high school principals indicated that sophomore administration represented a viable option.
 - Participants discussed the viability of administering NDSA at grade nine as this option might provide a clearer representation of student growth
 - Advantages and disadvantages for using the ACT as a proficiency measure were discussed.
 - Choice of assessment at the school/district level is important to Supt. Baesler.
- School Dashboard Update – NDDPI is in the process of developing a RFI for the school dashboard. They will review proposals and consider options as proposals are received.
- English Learner Update - - Sonja Butenhoff
 - Lodee Arnold continues to work with the English Learner Program Advisory Committee (ELPAC) to gather input for the ESSA plan.
 - Committee recommends the continued use of WIDA English Language Development Standards and the use of the WIDA proficiency assessment, ACCESS 2.0.
 - Guidance suggest that state assessment should be available in other languages when a “significant language” of ELs are identified. Currently, Spanish is the only other significant language group in North Dakota.
 - Committee recommendations
 - Exclude newly arrived EL for the first year of test administration in ELA (Option 1)
 - Use proficiency levels from entry year (considered year 0) and then consider growth over 4-6 years
 - Monitor students for two years after they exit the program
 - Administer a state-wide home language survey
 - Screen students if there is evidence of another language in the home (unless academic progress shows no need to assess)
 - Use teacher recommendation to recommend assessment on program entry
 - The committee is currently working on components of the exit assessment

12:20 PM Lunch

1:20 PM Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee Reports

- Equity Presentation – Russ Ziegler
 - Meetings in November and December – The committee looked at survey results from the equity plan which showed a large number of new teachers at low poverty schools
- Definition of Effective Educator – Aimee Copas
 - The subcommittee is currently working on definitions for effective and ineffective teachers and indicated the complexity of articulating these definitions.
 - The subcommittee is considering a multi-tiered approach that might include factors such as whether the teacher is highly qualified, on a plan of improvement, and/or receives a satisfactory formal teacher evaluation. A discussion on continuous improvement and how to develop effective teachers occurred.
 - Supt. Baesler reminded meeting participants that ESSA requires a definition of effective and ineffective teachers. State ESSA plans must include a link to a state website that shows where information on teacher effectiveness is reported.
 - Members indicated concerns about establishing a ranking system for educators.

Continuous Improvement Subcommittee Reports

- Identification for School Improvement and Resources – Joe Kolosky and Laurie Matzke
 - Comprehensive Support schools

- Represent the lowest 5% of Title I schools
 - Include high schools that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students
 - Are identified for three years
- NDDPI recommends using a multi-faceted approach (Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3) to support all Comprehensive Support schools
 - Tier 1: NDDPI will propose a partnership with the School Improvement Network to provide coaching and consultation services to help schools conduct a needs assessment and create a plan for improvement.
 - Tier 2: All Comprehensive Support schools will be eligible to apply for a \$350,000 school improvement grant to be used over three years to make the improvements identified in their plans
 - Tier 3: The Division of Student Support & Innovation will provide guidance and support to all Comprehensive Support Schools
- Targeted Support schools include any school that is consistently underperforming (as defined by the state) for one or more student groups.
- NDDPI proposes a multi-faceted approach (Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3) to support all Targeted Support schools
 - Tier 1: NDDPI proposes a partnership with ND REAs to roll out MTSS support to all Targeted Support schools. NDDPI will pool state resources within multiple programs (Title I, Title II, Title III, Title IV, Special Education, and School Improvement) to support this work
 - Tier 2: All Targeted Support schools will be eligible to apply for a \$50,000 school improvement grant each year they are identified for support
 - Tier 3: The Division of Student Support & Innovation will provide guidance and support to all Targeted Support schools
- MTSS - Luke shared the NDDPI definition of MTSS and its connection with ESSA
 - Essential components of MTSS include
 - Assessment
 - Data-based decision making
 - Multi-tier instruction
 - Infrastructure and support (vision and culture, professional development and resources, leadership)
 - Fidelity and evaluation
 - Data from NWEA and other assessments will be used to determine the best supports for students
 - Students will receive the specialized supports needed to address gaps or provide extension

3:30 PM Draft State ESSA Plan – Laurie Matzke

Laurie discussed the timeline to complete the ESSA plan by April.

- First draft of ESSA plan to subcommittees – end of December 2016
- Feedback from subcommittees during January 2017
- Review of feedback and plan revisions by ND DPI – mid February
- Public review of draft ESSA plan through mid-March
- Editing and approvals through end of March
- Submission to ED by end of March

Questions were addressed.

3:45 Meeting was adjourned

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Wednesday, February 8, 2017 | 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM | Bismarck Ramada Hotel

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Kathleen Dempsey | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 9:00 am | 4:00 pm | |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

**NORTH DAKOTA ESSA PLANNING COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2017 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM
ASSEMBLY HALL, RAMADA BISMARCK HOTEL, BISMARCK, ND**

AGENDA

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Provide updates regarding federal ESSA guidance, requirements, timelines and opportunities for cross-state collaboration
- Learn about the progress and recommendations of each subcommittee
- Solicit feedback on subcommittee recommendations

AGENDA ITEMS:

9:00 AM Welcome –Laurie welcomed committee members and discussed the most recent ED updates.

- Action taken by CRA repeals Accountability rules and regulations
- Key questions for ESSA development are
 - Timeline - CCSO is encouraging ED to keep the current timeline in place.
 - Template – Question-Will the ED template continue to be a requirement for ESSA plan development.
 - Does the new Administration have a different intention for ESSA? (ED may not issue rules and regulations but may issue non regulatory guidance.)
- ND is confident that the drafted ESSA plan is in compliance as it was built on the statute.
- The committee was reminded that the plan should not include hyperlinks. All resources/attachments must be included in the plan itself or the appendices.

Overview of Agenda

Stakeholder Table Discussion/Report Out

- Participants discussed the most recent outreach activities by committee members and stakeholder feedback the draft ESSA plan. Notes were recorded on chart paper, and small groups reported to the whole group. The charts were collected and the information compiled by NDDPI.
 - There was a recommendation to draft a statement from the ESSA planning committee that articulates how the ND ESSA plan clearly reflects the requirements in the ESSA statute. This statement would represent a proactive communication strategy.

Report outs

- Many stakeholders are still not familiar with ESSA. It is recommended that the committee help community/educators understand the “big picture” of ESSA. One group recommended a message map with key details about ESSA. This might result in a one-page document with visuals to help communicate the ideas. Stakeholders seem to focus on one aspect of ESSA (ELL, SpED, etc.) rather than the “big picture.”
- How can we communicate with stakeholders?
 - Bite-size chunks
 - ESSA Message Map:
 - ✓ Break plan down into sections, give 3-4 critical elements within that section
 - ✓ Give web links to the section of the plan
 - ✓ Provide the comment link
 - ✓ This would target the audience to their needs
- There is so much beyond ESSA, nothing concrete now
- Can we supply links to recap meetings
- Presentations given at conferences for various groups throughout North Dakota
- Information being given out at board meetings, workshops, and professional organizations
- Discussions at REA monthly meetings
- CTE director regular meetings, CTE listserv
- Consultation with tribal councils and leaders
- ELPAC discussion on EL issues
- The question of “What If” and should we have a plan in place?

- There has been considerable consultation with tribal members and this process has been well received. Committee members have talked with tribal councils and chairs of the tribal colleges. It is noticeable that comments have been very quiet.
- Committee members noted that stakeholders appeared positive about ESSA accountability through AdvancED. Committee members also noted that there was a positive response to focusing on effective/ineffective teaching practices rather than effective/ineffective teachers.

ESSA Training Plan – Grant Opportunity

- Laurie discussed the training plan and suggested that messages would be crafted in small chunks with specific messages by audience (ELL teachers, administrators, parents, etc.). The training plan would be multifaceted.
 - Webinars (maybe 15 minutes at a chunk) – similar to the webinars that DPI developed for School Board members (short clips from various DPI offices)
 - Book study on ESSA
 - Statewide ESSA training scheduled (East side of state on May 4 and West side of state on May 8 possible dates)
 - Regional training with REAs on consolidated applications with administrators
 - The ESSA planning committee will remain a structure during the plan’s implementation, especially through subcommittees. DPI wants to ensure the right data is being collected and needs help from committee members to work through implementation details. (This includes the training phase.)
 - CCSSO is allowing states to apply for an engagement grant to help SEAs conduct training and communicate about the ESSA plan.
 - It was noted that messaging needs to be consistent from group to group. It was suggested that DPI develop a slide presentation(s) to help committee members as they interact with stakeholders. There was a recommendation that slide presentations be as specific to the audience as possible.
 - DPI plans to share information through the many conferences (professional meetings) that will occur through the rest of the year.
 - It was shared that the partnership with AdvancED represents a big advantage as what is already occurring across the state with AdvancED accountability supports ESSA.
 - There was a reminder to continue outreach to stakeholders as an ongoing part of ESSA implementation.

10:00 AM Overview of CCSSO Sponsored Meeting Regarding Plan Peer Review

Laurie offered comments on the CCSSO meeting and noted that the team would have preferred comments in writing. Several comments referenced the long-term goals.

- Key components
 - Choice ready: The team was commended on having a choice-ready goal, but reviewers didn’t think the goal was rigorous enough. They questioned the decision to require picking two indicators, rather than require all.
 - Assessment: The goal for reducing the number of non-proficient students was supported by reviewers. Switching from grade 11 to grade 10 for accountability testing was supported. There was discussion about the use of the ACT as an option.
 - School improvement – target schools – There was discussion about whether capping the number of targeted schools at 10% would be supported by reviewers, however, since the Congressional Review Act (CRA) may void ED’s rules and regulations, using this process should not be problematic.
 - It was recommended that discussion related to English learners be inserted across in all components of the plan.
 - In regards to defining ineffective teachers, focusing on ineffective teaching practices rather than on ineffective teachers was supported.
- General comments included:
 - Provide more specific information on AdvancED into the plan.
 - No hyperlinks can be included in the plan. All documents should be included in the plan or the appendices.
 - Reviewers were complimentary on stakeholder engagement, especially tribal consultation – Wanted to know how plan has changed as a result of stakeholder input.

10:20 AM Update on Tribal Collaboration – Lucy Fredericks

Outreach included:

- Two tribal stakeholder meetings (October 21 and December 22)
- Board of Directors' meeting – Nov 4
- Superintendent Baesler, Lucy Fredericks, and Scott Davis (Indian Affairs Commissioner) are participating in the onsite tribal consultation meetings.
 - First tribal meeting – 12/13 Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa – This meeting focused primarily on providing information about ESSA as there were several newly elected tribal leaders.
 - Onsite meeting at Standing Rock, January 17 – There was strong participation from the community with about 35 attendees. Areas of interest/concern included:
 - Culture and language commitment
 - Preserving heritage
 - Discussion on language immersion
 - Need to continue discussion with tribal leaders
 - Onsite meeting in New Town on Feb 7 with approximately 30 attendees. Attendees voiced appreciation for participation by Superintendent Baesler.
 - Meeting is scheduled for Feb 15 at Spirit Lake Tribe
 - The third ND ESSA tribal stakeholder meeting will occur on Feb 16.
 - There will be a leadership summit focusing on consultation between tribes and LEAs on Mar 3. NIEA is collaborating on this summit.

There was discussion of how the ND Essential Understanding will help address concerns from tribes for inclusion of language and culture.

10:30 AM Break

10:45 AM Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Subcommittee Reports

Use of State Title II Funding

- Stefanie Two Crow shared CCSSO feedback regarding ineffective practices. CCSSO recommended
 - more positive language, and
 - more collaboration with institutes of higher education in the plan.

Title II Funding includes

- State level administration of Program – 1% (approximately \$100,000)
- State level activities – 2.6% (approximately \$260,000). Proposed state level activities include:
 - Principal mentoring
 - REA Grants for PD
 - Principal-Teacher evaluation support system – possible state dollars

Vote for Title II Set Aside (total of 3.6% set aside) – results: (Agree, Disagree, Need more discussion)

- 96% agree, 4% needs more discussion

Overview of Proposal for Reporting – Jim Stenehjem (ND LEAD Center)

Reported on concerns expressed by stakeholders

- going from a growth model to a deficit model
- Common definition of ineffective teacher
- Open records and identification of individuals (privacy)

Recommendation

- Focus on performance of teaching rather than an individual teacher. Recommended using ratings 1-4 from educator evaluation systems. Levels 3-4 will denote effective teaching. Level 2 will identify developing teaching practices and Level 1 will identify ineffective teaching practices.
 - The calculation based on the number of ineffective elements identified on the evaluation versus the number of total elements on the evaluation rubric.
 - Current software being used in schools across the state would allow for this calculation.
 - Plan for training to improve, that is help teachers build effective teaching practices.

Whole group discussion included:

- The needs of high poverty schools and what this reporting means to those communities.
- Concerns about inter-rater reliability in applying the evaluation elements, needs to be based on classroom teaching (engagement of students) rather than professional activities such as participating in a PLC.
- Need to have talking points for individuals sharing this message. (e.g. Receiving a 2 on an evaluation indicates an opportunity for growth, not a poor rating.)

Vote for proposal for reporting:

- Report out as effective teaching practices rather than effective teachers – results: 92% agree, 8% Need more discussion (model to report on teaching practices rather than teachers)
- Report to ED as ineffective teaching. Practices identified as Level 1 will define ineffective teaching: results 92% Agree, 8% Need more discussion

12:00 PM Lunch

1:00 PM Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Reports

• **Assessment – Jennifer Fremstad**

- There was discussion about when to test high school students. It was indicated that secondary principals wanted the state accountability test in the sophomore year, Grade 10, rather than at Grade 11. ACT will remain the test at grade 11 and will remain an option for accountability purposes.

Vote: Accountability assessment will be administered at Grade 10 (Sophomore year)
Agree – 100%

• **Choice Ready Initiative – Jeff Fastnacht**

Jeff provided context about the Choice Ready framework.

- Roots in redefining Ready indicators come from ASA
- Each high school is encouraged to provide all four options, but may focus on one option more than another depending on school resources. For example, a school may not offer AP courses but may offer dual enrollment.
- Schools would not be rated only on one pathway (college ready).
- Life ready may be added at a later date.
- Graduation rate expectations would remain in place.

Vote: Approve Choice Ready framework: Agree: 100%

• **Long Term Goals – Ann Ellefson & Greg Gallagher** (see handouts)

- Ambitious long-term goals for all students and for all student subgroups is the goal of ESSA with academic achievement measured by proficiency on annual assessments.
 - DPI projects a 2.05% rate of increase per year in student academic performance over a six-year period. This will reduce the number of non-proficient students by 33% over the six-year time frame.
 - An accountability system must be valid, reliable, and fair and thus DPI will incorporate an assurance system when calculating whether goals have been met.
 - ✓ This includes using a 99% confidence level.
 - ✓ Current software tools can be systematized to report school achievement over the six years.
 - ✓ High school graduation rates (four-year cohort)
 - ✓ Greater improvement for students who are further behind

Vote for agreement on six-year 33% goal: Agree 96%, Disagree 2%, Need more discussion 2%

• **Accountability Indicators – Aimee Copas**

- Indicators will be identified at two levels: Secondary and Elementary

Vote: on the percentage of indicators for Secondary: 96% Agree, 4% Need more discussion

Vote: on the percentages of indicators for Elementary: 100% Agree

- English Learners – Lodee Arnold and Sonya Butenhoff (see handout)
 - WIDA standards and assessments will continue to be used across the state.
 - Spanish is the significant other language across state at 28%.
 - Growth for English learners will use a linear trajectory.
 - Student trajectory growth chart will begin with the initial annual ELP level of each student. The maximum number of years to exit the program will be identified based on the entry ELP level.
 - Long term and interim goals for student growth will be determined upon completion of the 2017-2018 administration of the ELP assessment. This will provide base year data.
 - The subcommittee had considerable conversation and review of cut scores to arrive that their recommendations
 - Included data from former ELs
 - Comprehensive school report would include the percent of students not meeting their individual growth expectations.

Vote: English learner model for ESSA: Agree = 100%

3:00 PM Reports from ESSA Subcommittee Meetings

Continuous Improvement Subcommittee Reports - Joe Kolesky – Overview – Discussed the need to target a number of schools as ND could have hundreds of schools identified under ESSA – thus the cap for targeted schools will be 10%. There are simply more needs than resources.

- Selection Criteria for Targeted Support– Russ Riehl (principal, Simle MS in Bismarck)
 - Comprehensive schools are capped at 10%, so the subcommittee recommends using the same approach for targeted schools.
 - Schools will apply for funding as a targeted school.
 - MTSS model: moving away from consequences and toward intervention/enrichment
 - This model allows for more positive messaging.
 - This model will also help sustain the interventions after three years.
 - If schools apply for funds but don't receive funds, there will be other options to support these schools

Vote: Selection Criteria for Targeted support: Schools with large gaps in one or more subgroups – 100% Agree

- Suggestion for tying goals to accountability
 - Feedback from CCSSO peer review:
 - Use progress toward program goals as exit criteria for schools
 - ✓ This approach could apply to both Comprehensive and Targeted schools.
 - ✓ Such as approach would make the goals more meaningful.
 - ✓ This would create buy-in from schools for the goals.
 - ✓ This approach doesn't create more work, but makes the work more current and meaningful.
- Vote on Proposal for Use of State Title IV Funding – Cheryl Hagar-Minot Public Schools (See handout)
 - Estimated Title IV, Part A Funding is \$2,425,000
 - DPI will reserve 95% of the funding for Student Support and Academic Enrichment program allocation for sub-grants to LEAs.
 - 1% of the funding will be reserved to support DPI administrative costs.
 - DPI wishes to reserve 4% to support LEA activities and programs designed to meet the overall purpose of the program.

Vote: Agree 29%, Disagree 46%, Need more discussion 25%

- ✓ Discussion indicates that the formula is not equitable to all districts.
- ✓ DPI will reserve only the 1%.

- ESSA Plan Development Timeline (after today's meeting)
 - Starting Feb 9 – Update the plan based on feedback
 - Feb 16 through Mar 16: Official 30-day comment period
 - Feb 16 through Mar 16: CCSSO will review the plan
 - Mar 20 – Mar 24: Review comments from the public. Based on comments, a committee meeting may be needed.
 - Late March: edits and proofing
 - April 3: Submit to ED

State ESSA Plan – Official Release for Public Comment

- Feedback Form: Committee members were asked to review the ESSA plan section by section during the 30-day review period. Members should provide their feedback (support plan as drafted, recommend changes) check the box, provide feedback if appropriate, sign and return the feedback form. The form is due at the end of 30-day public review process.

Superintendent Baesler – comments

- Feels that this plan is the beginning, not the end.
- Wants to continue to work with committee during implementation to build a collaborative effort and make the plan a reality.
- Will be across the state to support communication about the plan
- Committee members offered kudos to DPI, especially Laurie, for leading this effort.

3:50 PM Q&A and Next Steps

- Next Meeting

4:00 PM Adjourn

ESSA Planning Committee MINUTES

Wednesday, March 22, 2017 | 3:30 PM – 4:30 PM | Conference Call

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Shauna Greff | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 3:30 pm | 4:45 pm | |

Attendance

Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

Agenda Items

Topic: Communication from USDE – New Template

Monday March 13, USDE sent out a letter with new template with dramatic changes

Same submission dates

Regulations were thrown out therefore they were required to change the template

USDE stated faith in CCSSO so either use new template or work with CCSSO to use another template

NDDPI had a webinar with CCSSO and they will use the template we have with just a few revisions

Some minor tweaks throughout the template with additional 3 items:

- Long term goals for EL
- Title IV program funding
- How do we ensure homeless receive assistance from counselors

Due to requirement of 30 days for governor to review, once changes are made, the governor must have an additional 30 days so we are given until May 3 to submit

Once all changes and updates are made, we will put it out for 30 days and plan to submit on May 1 or 2

Need a table of contents with a crosswalk so they know where to find all information from new template on our plan

Topic: Feedback Received from Open Comment Period

Received minimal feedback

Created one document of comments broken out by section

NDDPI created a response to each comment

Review the document and make sure you are comfortable with responses

If concerns, email Shauna, so we can make the corrections

This document will be posted on web and will be included along with plan

Topic: Feedback from the Governor

Laurie Matzke and Superintendent Baesler met with Governor Bergum and Levi Bachmeier last week

Governor's office is very engaged and interested in the plan

Were not able to get through everything so there is another meeting on the March 29

Governor's top 2: main street initiative and education

Very positive

When meet next week, will give our revised plan for his review

Topic: CCSSO Review of Plan Against Statute - Recommendations

Scott from CCSSO gave our plan an in-depth review

Provided comments summarized on chart handed out

Kudos in 3 areas: Choice Ready, Continuous Improvement theme, Excellent Stakeholder Engagement

Recommendations:

Some are easy fixes

- Instead of being narrow – talk of continuous improvement on an overall scale
- Need more detail on pie chart – step by step document
- Adding paragraph on how we make annual determinations and how our dashboard will work

Most states are using summation A-F rating. We are in the minority because we are not making an annual summative rating so need to be very clear how we are making annual determinations

- Graduation rates must be clear – first and foremost calculating grad rate using 4-year cohort then can include GED
- Change of percentage on pie chart for high school – need to add up all 3 elements: State assessment, graduation rate, EL
Plan must more heavily weight academic factors and must be over 50% - we are currently at 45%
Take a little from Choice Ready and Climate engagement and add to graduation rate and state assessment?

Discussion:

Hard to make this change when we don't see the data and how this will impact schools

We have a time element and need to make decisions

Do we want more time and only submit in September?

What is our current graduation rate – 89% overall?

We currently have 25% on assessment, 10% EL (leave), grad rate 10%

Topic: Communication from USDE – New Template

Recommend up graduation rate to 16%

Can we split between graduation rate and GED?

13% grad rate and 8% GED, leave state assessment at 25%, leave EL at 10%

Should we take equally from Choice Ready and Engagement or all from one?

Both are at 25% right now

Take from each equally 3% from each leaving 22%

This would put the total at 51%, which would meet the letter of the law

Need to add clarity to timeline on comprehensive and targeted support

Identity comprehensive schools in March 2018 so they are ready for 2017-2018 year

Targeted by 2018-2019 school year

Recommended a thesis statement – overarching – strengthen the beginning of section

Strengthen resource review for lowest performing schools

Some were long-term considerations that are not part of the plan but things to think about going forward

Putting out RFP for new assessment

Nothing we need to worry about now or need to be in the plan – just need to be thinking about it

Two additional school quality indicators

Create subcommittee groups to work on implementation of these

Questioning our rigor

Several organizations are going to be reviewing state plans and rating them

Effective educators:

Intrigued with our creative proposal – if truly going to do the things we say we are going to, it will be a great idea

How are the evaluations used? As they are supposed to be used? Would a teacher truthfully receive a 1?

Percentage for long-term goals

Reducing number of non-proficient students – questioning our 33% because most are at 50%

Could strengthen on what led us to use 33%. More justification why 33% works for ND based on data would strengthen

Advocating for meeting letter of law and improve over time; look at adjustments based on data in the future

Three areas we need to make changes

Choice Ready:

Not a required element in ESSA statute – Overarching theme is they are amazed and like the concept

Just not rigorous enough, a lot of potential

Don't want to pigeon hole students

Require tweaking the language and change the word “pathways”

Be clear in our language and ideally have all students ready for all areas

Create a small group to go over this concept and need to be consistent in the 3 areas this topic is discussed in the plan

Incorporate Superintendent recommendations and Jeff's revisions

Wayne Kutzer, reach out to Jeff Fastnacht, Aimee Copas or Russ Ziegler

Additional School Quality Indicator:

Need to pick either climate or student engagement

Can't submit without choosing – plan now states to be announced

We have research and language on both so we need to decide

First thing they will do is a completeness check

Anything not answered – we will have 3 days to fix or it will be rejected

Heather Kinsey's recommendation to go with student engagement

Student engagement surveys were designed to measure accountability

The climate surveys use perception data

Russ Riehl will be administering these surveys within the next week but prefers the engagement over the climate

Not sure if any schools have started implementing the surveys

Appears as though schools have just received these surveys

Have any received the climate survey and how effective was it?

These were completed more for parents and staff rather than students

More information that can be used to move schools forward using the student engagement survey

Topic: Communication from USDE – New Template

For the areas in the final column of the chart that we have discussed, will do a quick survey and get feedback since the call attendance does not include all members

Targeted Support:

Huge concern and issue from all states
If use process outlined in law, it could be a very large number identified
Want to get away from this
Rather than look at low performing, look at schools that have gaps and cap it at 10%
Scott does not believe we meet letter of the law according to statute
Gave ideas on how we can move forward
Statute requires states to identify low performing subgroups
5% based on low performing subgroups and 5% based on gaps
Revise using 10% using gaps
Regards to capping:
Scott thinks this concept might be approved if we can truly demonstrate all schools are doing an annual school improvement process and looking at low performing subgroups
All work done in AdvancED and create a school improvement plan
Once every 5 years is not good enough to show improvement plan
Every school should have a school improvement on an annual basis
If we can show this, for ESSA purposes, we are only going to target 10% to get the additional resources
AdvancED would have capacity to upload annual school improvement plans
If having low performing subgroups, they would be identified and they would work on them on their own
Can use 10% if lowest performing subgroups and see how many are identified and that would determine how we proceed
Do not need to score the plans, just need to be able to demonstrate that it is taking place; it should be happening anyway
Some schools are already doing this so it would not be anything additional for schools – may need to formalize a little more but the process is there
Either use AdvancED and strengthen this section to show we have a process for each school to have an annual school improvement plan as justification OR go with letter of law, identify for targeted support any school that has a lower performing subgroup than the highest performing for comprehensive support – we have no idea how many schools this would be
AdvancED is revising their process to move in this direction anyway
Recommend we move in the AdvancED direction

Topic: Additional Comments

Confusion with business managers on new law – in light of regulations being thrown out regarding school level data
It is a requirement in the law – schools need to present school level data
This will be recorded on dashboard and reported
Will try to get more information out to all
PowerPoint says implemented by December of 2017

Topic: Next Steps

Please review feedback document, correspondence will be sent to whole committee with brief survey questions regarding:
Targeted support
Using student engagement as first school quality indicator
Minor changes to pie chart at the high school

Will work to get all changes put in plan
Meet with Governor and Levi next week
Next Thursday will post and have 30-day comment period

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% set aside) • 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 Kinsey

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: This will be for the 2017-2018 school year. Received little to no guidance from the USDE other than the ESSA law. Consolidated a number of programs. Purpose to help improve academic achievement. Have an application process through STARS. Need to include equitable services of private school in community. 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. 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: 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. 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: Do we want full morning or afternoon like this or full day? Full days are hard so ½ days are better Need to talk about funding for school improvement MTSS Is ½ day doable? Yes – choices of morning or afternoon but just half days in October, November, December</p> | | | |
| Date: | TBD | Location: | Time: |

ESSA Continuous Improvement Subcommittee MINUTES

Monday, October 31, 2016 | 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM | State Capitol – Sakakawea Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Joe Kolosky | Angie Thomas | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 1:00 PM | 4:00 PM | Sakakawea Room |

Attendance Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Topic: Welcome/Introductions | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
| <p>Joe introduced himself as the lead for this subcommittee. Other attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amy Arness – representing ND Parent Teacher Association • Cheryl Hagar – representing Title I Targeted Schools • Rosemary Hardie – representing Special Education • Julie Jaeger – representing ND Association for Gifted Children • Marcus Lewton – representing Principals • Luke Schaefer – representing NDMDEC • NDDPI staff introduced themselves | |
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
| <p>Discussion of 4.3 – Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools Discussion of 6.1 – Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students If time allows Discussion of 4.4 – Technical Assistance for Improvement Schools Discuss who will report out at next meeting</p> | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 4.3 – Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools | Presenter: Laurie Matzke & Stefanie Two Crow |
| <p>Identification for Comprehensive and Targeted Support (Laurie Matzke)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laurie & Joe attended recent training in Minneapolis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Long-term goals should apply to all schools ○ Support a school dashboard for every public school in the state <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We determine the indicators ▪ Additional factors can be personalized so schools can evolve ▪ Accountability and transparency are very important • Identification for school improvement under Title I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We need to decide, as a state, if we want targeted identification to apply to all schools or just Title I schools, which will be eligible for a grant ○ Right now, program improvement requirements only apply to those identified as Title I schools ○ Never in the history of receiving Title I funds have NDDPI been able to give these funds to non-Title I buildings ○ Discussed in Minneapolis if the decision is made for targeted support for all schools, will they allow Title I funds for non-Title I schools? The experts did not see this changing ○ The following provisions apply to all schools, even if they choose to not accept Title I funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AdvancED Improvement ▪ Long term goals ▪ School dashboard • Recommendations on resources for schools identified for comprehensive and target support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to ESSA, comprehensive schools must receive \$500,000 ○ According to ESSA, targeted schools have must receive \$50,000 ○ Every state submitted a letter stating these laws do not make sense-should be left to the states to determine <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Minneapolis, one of the heads of CCSSO felt there would be relief in this regard ○ <u>Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Schools that are in the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools in the state (15 schools) ▪ High schools that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students ▪ Schools have to be identified at least once every three years ▪ Per discussion in Minneapolis, the timeline will most likely be revised for when we identify schools ▪ Current timeline says by the beginning of the 17-18 school year meaning we would identify these schools before implementing the law and probably even before we have a state approved plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Should see flexibility and identify schools by spring of 18-19 school year ○ <u>Targeted Support and Improvement Schools</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any school that is consistently under-performing for one or more student groups ▪ USDE is still determining if this should be any school of just Title I schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Even if they determine it's all, we, as a state, can decide to make only Title I | |

- As a whole, scores are pretty high, but have low performing subgroups
 - USDE recommended when determining low performing subgroups, go to comprehensive school list, go to the highest performing comprehensive schools, whatever the proficiency rate is would be used for low performing subgroups.
 - Laurie had them run the data based on the 2014-2015 state assessment, the highest performing comprehensive school would be 10% proficiency
 - ✓ This means we would identify schools for targeted support subgroups who had 10% proficiency or below.
- Funding for School Improvement Activities
 - States have to reserve 7% of their Title I, Part A funds for school improvement activities
 - 95% distributed to comprehensive and targeted support schools
 - States have to submit an application to include an improvement plan
 - Will receive resources & support to help achieve goals
 - The state will monitor the plan
 - When allocating grants, states have to prioritize districts that serve high numbers of comprehensive and targeted improvement schools
 - We need to make a decision as a state:
 - ✓ give funds to all schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support
 - ✓ make it competitive
 - ✓ provide funds to some schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support
- * NDDPI has a responsibility under ESSA to do the right thing
 - Under No Child Left Behind there were 4 models you had to implement if received SIG funding and they were very unrealistic for ND schools
 - Under ESSA it is now the State's decision versus Federal
 - If the Feds see schools not making gains, will be back where we were with stricter guidelines and Federal intrusion
 - Must hold schools accountable and make they are using the funds wisely and evidence based
- Resources for schools with Improvement
 - Estimated allocation NDDPI will receive with 7% set-aside is \$2.2 million
 - July 1, 2017 \$2.2 million
 - July 1, 2018 \$2.2 million
 - July 1, 2019 \$2.2 million
 - July 1, 2020 \$2.2 million = for a total of \$8.8 million
 - Comprehensive Schools – 3 Year Identification
 - 5% Title I Schools = 15 schools
 - \$350,000 (highest we could go for all schools) x 15 = \$5,250,000
 - Targeted Schools
 - \$50,000 x 20 = \$1,000,000
 - \$1,000,000 x 3 years = \$3,000,000
 - Sometimes highest needs schools struggle with the capacity to write a competitive grant
 - Need to have the capacity to implement the improvement as well
 - Make sure they work with a high quality consultant to assist in making sure they have the capacity
 - Would need to implement a reform model
- Additional Points/Comments
 - Superintendent Baesler spoke about funding and how we help our lowest performing schools. Through the interim education hearing process, the majority of our senators and representatives now have an understanding of what levers or options are available to states and which they are using to turnaround the lowest performing schools. There were six levers that states were using. Of the six levers, ND only had one lever and that was to give more money. What can this realistically solve? Other levers might be available depending on the results of the 2017 legislative session.
 - How do we identify Title I schools?
 - In small districts, need a poverty count of 10
 - In large districts, need to be above district poverty percent
 - This funding is meant to level the playing field
 - Are there other funding sources to help out non-Title I schools?
 - There are look-alike programs given to these schools

SIG Partnership with School Improvement Network (Stefanie Two Crow)

- Partnership with School Improvement Network
 - External provider who offer resources to schools and districts in a model referred to as a "turnaround" model
 - Four areas this model covers
 - ✓ Effective school leadership
 - ✓ Effective teachers
 - ✓ Personalized learning
 - ✓ School culture that promotes excellence
 - Support schools in capacity building
 - Assist with effective school leadership
 - Roadmap achievement goals through an appraisal process
 - Look at effective teaching practices
 - Hands-on modeling and coaching
 - Provide a collaborative culture
 - Personalize learning
 - Promote excellence in school culture
 - Provide a year's subscription to a platform called Edivate which offers professional development opportunities
- 1003(g) funds - \$2.2 million
 - Three year grant process
 - First 6 months get 20 days of on-sight coaching
 - Boot camp – coaching services
 - Tracking method to assist with capacities – Partner Success Manager
 - Subscription for Edivate
 - One question to discuss when go to Washington DC in December:
 - There are two schools applying for SIG funds over the next 3 years
 - Good chance these schools would fall into comprehensive support
 - Would they be exempt because already going through School Improvement Grant process?

Additional Points/Comments

- Civics engagement
 - Students of color and low socioeconomic status don't understand how to engage in formal ways

Topic: Overview of Section 6.1 Well Rounded & Supportive Education for Students

Presenter: Luke Schaefer/Nancy Burke
Joe Kolosky and Stefanie Two Crow

Statewide System of Support (Luke Schaefer & Nancy Burke)

- MTSS in ESSA
 - MTSS is a framework to provide all students with the best opportunities to succeed academically and behaviorally in school
 - Focuses on providing high-quality instruction and interventions matched to student need
 - Monitoring progress frequently to make decisions regarding changes in instruction or goals
 - Data is used to allocate resources to improve student learning and support staff implementation of effective practices
 - Customized plan for ND schools to be able to scale-up using implementation science
 - It's not about lower-achieving students, it's about all students
 - Multi-tiered system of support for small and large schools
 - Framework to meet success for all students
 - Create a plan for all students beginning at registration to start students at expected level as soon as possible
 - The definition of ESSA and NDMTSS are very similar
- MTSS and RTI are not the same thing
 - The biggest similarities are
 - All students get what they need to learn
 - Assessment, progress monitoring, data-based decision making

- Provision of evidence-based instruction and intervention
 - Multiple levels of increasingly intensifying instruction and interventions
 - Requires plans for how students respond to instruction and intervention
- The biggest differences are
 - RTI has triangle of tiers 1, 2, and 3 (or diamond)
 - ✓ Fits within MTSS (RTI is a program, MTSS is a system or framework)
 - ✓ Assessment, progress monitoring, data-based decision making
 - ✓ Often a problem-solving model
 - MTSS may require more than 3 tiers to address high- and low-achieving students
 - ✓ Also includes leadership, culture, professional development and evaluation
 - ✓ Social and emotional supports
 - ✓ Planning for a full system, not just problems
- The five essential components of MTSS are
 - Assessment
 - Data based decision making
 - Multi-tier instruction and intervention
 - Infrastructure and support mechanisms
 - Fidelity and evaluation
- NDMTSS = Continuous Improvement
 - First, have to know the needs to meet the needs of students (assess)
 - Next, put together a plan based on data collected
 - Next, need to implement the plan with multiple levels of support
 - Finally, need to evaluate to determine if you did what you said you would do and it had the affects you desired
- The two components that are often missing from RTI are
 - Infrastructure and support mechanisms
 - Fidelity and evaluation
 - Frequently missing adult support (Peer feedback, ongoing coaching, job-embedded PD)
 - Two things hear most from School Improvement Network are their focus on building the capacity through infrastructure and support and then evaluate the system after
- Infrastructure and support mechanisms
 - Professional development and resources
 - Funding is required
 - Schedules
 - When student success is on the line, everything must feed success (ITV, specials, lunch, recess, bussing, etc.)
 - Vision and Culture
 - A focus on prevention and willingness to innovate is required
 - Leadership
 - Includes Boards, Superintendents, Principals, Curriculum Specialists, Coaches, Leadership Teams, and/or Teacher-Leader
- Multi-tiered systems of support written into the law
 - For professional development
 - For supports of literacy services
 - Activities included in the definition of professional development
- How AdvancED and NDMTSS work together
 - AdvancED helps us determine *WHAT* effective schools do to meet student needs (efficacy of engagement, healthy culture, high expectations, resource management, clear direction, impact of instruction, implementation capacity)
 - NDMTSS helps us to determine *HOW* schools can meet student needs (assessment, data-based decision making, multi-tiered instruction, infrastructure and support, fidelity and evaluation)
- Brainstorming supports (what are schools doing?)
 - Title programs
 - SPS
 - MTSS
 - RTI
 - School counseling
 - Special Ed
 - Career counselors
 - REAs

- AP
- Dual Credit
- Bank of ND
- EL
- AdvancED
- STEM
- CBE
- CTE
- Center for Distance Learning
- Gifted
- Teacher/Principal mentoring
- University Systems
- LEAD
- NDCEL
- 21st Century Grant
- PTA
- Pathfinder
- Nutrition and School Foods
- Edutech
- PBIS
- ACES
- Project and problem-based learning
- Turnaround Arts
- Personalized Learning Theory
- Restorative Justice
- PLC
- Middle School Teaming
- Integrative Learning

Additional Points/Comments

- How many schools are using MTSS in ND?
 - Luke wasn't able to answer at that time
 - Seven middle schools and five rural schools and Bismarck Public have gone through the cohort trainings and continue to build on MTSS

Parent and Community Support (Stefanie Two Crow)

- Overview of requirements
 - Districts receiving over \$500,000 in Title I funds
 - Set-aside 1% for parental involvement (may reserve more)
 - Must allocate 90% to Title I schools of higher needs
 - Funds must be used for at least one of the parental involvement requirements
 - Parent involvement policies for districts and schools
 - Title I annual meeting – hosted by schools
 - School-parent compact – school must revise annually
 - Parent notices
 - State and district report cards
 - Parents Right to Know teacher qualifications
 - Details about assessments
 - Parents' right to opt out
 - Personalized parent notices
- Highlights of components
 - Parental involvement funds must be used to carry out activities and strategies included in the district's parental and family engagement policies
 - Must include one off the list of set-aside uses
 - Title I 1003(a) – Address parent outreach
 - Title I Part B – Eliminates Even Start and Reading First but includes literacy
 - Title I Part D (Neglected & Delinquent, or At-Risk) – Adds language to ensure coordination with correctional facilities, child's family, and district
- Resources
 - PTA
 - Pathfinder
 - Family Research Project

- National Network of Partnership Schools

Q&A and Next Steps:

- Next subcommittee meeting is November 14th
 - Will need to further discuss whether we want targeted identification to apply to all schools or just Title I schools (if we say all, some of them would not be eligible for funding)
 - Will need to further discuss recommendations on resources for schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support
 - Stefanie Two Crow will present on application and rubric for Improvement Schools at the next meeting
- Next large ESSA meeting is November 30th
 - Will determine who reports out at the November 14th subcommittee meeting

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Date: | November 14 | Location: | Peace Garden Room | Time: | 1:00 PM - 4:00 PM |
|--------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|

ESSA Continuous Improvement Subcommittee MINUTES

Monday, November 14, 2016 | 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM | State Capitol – Peace Garden Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Joe Kolosky | Heidi Merkel | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 1:00 PM | 4:00 PM | Peace Garden Room |

Attendance Planning Committee Members

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

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Topic: Welcome/Introductions | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
| <p>Joe introduced himself as the lead for this subcommittee. Other attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amy Arness – representing ND Parent Teacher Association • Cheryl Hagar – representing Title I Targeted Schools • Rosemary Hardie – representing Special Education • Julie Jaeger – representing ND Association for Gifted Children • Marcus Lewton – representing Principals • Russ Riehl – representing Principals • Luke Schaefer – representing NDMDEC • NDDPI staff introduced themselves | |
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
| <p>Discussion of 4.4 – Technical Assistance for Improvement Schools Discussion of 4.3 – Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools 6.1 Equity of Presentation – Joe Kolosky 6.1 Early Childhood Education – Tara Bitz Discussion on 6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students Discussion on 6.2 Supporting All Students Review of Rough Draft Template will be sent home for recommendations</p> | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 4.4 – Technical Assistance for Improvement Schools | Presenter: Stefanie Two Crow |
| <p>Application and Rubric for Improvement Schools 1003G Funds</p> <p>Tier 1 Schools - \$2.2 Million approximately two schools who have submitted Letter of Intent and are applying for the funds.</p> <p>This is a state application process based on specific federal requirements that have to be included in the application.</p> <p>Reviewed Application of current process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow guidelines and federal regulations • Have to identify needs and focus on needs assessment • Describe what interventions they selected • Select outside/external provider to assist with process • Have capacity to follow through on SIG application • Have to include family and community engagement • Outline detailed timeline of schools' actions and steps they are going to take • Show all of their activities outlined – month to month <p>Part G</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate funds to implement interventions outlined in application • Budget narrative – provide detailed description <p>Rubric</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a school scores a "0" in any section, this would eliminate eligibility and would not be eligible for the funds • Point summary within the rubric – scored by reviewers in proficient, basic, and incomplete <p>Laurie explained the purpose of Stef reviewing this is to follow similar process under ESSA. NDDPI would still have an application and rubric to address key components under the law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking to this committee for input on what should be required or revised • Have a recommended list but not inclusive (ex. School Improvement, REA's) to show they are reaching out to partner with them • All comprehensive schools are small, rural districts so capacity is going to be an issue • What can we add to strengthen rubric...sustainability? What will they do after three years to keep the schools going in a positive direction? | |

- Suggested by Marc B. – Are schools required to take Title II funds? What interventions are in place? What weaknesses for comprehensive support? Outline Title I, Title II, Title IV, and School Improvement funds. Use all resources for the school to show NDDPI what they are going to do to all work together and how all these schools will be used to implement their plan
- Russ suggested we give extra points on rubric for budget

Topic: Overview of Section 4.3 - Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools

Presenter:
Laurie Matzke

Re-address Identification and Resources for School Improvement

- Comprehensive Support
- Targeted Support

Subcommittee needs to make recommendations to the whole ESSA Committee on November 30.

Revisions will be made for ALL schools. We want to create one unified accountability system for all schools under ESSA.

- School dashboard for Title I and Non-Title I for all schools in ND
- Will have AdvancED Improvement for all schools
- Long-term goals apply to ALL schools within the state

Comprehensive Support for Title I Schools:

Lowest Performing 5% Schools – Can do ranking based on scores

5% would be about 15 schools – not necessarily accurate because it will be based on new accountability

Looking at:

- Achievement
- Growth
- Climate and Student Engagement
- High school graduation (all will go into one score and then will rank them)

In addition, schools having a graduation rate of less than 67% (looking at about 10) all but one or two were Title I schools.

Exit Criteria – Approximately eight states have posted a draft ESSA plan; most of them are keeping it simple.

What got you into identification of comprehensive support is what can get you out of comprehensive support.

- Can get out by achieving scores above 5% for three consecutive years
- Graduation rate bumps above 67%
- Have to make AYP for two consecutive years to bump out

Discussion – Is one year sufficient vs. two or three consecutive years?

- If they stay for two consecutive years it would give them three years of money
- Feel the school would need three years of support for systemic change
- Perception is supposed to be a “school improvement” process not a “gotcha” process; three years shows we are buying in to you and helping you
- Three-year term, writing a three-year plan, show three years of continuous improvement before you bump up
- Hold a Program Improvement Workshop to go through the requirements so schools know what is expected
- Identify 5% lowest performing schools, but can't force districts to apply for funds. If you are identified as a low performing school and you choose not to participate, you give up Title I funds and school improvement funds
- Our plan is to have a liaison identified within NDDPI where they would be on all the calls and would be the “go to” person to help them, answer questions and walk them through processes to provide individual support and technical assistance to focus on the 15 schools
- Hopeful for revised timeline with dates pushed back for identifying schools for school improvement

TARGETED SUPPORT – Every three years Laurie shared data

- Low Performing Subgroup looking for schools with one or more of their subgroups performing as poorly as the highest performing comprehensive school; data shows 10% will be higher when everything is on the dashboard

- Asked for list of schools with one or more subgroups where performance was 10% or lower

EXIT CRITERIA – Low Performing Subgroups

- Used 10% as threshold; many school with subgroups below 10%
- Real data is going to be significantly worse than this with all criteria on the dashboard this may go up to 20%
- How many more schools will have subgroups below 20%?
- Only taking into consideration four subgroups under NCLB
 - Economically Disadvantaged
 - IEP Students
 - LEP Students
 - Ethnic Students

Under ESSA will also be looking at:

- Homeless Students
- Foster Care Students
- Military Family Students
- We will never have money to give 167 or over 200 schools a grant
- We also run into a capacity issue; focus our efforts on 15 schools but don't have enough staff to focus on 200 schools
- All the ones in YELLOW (shown on handout) are non-Title I schools

Discussion: Do we identify only Title I schools for targeted schools or any school?

Most states are again taking a simplistic approach – exit when they move above the performance of the highest performing school in comprehensive support – what got you in can get you out.

Need to decide one, two, or three consecutive years

Targeted Support is annual

Comprehensive Support is every three years

Resources available for schools identified for improvement

Bonus year of 2.2 million if we don't have to identify school till 2018-19

Option 1

Take comprehensive schools and give them \$350,000 each over a 3-year period then set aside \$1 million for Targeted Schools.

State Set-aside

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| July 1, 2017 | 2.2 million |
| July 1, 2018 | 2.2 million |
| July 1, 2019 | 2.2 million |
| July 1, 2020 | <u>2.2 million</u> |
| | 8.8 million available |

Comprehensive Schools – 3 year Identification

5% Title I Schools – 15

350,000 X15 = 5,250,000

Targeted Schools

50,000 x 20 = \$1,000,000

1,000,000 x 3 years = 3,000,000

Option 2

State Set-aside

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------|
| July 1, 2017 | 2.2 million |
| July 1, 2018 | 2.2 million |
| July 1, 2019 | 2.2 million |
| July 1, 2020 | <u>2.2 million</u> |
| | 8.8 million available |

Comprehensive Schools – 3-year Identification

5% Title I Schools – 15
500,000 X 15 = 7,500,000

Year 1 School Year 2018-19 200,000 X 15 = 3,000,000
Year 2 School Year 2019-20 150,000 X 15 = 2,250,000
Year 3 School Year 2020-21 150,000 X 15 = 2,250,000

Targeted Schools
No funds available

Set aside \$1 million for Targeted Schools and make it competitive of 200 schools identified; only 20 would get a grant.

For 15 schools give \$500,000 a year for three years; when divided out, not a lot of money if we expect them to contract it out.

Year 1 - 200,000
Year 2 - 150,000
Year 3 - 150,000

Nothing left for Targeted Support so no funds for Targeted Support and focus only on the comprehensive schools.

Discussion on Targeted – We would not fund any of them and IF we did it would be very minimal.

Discussion on whether non-Title schools have the sense of urgency; feel that they do because they are left unnoticed and may be left behind.

VOTE:

#1 Do we think the targeted identification should apply to all schools or only Title I schools?

- All Schools – Russ Riehl, Julie Jaeger, Amy Arness, and Marcus Lewton
- Only Title I Schools – Rosemary Hardie, Cheryl Hager, and Marc Bluestone

** Marc Bluestone and Cheryl Hager changed their vote to All schools**

VOTE:

Continuous Improvement

- Focus Funds on just Comprehensive – 0 votes
- Some for Comprehensive and Some for Targeted - Russ Riehl, Julie Jaeger, Amy Arness, Marcus Lewton, Rosemary Hardie, Cheryl Hager, and Marc Bluestone

Laurie asked the group to identify someone to report out to the committee; someone who would be able to be balanced and give both sides. Amy Arness nominated Rosemary Hardie to report out and committee agreed.

Superintendent Baesler – Called in and Laurie gave her an update regarding the vote. Kirsten agreed with the recommendation so all schools can improve in North Dakota; mindset is more state responsibility plan and what are we going to do to stay focused and help all schools.

Superintendent Baesler also asked about equity and stated it is defined differently by culture and people. For education, what opportunities are we giving our students? What do students in every zip code need? She felt that we need to make opportunity for all students and give them access to even more opportunities; move the needle on areas like electives, dual credit, fine arts, and AP.

Superintendent Baesler will be meeting with the Trump transition team to discuss ESSA regulations. North Dakota charted course for state plan is to be a responsible leader.

6.1 Topic: Statewide System of Support – Early Childhood Education, Equity

Presenter:
Tara Bitz & Joe Kolosky

Early Childhood Education – Early Learning in the Every Student Succeeds Act – Tara Bitz

Tara reported there are very few changes with ESSA. Following are three key pieces they are concentrating on:

1. Expand high-quality learning
2. More focus on preschool - 3rd grade
3. Supporting educators with high focus on professional development

States & LEAs are required to include on their report cards the number and percentage of children enrolled in preschool programs.

Local Education Agencies are also responsible for developing agreements with Head Start programs to coordinate services (data sharing, transition activities, and special education).

- Provisions to Support Early Learning in Three Main Ways
 - Expanding Access to High-Quality Early Learning
 - Encouraging Alignment & Collaboration from birth through 3rd grade
 - Supporting Educators
- Title I funds may be used for
 - Professional learning for early childhood staff
 - Minor repairs or remodeling to accommodate preschool program
 - Health, nutrition, and other services for children in a Title I preschool program
- To support children at risk of failing to meet the State's standards by improving quality of K-3 education

Preschool Development Grants:

- New discretionary grant for States to improve the coordination and quality of early childhood education programs for children birth to age 5
- Jointly administered by the Federal ED and HHS
- Builds on original PDG program authorized in 2014
 - ND did not apply for the 2014 PDG
 - ND anticipates applying for the 2016-17 PDG Initial Grant

New ways SEAs and LEAs may support early learning through Title II Part A:

- Joint PD learning to increase ability of principals & other school leaders to support teachers, EC educators & other professionals
- Identifying students who are gifted & talented, and implementing instructional practices that support the education of such students, including early entrance to kindergarten
- Opportunities for principals, and early learning leaders/teachers to participate in joint efforts to address the transition to elementary school

The ultimate goal is to have an Office of Early Learning. If we get the preschool development grant and create an Office of Early Learning, we can bring all early learning together.

All students should have equitable academic opportunities – Joe Kolosky

North Dakota Department of Public Instruction's Vision Statement is "All students will graduate choice ready with the knowledge, skills, and disposition to be successful in whatever they choose to do, whether they pursue a post-secondary degree, enroll in a technical college, enter the workforce, or join the military."

It is ND's responsibility to provide an equitable education that ensures all students excel and succeed.

Equity = Uniqueness of support in the light of the setting for the student

Equality = Uniform insertion of supports

ESSA and Equity – Areas of Focus

- Teacher Equity
- Fiscal Equity and Transparency
- Equitable Access to Educational Opportunities for All Students

Teacher Equity - What does this mean? Highly Qualified Teachers in Every Classroom

Fiscal Equity and Transparency

- Stakeholders knowing where their tax dollars are going
- Ability to have a conversation on fiscal allocations based on data

- Ability to compare and contrast fiscal allocation on the local level
- Stakeholders have the responsibility to be informed and local district is spending dollars efficiently

Should there be a discussion on dashboard under general information regarding dollars and what they are being used for?

Equitable Access to Educational Opportunities

- All students should have equitable academic opportunities
- District population and funding should not hinder students' access to opportunity
- Courses, such as Pre-K Advanced Placement, the Arts, STEM, and Physical Education that promote healthy lifestyles, 21st Century Skills, and academic skills
- Support students who drop out
- Programming to aid with transitioning students
- Equitable educational opportunities are a right for all ND students

Topic: Overview of Section 6.1 – Well-Rounded & Supportive Education for Students Review of Rough Draft Template

- 6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students
- 6.2 Supporting All Students

Q&A and Next Steps:

Joe Kolosky will get one-page summary out to group.

Rosemary Hardie will report out on Comprehensive vs. Targeted.

Laurie would like a subcommittee of two people to work with her before November 30th on how we can use federal dollars to support Title I and non-Title I schools. Cheryl Hagar stated she would be part of the group.

Templates were passed out to committee members who were asked to review and provide feedback to Joe.

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Date: | November 30, 2016 | Location: | Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan | Time: | 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|

ESSA Continuous Improvement Subcommittee MINUTES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017 | 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM | State Capitol – Dept. of Health, Room 212

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Joe Kolosky | Angie Thomas | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 1:00 PM | 4:00 PM | Dept. of Health, Room 212 |

Attendance Planning Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amy Arness | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marc Bluestone | <input type="checkbox"/> | Nikki Gullickson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cheryl Hagar | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rosemary Hardie | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marcus Lewton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russ Riehl | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Topic: Welcome/Introductions | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
| <p>Joe introduced himself as the lead for this subcommittee. Other attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amy Arness – representing ND Parent Teacher Association • Cheryl Hagar – representing Title I Targeted Schools • Rosemary Hardie – representing Special Education • Julie Jaeger – representing ND Association for Gifted Children • Marcus Lewton – representing Principals • Marc Bluestone – representing Middle School Principals • Russ Riehl – representing Middle School Principals • NDDPI staff introduced themselves | |
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
| <p>Discussion of 4.2 – Identification and Exit Criteria for Identified Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Schools • Targeted Support Schools <p>Discussion of 4.3 – Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources & Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comprehensive ○ Targeted <p>Discussion of 4.4 – Technical Assistance for Improvement Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four Intervention Charts <p>Discussion of 6.1 – Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title IV State Set-aside <p>Discussion on 6.2 – Supporting All Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section VI, NDDPI Key Initiatives | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 4.2 – Identification and Exit Criteria for Identified Schools | Presenter: Joe Kolosky and Laurie Matzke |
| <p>Identification Criteria for Comprehensive Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest Performing 5% of Title I Schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Based on pie (State Assessment Achievement/Growth, Climate/Engagement, EL Proficiency, Choice Ready, Graduation Rate, GED Completion) • Low Graduation Rates of High Schools <p>Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scores that are above the bottom 5% of Title; and • A graduation rate that is 67% or higher <p>20 schools would receive funding and support over 3-year cohort</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is offered to all schools, not just Title I schools • Allows an opportunity to show growth • Schools would be identified every 3 years • For sustainability, will receive \$50,000 over 3 years • Funding on a reimbursement basis • Need some flexibility regarding the exit criteria <p>Identification Criteria for Targeted Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools with one or more subgroups performing as poorly as the highest performing school identified for comprehensive support, based on the state accountability system • Applying these criteria creates an issue where there would be many schools identified and not enough funding to provide grants to each school • Laurie discussed the possibility of writing our own identification criteria - create a ranking of school subgroups from high to low, capping it so that everyone could be eligible for a grant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 10% of schools (35 schools) ○ Could give them all grants <p>Exit Criteria for Targeted Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools with low performing subgroups will exit targeted support and intervention when the targeted subgroup(s) moves above the performance in the highest performing school in comprehensive support and intervention | |

Apply annually for one year only for \$50,000

- No guarantee they will receive funding each year

All schools will have a dashboard

- Holds schools accountable
- Creates transparency
- Don't want an open-ended process

Two options:

- Look at school's overall achievement; or
 - Comparison between each subgroup's combined math/reading proficiency rate and overall combined math/reading proficiency rate for that particular school
- Those schools with the lowest combined ELA and math percent proficient over a three-year period for each subgroup

Committee discussed:

- Laurie feels the gaps option would be more easily approved as it meets the intent of the law.
- Betsy Deal added that during AdvancED external reviews when looking at student performance, the focus is on gaps

Do not want to use negative verbiage-call it what we want, use supportive verbiage

- Example "Local school district awarded an educational support grant to strengthen systems and enable all students to succeed"

Recommend to the large ESSA group:

- Use targeted ESEA flexibility waiver which identifies focus schools and look for gaps
- Cap at 10% so every school identified gets a grant

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Topic: Overview of Section 4.3 – Support & Improvement for Low Performing Schools | Presenter: Joe Kolosky |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|

A request was made to not use the term "low performing school"

- We can use whatever verbiage we would like

Resources/Supports for Comprehensive Schools:

- Within Tier (Strategy) 1 - Continue work with SIG schools which provides coaching and consultation services to help schools conduct a needs assessment and create a plan for improvement
- Tier II – All schools identified will be eligible for \$350,000 grant used over three years
- Tier III – NDDPI will provide guidance, support and training.
- These are lowest performing schools which lack capacity

Resources/Supports for Targeted Schools:

- Tier I – NDDPI is proposing to build into our State ESSA plan a partnership with the ND REAs to roll out MTSS support to all schools identified. NDDPI will pool state resources within multiple programs:
 - Title I
 - Title II
 - Title III
 - Title IV
 - Special Education
 - School Improvement
- Tier II – All schools identified will be eligible for \$50,000 grants each year they are identified
- Tier III – NDDPI will provide guidance, support, and training

Use the word "Action" instead of "Tier"

Next steps:

- After initial vote in February, write a letter to Luke and CC all REA's, with a formal proposal in writing
- Request a proposal from them as well
- We can then determine the cost
- Work with AdvancED as to not duplicate information
- Exit strategy to be determined
 - Want to look at other states plans

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Topic: Overview of Section 4.4 – Technical Assistance for Improvement Schools | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Within Waiver application, identified priority and focus schools will be required to submit an improvement plan to identify interventions that will be implemented to address the identified needs and challenges

- The interventions are separated into categories to include:
 - Interventions for Low Achieving Students
 - Interventions Geared for English Learners (EL) Students
 - Interventions Geared for Native American Students
 - Interventions Geared for Students with Disabilities
- The committee agreed these interventions were a valuable supplement for the plan

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will need to update the information | | | | | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 6.1 – Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students | | | | Presenter: Ann Ellefson | |
| ESSA Title IV, Part A new formula grant <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated Federal Title Allocation of \$2,425,000 Purpose of grant is to improve academic achievement by increasing the capacity of states educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and local communities to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide all students with access to a well-rounded education; Improve school conditions for student learning; and Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students | | | | | |
| Some key areas to highlight: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1% set-aside (estimated \$24,250) must be set-aside for administrative costs An opportunity is proposed for an additional 4% set-aside (estimated \$97,000) for states to provide monitoring, training, technical assistance, and capacity building to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support LEAs to improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy, and affirming school environments Support LEAs to effectively use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy Support strategies to support LEAs to engage parents, families, and communities Wide scope on how funds can be used Can transfer funds into Title I, Title II, etc. | | | | | |
| Vote on funding: (none, 2% or 4%) None – 1 2% - 0 4% - 6 | | | | | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 6.2 Supporting All Students | | | | Presenter: Ann Ellefson | |
| Section VI, Key Initiatives to develop a choice ready student: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great Teachers/Leaders – Professional Development/Mentors, ESPB Licensure, Professional Learning Partnerships with NDREAs, NDLEAD, and NDUnited Continuous Improvement – Increase Academic Proficiency, AdvancED, School Improvement Process, NDMTSS Equity – Fiscal Equity, Teacher Equity, and Opportunities for Equitable Access and Participation for Students Local Educational Opportunities – Well Rounded Education, Student Engagement, School Culture/Climate, Waivers, Innovative Learning Early Childhood Education – Office of Early Learning, Preschool Funding and Transition Supports, Pre-kindergarten Content Standards, Kindergarten Entry Assessment | | | | | |
| Q&A and Next Steps: | | | | | |
| Next large ESSA meeting will either be February 7 th or February 8 th <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Russ will report out to large ESSA group on 4.2 and 4.3 Cheryl will report out on 6.2 | | | | | |
| Date: | February 7 or 8 | Location: | TBD | Time: | TBD |

ESSA Continuous Improvement Subcommittee Conference Call Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, February 1, 2017 | 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM | State Capitol – 11th Floor Conference Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Joe Kolosky | Angie Thomas | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 3:00 PM | 4:00 PM | |

Attendance Planning Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Amy Arness | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Marc Bluestone | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Nikki Gullickson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cheryl Hagar | <input type="checkbox"/> | Rosemary Hardie | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Marcus Lewton | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russ Riehl | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

NDDPI Ex Officio Members

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

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Topic: Welcome/Roll Call | | Presenter: Joe Kolosky | | | |
| <p>Joe introduced himself</p> <p>Other attendees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amy Arness – representing ND Parent Teacher Association • Marc Bluestone – representing Middle School Principals • Nikki Gullickson – representing ND Parent Teacher Association • Cheryl Hagar – representing Title I Targeted Schools • Julie Jaeger – representing ND Association for Gifted Children • Russ Riehl – representing Middle School Principals • NDDPI Employees | | | | | |
| Topic: Feedback from CCSSO Sponsored ESSA Meeting | | Presenter: Joe Kolosky | | | |
| <p>Joe provided an overview of the meeting, attended by several NDDPI staff, in Washington DC on January 26, 2017. The purpose of the meeting was for states to have their ESSA plans reviewed with immediate feedback and suggestions. Joe attended the meeting for Continuous Improvement and received verbal feedback. The reviewers provided very few comments and no action steps. They were pleased to see our ESSA planning included tribal stakeholders and parent groups. Two key suggestions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include strong stakeholder engagement to support rationale for recommendations/decisions in the plan • Clearly explain that strategies implemented are used to build capacity at state and local level | | | | | |
| Topic: Language from the Law | | Presenter: Joe Kolosky | | | |
| <p>Joe provided a handout on ESSA law for Targeted Support and Identification of Schools. The law does not specifically give instruction on how to identify schools for Targeted support. The law states that the State is responsible for identification measures; however, the regulations give recommendations on Targeted support identification.</p> <p>A brief summary of the Comprehensive schools (lowest performing 5%) identified would be approximately 13 schools and Targeted schools would be approximately 40 schools. Targeted support would be capped at 10% lowest performing. This capping would be similar to the ESEA waiver the state previously applied for and was granted.</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Capping Targeted Support Schools | | Presenter: | | | |
| <p>The subcommittee discussed the recommendation to move forward with the decision to cap Targeted schools at 10% or to reconsider and follow the law by identifying all schools in North Dakota.</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Options | | Presenter: | | | |
| <p>The subcommittee decided to leave the 10% cap as it will allow more funds to support identified schools. We will make any revisions if necessary in the future.</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Goals | | Presenter: | | | |
| <p>Laurie Matzke discussed the option to use the goals of the accountability system as exit criteria for Comprehensive and Targeted schools. This decision will be discussed in future meetings as exit criteria has not been established at this time. The goals are in draft form and will be presented to the large group at the February 8th meeting.</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: February 8, 2017 Meeting | | Presenter: | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Russ Riehl will speak to the large group on the recommendations for identification and exit criteria • Cheryl Hagar will speak to the large group on the recommendations on Title IV State set-aside | | | | | |
| Date: | February 8, 2017 | Location: | Ramada Hotel – Bismarck | Time: | 9:00 AM – 4:00 PM |

ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes

Monday, September 19, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM | State Capitol – Sakakawea Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Angie Thomas | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 10:00 am | 3:00 pm | Sakakawea Room |

Attendance Planning Committee Members

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Sonja Butenhoff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Friesen | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Wayne Kutzer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Amiee Copas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Grosz | <input type="checkbox"/> | Richard Rothaus |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Teresa Desai | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cheryl Hagar | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Wendy Sanderson |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Fremstad | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Melanie Kathrein | <input type="checkbox"/> | Russ Ziegler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jody French | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Korsmo | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Marthaller | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tammy Mayer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Valerie Fischer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Laurie Matzke | <input type="checkbox"/> | Beth Larson-Steckler |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| Review of Timeline handout: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does meeting once a month September through December seem realistic in terms of having enough time to discuss/make recommendations to the large ESSA group? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determined timeline seemed reasonable at this time. Will tweak if needed. ○ Decided to extend the length of the meeting to a full day versus 4 hours. | |
| Topic: Subcommittee Roles, Responsibilities & Expectations | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| A handout was provided listing the roles and characteristics of a facilitator, attributes of effective committee members, and the purpose of each workgroup. Each subcommittee will have a spokesperson who will present information back to the large ESSA group regarding committee recommendations. Bob Grosz agreed to be this subcommittee's representative. | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 1.0 Goals & Measures of Progress | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| Suggested Goals/Measures of Progress: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term achievement goals • Graduation rate • English Language proficiency | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 3.0 Standards & Assessment | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review content and structure of current state academic content standards • State assessments | |
| Topic: Overview of Section 4.0 Accountability, Support, & Improvement for Schools | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| Suggested methods of identifying accountability/school improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School dashboard • Report card • Additional school quality factors | |

ESSA requires that we establish an accountability system based on multiple indicators:

- Academic achievement
- Another academic indicator (which must include graduation rates at the high school level)
- English proficiency
- At least one other valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide indicator of school quality or student success

The survey results for additional school quality factors resulted in 25 additional factors. From those it was broken down further into ten factors:

- Commitment to school improvement
- Use of evidence for planning, organizational learning, and accountability
- Student engagement
- Approaches to curriculum and instruction
- School climate/culture
- Teacher quality/qualifications
- School connectedness/sense of belonging
- Job-embedded, meaningful professional development
- School leader quality/qualifications
- Infrastructure alignment/resource allocation

To help narrow the recommendations even further, we must ask ourselves:

- Can valid & reliable data be collected statewide for all school types/classifications?
- Is there evidence that improving this measure will directly impact student achievement?
- Will this measure allow for meaningful differentiation?
- Can results be disaggregated by student groups?
- Does this measure align with ND's vision?
- Does it promote continuous improvement?

Narrowing the recommendations

School Climate/Culture:

- **PROS**
 - Critical factor of school quality
 - Actionable & meaningful data
 - Surveys currently part of ND continuous improvement/accreditation
 - Cost effective
- **CONS**
 - Perception data-relative to situational context & normative expectations
 - Potential motivation/pressure to inflate response to improve school standing
 - Limited ability to disaggregate by student population

Additional Points/Comments:

- Need to define the difference between climate and culture.
- How would we make this relatable to all schools?
- Positive climate would equal positive culture?
- Need to find the right tool to measure so schools don't feel threatened and will report the actual response.
- Students, parents and staff are important to climate/culture.

Student Attendance:

- **PROS**
 - Important factor-especially for ND lowest performing schools
 - Actionable & meaningful data
 - Currently collected
 - Cost effective
- **CONS**
 - Potential motivation/pressure to falsify data to improve school standing
 - Limited school/district control
 - Limited use of opportunity afforded under ESSA

Additional Points/Comments:

- Attendance is a critical issue and a key driver to student success.
- Potential of having cost involved as this requires new data collection points.
- Will require student engagement to collect valuable and reliable data.

Student Suspension/Expulsion:

- **PROS**
 - Important factor
 - Actionable & meaningful data
 - Currently collected
 - Cost effective
- **CONS**
 - Potential motivation/pressure to falsify data to improve school standing
 - Limited use of opportunity afforded under ESSA?

Additional Points/Comments:

- We can control suspension/expulsion versus attendance and it is measurable.
- Tracking truancy can tie to dropout prevention.
- Having control over suspension/expulsion will assist in helping us keep those students in school.
- Getting schools/buildings to agree on what suspension/expulsion means is challenging.
- Which can we truly control out of attendance, suspension/expulsion, and student engagement?
Attendance is more of a parent control, but we can control suspension/expulsion-do what we can to keep the student in school.

Student Engagement:

- **PROS**
 - Driving factor of student success & school quality
 - Actionable & meaningful data
 - Directly aligned with ND continuous improvement/accreditation
 - Innovative use of ESSA Flexibility
 - Experience vs. Perception
- **CONS**
 - New data collection requirement
 - Potential motivation/pressure to inflate response to improve school standing-especially if linked to student identifier
 - Cost?

Additional Points/Comments:

- Student engagement is the strongest driver to get student success-more likely to come to school if engaged. Providing this data to schools/teachers will drive change in the classroom.
- Other states are currently piloting student engagement surveys.
- Changing climate/culture can have immediate impact in the classroom and on student engagement.
- All are tied together.

Polls for School Quality:

Truancy? 8-No; 1-Yes

Attendance? 5-No; 4-Yes

Climate? Unanimous Yes

Student Engagement? Unanimous Yes

Suspension/Expulsion? 8 No; 1 Yes

- We need to focus on where the system is broken and which areas need the most support and resources.
- Move forward with those items we feel passionate about.
- Want school dashboard to be positive.

Topic: Discussion on Section 3.0 Standards Update

Presenter: Greg Gallagher

Under States application:

- Expectation to have section on standards & assessment
- Academic expectations and the manner in which they measure them
- Peer Review for state assessment and state's alternate assessment
 - Smarter Balance for general
 - DLM for alternate
 - Submitted and so far so good
- Submit template in March
- Final release in July
- RFP going out after March, resolution by August

Constitutional Mandates:

- Uniform system of free public schools throughout the state
- To prevent illiteracy, secure a reasonable degree of uniformity in the course of study

Legislative Mandates:

- All approved schools must meet curricular requirements set forth in state law (NDCC 15.1-06-06)
- Each instructional unit in approved high schools will meet or exceed the state content standards (NDCC 15.1-21-02)

Committee Activity Summary:

- Two committees: one for English language arts/literacy & one for mathematics
- These committees will study the effects of implementing the 2011 approved academic content standards in each content area and draft any revisions to improve the structure and content

Content Standards Committee Structure:

- General education, K-12
- Special education settings, K-12
- Higher education
- English learner settings
- Career technical education
- Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance schools

Committee Member Duties:

- Review content and structure of standards
- Review standards from other sources
- Examine and set structural design for proper articulation, breadth of inclusion, depth of knowledge, internal and cross-grade integrity, presentation of sequence, and support documentation of content standards
- Discussion, voting, preparing multiple drafts, etc.

Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015

- This act is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
- Reaffirms the requirement for states to develop own academic content standards
- Requires states to adopt content standards aligned to college and career readiness expectations
- Each state shall provide an assurance that the State has adopted challenging academic content standards and aligned academic achievement standards (align curriculum to content standards)
- Each State shall demonstrate that the State academic standards are aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education and relevant State career and technical education standards
- The Secretary shall not have authority to mandate, direct, control, coerce, or exercise any direction or supervision over the standards adopted or implemented

Purpose of Academic Content Standards:

- Present concise statements of what students are expected to know/do within a subject at a specified grade level
- Establish guidelines for local school district curriculum
- Content standards are NOT curriculum
- The State establishes these standards
- Local school districts determine local curriculum

Additional Points/Comments:

- Greg suggested adding alignment activity to the report card-statement of assurance.
- This committee doesn't need to do anything regarding the template for standards but may want to incorporate the meaning of standards for accountability.
- Do superintendents, teachers, etc. want to see an option in ESSA where they can choose to give either the state assessment or ACT/SAT?

Topic: Discussion on Section 4.0 Dashboards & Report Cards

Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Dashboard: Reveals and reflects the school's progress toward the vision for the state education system (Summary or Overview)

- Achievement on state assessment
- High school graduation rates
- Progress of ELs in achieving proficiency
- At least one additional measure of school quality
- Need to be publicly available and transparent

Report Card: Detailed information and data that serves as the compliance reporting instrument in support of federal and state regulations (In Depth)

- Achievement on state assessment
- High school graduation rates
- Progress of ELs in achieving proficiency
- Achievement by subgroup
- 95% participation rate
- Need to be publicly available and transparent

Additional Points/Comments:

- What additional elements on dashboard beyond what is required? Minimal funding available
- What methods do we want to use on our dashboard?
- Numbers, words, letter grades, symbols, colors, etc.
- Accessibility requirements important and will be built into RFP.

Likes:

- Staff attendance has high rating for impact
- Important for schools/teachers to own the dashboard
- Colors are useful/graphics are nice
- Equal amount of white space
- Showing progression is good
- Modesto City dashboard is well liked-3 year comparison is nice
- Graphs/charts
- Core was liked as well without school quality index number
- Trends and arrows are liked

Dislikes:

- Do not like letter grades
- Too many items (not sure what they all mean)
- Don't want repetitive charts, graphs, etc.
- Colors-need to choose colors wisely (yellow proceed with caution?)

Learning Opportunities: (a bucket for more flexibility to include)

- Criteria
- Attendance
- AP Courses
- Suspension

Follow-up survey on what was liked/disliked on the example dashboards will be sent out

Next Steps:

- Next meeting: Will discuss dashboards & assessments
- Homework: Read the ND Assessment Task Force Final Report and be prepared to discuss at next meeting
- Next meeting is large ESSA group meeting on September 30, 2016 at the Baymont Inn in Mandan.
- Bob Grosz agreed to be the spokesperson to report back to the large ESSA group regarding additional school quality factors.

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---------|------------------|--|--------------|--|
| Date: | October | Location: | | Time: | |
|--------------|---------|------------------|--|--------------|--|

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

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sonja Butenhoff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Friesen | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tracy Korsmo |
| <input 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"/> | Richard Rothaus |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Fremstad | <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | Gerry Teevens |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Kirsten Baesler | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greg Gallagher | <input type="checkbox"/> | Rob Bauer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ann Ellefson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Marthaller | <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 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| <p>Welcome and introductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |
| <p>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.</p> | |
| Topic: Accountability Indicators | Presenter: Heather Kinsey |
| <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what is on the dashboard • what is required • what is not required but we want included as useful <p>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:</p> | |

- 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 |
| <p>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.</p> | |

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 in 15 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: | |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--|



ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes Conference Call

Thursday, November 10, 2016 | 1:30 PM – 3:00 PM | State Capitol – 9th Floor Conference Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Jane Gratz | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 1:30 PM | 3:15 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 type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Travis Thorvilson |
| <input 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 type="checkbox"/> | Kirsten Baesler | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Greg Gallagher | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rob Bauer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ann Ellefson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Leah Kugel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tammy Mayer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Valerie Fischer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Laurie Matzke | <input type="checkbox"/> | Beth Larson-Steckler |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------|
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | | | Presenter: Laurie Matzke | | |
| <p>Welcome and introductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: Gifted and Talented Subgroup | | | Presenter: Heather Hume | | |
| <p>First and foremost, the group must define "Gifted and Talented" vs. "High Achievers." What is Superintendent Baesler's definition? Ultimately, the subcommittee would have to decide. Not a required subgroup. Very few states report results for high achieving students separately; only Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, and Wyoming. Possibility of factoring into performance index. Four Steps under ESSA states should take to ensure the needs of high achievers are prioritized:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Achievement Student Growth "Gifted Students (or "high achieving students) Growth for All Students <p>Discuss with other states how they monitor achievement. Office of Student Support to coordinate discussion with other states. Subgroup created to do research: Cheryl Hagar, Leah Kugel, Julie Jaeger, and Heather Hume; report out at the Nov. 22 meeting. Develop Criteria for "gifted and talented," and "high achievers."</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Graduation Rates | | | Presenter: Greg Gallagher | | |
| <p>Do we want to include GED results in the Graduation Rate? South Dakota DOE shared language in their plan that states...the state's Accountability Work Group strongly recommended to give schools credit for committing to see that all students finish high school, whether they do it the "traditional" way or another appropriate route. "All students" level and at each subgroup level will still be reported out so schools can determine where to focus efforts to increase graduation rates. Are students dropping out due to the environment or to grades? How would the cohort be tracked? Will these students be tracked back to the school district? If the student enters an adult learning center, why would the school get credit when the center provided the teaching? Including this subgroup may have an impact on the GED program. Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the number of non-proficient students by 25% over six years; handout provided to group • Use quartiles (all students reach the 4th quartile in six years; handout provided to group) • Growth Model in the Accountability System <p>Run a mock trial of a couple schools and report out at the Nov. 22 meeting.</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Establishing Long Term Goals | | | Presenter: Laurie Matzke | | |
| <p>Two handouts provided to the group: Measurable Objectives and Quartile Chart for non-proficient students. Tabled until the Nov. 22 meeting. Ran out of time.</p> | | | | | |
| Topic: Elements to Include in the Accountability System | | | Presenter: Laurie Matzke | | |
| <p>Pie charts using State Assessment Achievement, Growth, and Climate/Engagement were provided to the group regarding the ESSA Accountability w/o EL students and with EL students, with EL students making up 10%. More discussion will be held at the Nov. 22 meeting. Ran out of time.</p> | | | | | |
| Next Meeting: | November 22, 2016 | Location: | Pioneer Room | Time: | 8:30 AM |

ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes

Tuesday November 22, 2016 | 8:30 AM – 4:30 PM | State Capitol – Pioneer Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Shauna Greff | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 8:30 AM | 4:25 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 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"/> | Richard Rothaus |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jennifer Fremstad | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Melanie Kathrein | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Russ Ziegler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Travis Thorvilson | | | | |

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Marthaller | <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 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Topic: Overview of Agenda and Summary of ESSA trainings in MN & MD | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| <p>Welcome and introductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aimee Copas representing ND Council of Ed Leaders • Jeff Fastnacht representing Small Districts • Jennifer Fremstad representing ND High School Principals Assn • Cheryl Hagar representing Title I Targeted • Teresa Desai representing Schoolwide • Melanie Kathrien representing Curriculum Coordination • Tracy Korsmo representing NDSLDS • Tracy Friesen representing ND Non-public Schools • Julie Jaeger representing ND Assn for Gifted Children • Wayne Kutzer representing ND Career and Tech Ed • Anita Thomas representing ND School Boards Assn • Russ Zieger representing ND Council of Ed Leaders • NDDPI employees introduced themselves <p>Laurie M. provided overview of MN and MD meetings recently attended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USDE is still planning to release final regulations • USDE still holding Dec. 12-13 meeting – team of four NDDPI staff will be attending • No one really knows what is going to happen • We need to be flexible • NDDPI is still planning on submitting according to the established timeline • Most important thing is states should continue to draft the plan based on the statute | |
| Topic: Discussion on High School Graduation Rate | Presenters: Greg Gallagher/ Valerie Fischer |
| <p>Two basic definitions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Four-year adjusted cohort 2. Extended-year adjusted cohort <p>Past graduation rates were based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rules Since 2005 • Historical Goal • Data Compilation • Date Validation • Multi-year Cohorts • Demographic Data • Sample Size Determination • Graduation Requirements • Graduation Growth <p>Graduation Decision Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four-year Cohort – Do you want to retain a straight four-year cohort? • Multi-year Cohort – Must have a four-year but can have additional years. • Long-term Goal – Currently at 89%; should state go higher? What would be an acceptable level? • Interim Goals – Could set interim goals within your long-term goals. • Sample Size Determination – Nine and below is non-reportable. Must be consistent across the board. • Reliability Test – A rate is a rate; however, do we consider a pure rate or incorporate a statistical test to ensure stability? • Growth Model – Comparing one year to the next. • Introduce a Completion Rate Metric – GED is not identified as a metric. If bring in GED, would lead to discussion of regulatory review. Option to bring it in separately as a completion rate. <p>Val gave an overview of GED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 92% pass rate • Average age of 22 – biggest population is 17-18 year olds • Opportunity to include GED offers flexibility and validates efforts • It is a rigorous test • GED prepares a student to be Choice Ready | |

Many questions and details on how we want this to look.

Four issues for committee to consider:

1. Are we comfortable with historical practice? Yes
2. Do we want to look at growth? Any concerns? Are the BIE schools going to be on the top of the list for comprehensive support?
If look at GED extender and growth, it could help.
Ok with language on using growth and extender model with understanding we want to look at this with regard to reporting.
3. Do we want to consider the GED extender? South Dakota has done it.
4. What do we want as our long-term goal for graduation rates?

What is the reliability of our graduation rate? Seat time requirement unfortunately.

The law says a four-year cohort and then state discretion, up to seven-year.

How do you honor the definition of the law and also give value to what your state wants?

GED is state-by-state but could do a memorandum of understanding with surrounding states.

Topic: Additional School Quality Indicator – Climate and Culture

Presenters: Heather Kinsey/Valerie Fischer/Trish Arnold

Heather Kinsey presented a PowerPoint on the status of development of AdvancED.

Need to understand what we are measuring and how we define it.

List of 7 school quality factors.

New set of Climate and Culture surveys.

New diagnostic tools.

How to measure student engagement?

ELEOT classroom observation tool was used and came up with seven key learning environments.

Developed a student engagement survey. Need to measure quality and level of student learning process.

Three types of engagement:

Cognitive

Behavioral

Emotional (Affective)

Additional measures of quality of engagement:

Committed

Compliant

Disengaged

School quality and performance standards directly related to surveys.

School quality factors must be used state-wide so we are lucky to have AdvancED statewide.

Surveys are being used to measure climate.

Harder to measure culture.

Have not piloted the survey but are in the process.

Have research that shows there is a direct correlation to student outcome based on Eliot.

Might be comfortable to actually see the survey before we agree to it. Heather will send to Laurie to disseminate.

Student engagement is directly correlated to Climate and Culture.

Content for new climate/culture AdvancED surveys will be given to committee to review.

Heather will ask if the developers can use these surveys as a measure for accountability because that was not the original intent.

Can be vague on details but need the frame within the plan.

Testing done on surveys before January.

Accountability reporting should drive improvement.

There are surveys that can be used for accountability and can be scored.

Val Fischer/Trish Arnold presented on Measuring Climate and Engagement – PowerPoint

Is there a survey that can be used to measure? Yes, but they are lengthy. One has a fee and one is free. Shouldn't we be using a metric of participation of students who are engaged in the survey and school improvement process?

We should have, at a minimum, participation.

Student engagement in academia and extracurricular are critical.

Need to focus on accountability for our plan.

School improvement is already part of this plan.

What process can we use to encompass all?

Need to have validity and reliability.

Need one consistent state-wide indicator and then each school can have more.
Whether we like the survey will depend on the number of questions – should not be cumbersome.
Crosswalk of surveys may be helpful as a next step.
Interested in the compendium? Yes, it will be sent out.

Topic: Assessment

Presenters: Bob Marhaller/
Greg Gallagher

Copy of the pre-filed bill draft was handed out by Bob Marthaller.
Greg Gallagher discussed handout on Assessment Consideration Points.
Reaffirms states set their own academic standards.
Driven by requirements of the law.
The test is aligned to the standards.
The old test was aligned to standards in 2002 and restated in 2006.
Question of how to move forward with the reports that will provide the data we need.
There should be correlation of standards assessment data to the grade the student is receiving.
Schools need to be transparent; however, there are other factors that impact the data.
Much of this section in the plan includes the story of how we got here, where we are at, and where we are headed.
Decisions:
Use ACT instead of Smarter Balanced
What are we going to use to measure growth?
What grade are we going to assess?
Handout on pros/cons chart for discussion.

Pros/Cons Grade Tested in High School Handout and Discussion:
If tested in 9th grade, would assessment be at 9th grade level. Yes
Is it possible to use cohort for growth? Yes
Full Academic Year (FAY) is practical issue and has validity.
Looking at one year to test.
Voting took place regarding which grade the committee would like to see testing done:
Do not want 12th grade but the other grades are not an obvious decision.
At 11th grade, they could choose ACT or NDSA but if they want growth, the ACT doesn't include that.
If choose 11th grade, some schools will only test once regardless of growth.
Redefining Ready will be the indicator on how our students are doing. It is not and should not be based on testing.
Not against testing in 9th grade as long as there is an indicator at the end of 12th grade like ACT or Redefining Ready.
ACT and NDSA take so much time. If they were not so time intensive would it make a difference?
Very split between whether to choose 9th, 10th, or 11th grade.
Is it best practice to move it? There are a lot of other changes; this is just one small piece of the puzzle.
The option of another test does change the picture.
Teachers will teach to standards or teach to ACT.
The option to give either test should not be there. They should have to take both so we can measure growth.
Growth would give some schools an opportunity to not be identified for supports.
Whatever you do to the whole group, it also affects the subgroup.
There is a chance for growth and the state defines what that growth looks like.
Hard to know until we run the data to see how it all plays out before we actually go live with our decisions.
Need to decide on the option of ACT and on grade level for NDSA.
9th and 12th grades are not the grades to test.
Decision is either 10th or 11th grade and this needs more discussion.
What would help make this decision?
What does the data show?
An idea would be to present to the large group on our discussion and indecision and allow for discussion and voting from the large group.
We need to choose a grade for assessment. Schools will not have this choice.
What do we want our state assessment to measure? ACT does not measure what we value.
Would like to give our principals an opportunity to share their views on what they would choose? Then, shortly before the full meeting, report out what our colleagues decided.
10th or 11th grade?
ACT or not?

Timeframe of testing?

Discussion on timeframe of when to test.
We can ask for a shorter test and results back quickly.

Topic: Establishing Long Term Goals | Presenter: Laurie Matzke

Incremental increments make the goal more achievable.
Need to set an end goal to establish a reference point.
Should we meet earlier next week due to the number of decisions to make?
Do not want to make these decisions just to rush through the agenda.
Further discussion at meeting prior to large committee meeting next week at the Baymont.

Topic: College and Career Ready

Table discussion until next meeting prior to large meeting at Baymont next week.

Topic: School Dashboard/Elements to Include in Accountability System | Presenters: Sam Unruh/Ross Roemmich/Tracy Korsmo

Presentation:
Twelve questions arose when going through the AdvancED module.
Could go into SLDS to get data but it wasn't in a usable format.
Created a method of efficient analysis of the data.
Several methods of data retrieval and viewing were presented.

| Name | Organization | Scope of Presentation |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Nathan Anderson | SLDS | SLDS cube (AdvancED reports) |
| Sam Unruh | SLDS | Data Explorer |
| Steve Derzi | SLDS | New.NET SLDS interface including data dashboard |
| David Lamitina | SLDS | Potential analytics |
| Tracy Korsmo | SLDS | Student/parent portal |

Could be updated daily with current information.
Confidence in the data from the SLDS system is high.
Schools will be able to customize their dashboard based on the information they desire.
Could be shared on the dashboard? Live and interactive data.
Would like to eventually get there. Challenges exist but they are working on it.
Ross provided a handout on the State Support Team and the resources available.
Next Steps on Dashboard:
Next week put out Request for Information (RFI) and allow three weeks' turnaround
Time is essential and all other deliverables
Decide then to put out the full RFP in January
February/March timeframe to decide
Data turned over by June
Dashboard ready by October
Work to identify schools for supports
Meet with them to go over requirements and plans
July 1, 2018 fully implement law for supports
The entity we contract with will have the ability to tap into the SLDS data.
Question on ownership of the data.
There still must be a state view of the data.
Concerns will hopefully be addressed from the information from the RFI.
This committee will need to decide based in the RFI which vendors would be able to accommodate the state requirements and needs.

Topic: Equity Discussion/EL Updates | Presenter: Lodee Arnold

Ran out of time – no discussion
EL Updates:
Handout with the updates from the English Learner Advisory Committee Meeting/ESSA Recommendations.
No concerns on information presented.
Do we feel comfortable recommending ELPAC recommendations as submitted?

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------|
| Yes, all were in agreement. | | | | | |
| Topic: Advanced Student Subgroup Discussion | | | | | |
| Ran out of time – no discussion | | | | | |
| Topic: Review Draft ESSA Template – Application Sections | | | | Presenter: Laurie Matzke | |
| Three sections of the template were handed out (1.0, 3.0, and 4.0). Homework is to review them and provide feedback. | | | | | |
| Next Steps: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet at 8:00 AM at Baymont prior to large committee meeting to discuss <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Setting goals ▪ Determining test grade, option of ACT, and timeframe of testing ▪ College and Career Ready – Redefining Ready – Share link with this subgroup • Provide feedback on template sections • Follow-up email tomorrow with information from Heather and Jeff, a one-page summary, and meeting reminder for the 8:00 AM meeting prior to full committee meeting • One or several members to report out: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historical data on graduation rate ▪ Climate engagement – Jeff Fastnacht ▪ Redefining Ready – Jeff Fastnacht ▪ Assessment topic – Jennifer Fremstad ▪ EL Update – Sonja Butenhoff | | | | | |
| Date: | November 30, 2016 | Location: | Baymont, Mandan | Time: | 8:00 AM |

ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes Conference Call

Friday, December 16, 2016 | 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM | State Capitol – 9th Floor Conference Room

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Shauna Greff | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 10:00 AM | 11:30 AM | |

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 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 type="checkbox"/> | Rob Bauer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ann Ellefson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Leah Kugel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tammy Mayer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Valerie Fischer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Laurie Matzke | <input type="checkbox"/> | Beth Larson-Steckler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Marthaller | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ross Roemmich | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Joe Kolosky |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Topic: Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| <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 • Wayne Kutzer representing Career and Tech Ed • Aimee Copas representing ND Council Ed Leaders • Russ Zeigler representing ND Council Ed Leaders • Jeff Fastnacht representing Small Districts • Julie Jaeger representing ND Assn for Gifted Children • Tracy Korsmo representing ND ITD • Melanie Kathrein representing Curriculum • NDDPI employees introduced themselves <p>Need to decide on issues and if the committee is ready to make a recommendation to the full committee at this time</p> | |
| Topic: Assessment | Presenter: |
| <p>Jennifer said survey closed last week Is ACT very much a part of the conversation? If ACT were the option or choice are we still looking at options for different grade levels? Stakeholders are excited about using the option of the ACT Standards need to be included on this Survey results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 61 responses • 44 class B, 17 class A • Leave as is: NDSA and ACT 11th Grade = 8.2% • NDSA 10th grade and ACT 11th grade = Highest percent 57.4 • Only ACT 11th grade 26.2% • 89.7% want state assessment given in spring • Comment: Possibility to use NDSA to calculate growth? <p>Is it possible to use ACT Aspire as alternate to State Assessment? Interim assessment – If move NDSA to 10th – would there still need to be an interim? If you only use ACT – no growth would be used The data is telling us there is a drop in student performance from middle level to high school Students are not being exposed to standards in high school Many feel students are over tested in grade 11 Redefining Ready indicator should be used for growth rather than any test Still need to give a choice – Where do we keep the state assessment? School level can choose to use ACT or NDSA or both 10th grade NDSA 11th grade ACT Which test are we going to use for accountability under ESSA? What is ACT assessing? Tuesday large meeting – Hold off on this piece until we discuss more at Wednesday's meeting? Committee would like to inform the large group on this issue to hear their thoughts and ideas regarding this committee's roadblock so they can maybe shed some insight Jennifer will report out on where our committee is to the full committee and then pick up this discussion at the Wednesday subcommittee meeting</p> | |
| Topic: Redefining Ready | Presenter: |
| <p>Handout on Career, College, Military Regarding the military – Is this through the Redefining Ready or from what other states have in place? ASVAB given and technical assessment – Would schools have the capability to do this? The military would be a partner to work with schools for accessibility of these What is the technical assessment referring to? LM will get clarification on this for our next meeting College Ready – If you meet one of those bullets you have met more. A lot of overlap on bullets Career Ready – Looking at different components within this factor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade point average • Using WorkKeys | |

11/29 email had attachments with regard to this
 This will be discussed in full on the agenda as the first topic so it gets the time it needs to be discussed
 Workplace learning experience – Would it be wise to put hours with that if a possibility?
 75 hours would be equivalent to ½ credit; it should be hours based
 Sam will be on the agenda at next subcommittee meeting
 A concern is that State Assessment is not included in any area
 College Ready needs to be broken down based on readiness
 Wayne will update on several of these areas to provide clarity
 No report to full committee on this issue

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| Topic: Establishing Long Term Goals | Presenter: |
|-------------------------------------|------------|

What information can we bring on Wednesday to move forward with this issue?
 States must use the USDE template because of the peer review process
 We have our Choice Ready Goal
 Need to get much more specific – Look at reading and math separately and subgroups
 Set an achievable goal
 3 handouts distributed
 Where would you draw a line of the beginning expectation to be and then where do we want them to be?
 3rd quartile is ambitious but achievable
 Need to be clear in what our goal is; do not need to be 100% to be proficient
 Where will the information for foster and military be reported? They are not used for accountability but will be on the report card
 Laurie will look at other state plans to review this issue

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Topic: Elements to Include in the Accountability System (Assigning Percents) | Presenter: |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|

Handout of pie charts of elementary and high schools
 USDE reminded states, you only have to have one factor according to the law
 Can start with one and add others at a later date
 Anything we can bring to Wednesday's meeting to facilitate this discussion?
 Sliding scale between growth and achievement
 Growth and achievement would be combined behind the scenes with Dr. Elgart's model
 Elementary level looks good
 High school level would work using Redefining Ready indicators
 Percentages are worthy of discussion; however, they are at a good starting point
 We don't know how detailed it will need to be once President Elect Trump takes office
 Can we track the GED completion portion?
 Another state has been doing it so it should be able to be used

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Overview of December 20 th and December 21 st Agenda | Presenter: |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|

Tuesday, December 20, 2016:

- Meeting from 8:30-4:30 at Baymont
- Jeff will report out on Graduation Rate and Climate Engagement discussion
- Jennifer will report out on discussion on Assessment and survey results
- No recommendations are ready to be made
- Sonja will report on the English Learner piece
- Redefining Ready and pie will not be reported out, but tackled in more depth on Wednesday

Wednesday, December 21, 2016:

- Comfort Inn – hope to be done by early afternoon
- Redefining Ready
- Assessment
- Long term goals
- Accountability percentages
- Gifted and Talented presentation

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|
| Next Meeting: | December 20, 2016 | Location: | Baymont Inn, Mandan | Time: | 8:30 AM |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------|



ESSA Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting Subcommittee Minutes

Wednesday, December 21, 2016 | 8:15 AM | Comfort Inn, Bismarck

| Facilitator | Note Taker | Bucket Leader |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Laurie Matzke | Shauna Greff | |
| Meeting Convened | Meeting Adjourned | Breakout Room |
| 8:30 AM | 12:55 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | L Anita Thomas |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Jeff Fastnacht | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Julie Jaeger | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | Gerry Teevens |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Kirsten Baesler | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Greg Gallagher | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rob Bauer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ann Ellefson | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Leah Kugel | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tammy Mayer |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Valerie Fischer | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Laurie Matzke | <input type="checkbox"/> | Beth Larson-Steckler |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Robert Marthaller | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Ross Roemmich | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Joe Kolosky |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Topic: Welcome and Overview of Agenda | Presenter: Laurie Matzke |
| <p>Envision one more meeting in January for this subcommittee</p> <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 • Wayne Kutzer representing Career and Tech Ed • Russ Zeigler representing ND Council Ed Leaders • 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 • L Anita Thomas representing School Board Assn • Travis Thorvilson representing ND EL • Melanie Kathrein representing Curriculum Coordinators • NDDPI employees | |
| Topic: Assessment – Grade Tested in High School | |
| <p>Unless a waiver or given special permission, the grade selected in the plan would be for the whole state</p> <p>Dr. Elgart's model for testing at grade nine is a great option, as a system and using Choice Ready to measure growth</p> <p>Discussion on using grade nine or ten for NDSA</p> <p>PD planning currently is not based on NDSA so that should not be a factor</p> <p>The standards remain important, just not using the state assessment to validate instruction or PD</p> <p>Doing more than one interim assessment within their high schools</p> <p>Tenth grade takes Aspire and Pre-ACT</p> <p>Any negatives for going with grade nine?</p> <p>Could the math be specific and not include geometry or be more algebra based?</p> <p>If ninth grade, the issue of science would need to be changed</p> <p>Limiting the intent of the standards if you remove geometry</p> <p>Assessments overall design of curriculum and where do our students stand</p> <p>What is the balance of what the standards are trying to put forth?</p> <p>Just because we are not testing specific courses does not mean that those subjects are not being taught</p> <p>Standards are interwoven; however, they are not a driving force in our high schools</p> <p>Redefining Ready is a measure of assessment – measures all of things that we value</p> <p>It is a different measurement of assessment but needs to be looked at and valued</p> <p>Interim assessments are great for engagement and measurement</p> <p>Need to balance a common measurement against common standards on a common goal</p> <p>What is the appropriate tools needed to accomplish our goals?</p> <p>If test early, it removes University Systems data for placement</p> <p>There are many ways to assess our students on standards</p> <p>State assessment is a measure for College Ready but not Choice Ready</p> <p>How does assessment fit into Choice Ready and multiple measures?</p> <p>It is not a single measure but we need to figure out where it fits and should be used</p> <p>Students success needs to be measured by multiple indicators, not just one</p> <p>All paths matter not just one</p> <p>There will be pros and cons for any grade we choose</p> <p>Need to figure out which grade to use for accountability</p> <p>We have already reduced the weight of the test as far as accountability</p> <p>Are we ready to vote?</p> <p>Jennifer has a conference call planned for early January of stakeholders</p> <p>If a recommendation is made, we can still change it, but it would be necessary to voice opinion</p> <p>Table discussions:</p> <p>Would like to steer away from eleventh grade</p> <p>Not sure ninth grade could show growth</p> <p>If math could be more aligned with algebra, ninth grade would work</p> <p>Concern of public relations aspect – State Assessment is still being viewed as accountability measure</p> <p>People that make the decisions and hold the purse strings still look at assessment - we need to inform them that it is only one measure</p> | |

Quite a few new members on the Education Committee of the legislature so now is the time to provide information
Are we stuck within our design structure and thought process?

Can we come up with a hybrid of a system that would provide smaller assessments still tightly held to assessments to drive instruction?

What if instead of one assessment, we package what we feel is necessary for learning

District's responsibility when it is appropriate to give assessments

Different tracks of learning: traditional or non-traditional

Could we do this with interim assessments? They are not directly linked to our standards

This has been in discussion for several years

Focused tests per grade level that gets banked and provides opportunity for summative score

Not a well-tested approach but does open the door for opportunity

Need to design and sell this approach

Two options:

Use the interim like Smarter Balance that aligns to standards

Use modules through the years with the summative to be used in the 11th grade for reporting

Concerns would be cost – limited dollars for assessment and we need to pay for the dashboard with these funds

The other issue would be the transient population – how would we track?

Possibly assess as student enters your system so earlier modules would not need to be taken?

For math, could our assessment be more subject based rather than how it is now?

Put forth the recommendation of how to proceed but have this as an optional package in an RFP for assessments to figure out costs and what would be needed

Giving the student the assessment close to instruction as chunked would help to use the data to drive instruction which would drive competency based education

Huge hill to educate others on this because we would be going from one assessment to three

However, these would be smaller and not such a huge test

Other states are proceeding with this process

This is a process we should pursue but we need to make decisions today

University Systems decision to use assessment for placement, it is based in assessment being used

Innovative Learning initiative is being worked on and fits nicely into this

From a parent perspective, my goal is to have them be college ready and access to other school's data to compare

There were no comments in the survey valuing ninth over tenth or vice versa

Vote taken on grade level:

- 9 – 6
- 10 – 8
- 11 – 0
- 12 – 0

Jennifer will run this by her group on the conference call and indicate the voting result and see what their views are
Start with RFP

Should Greg draft something preliminary to bring to January meeting?

Or create a focus group to help Greg put the parameters together?

Go with grade ten for state plan however, this would be a pilot idea to put on the RFP to determine cost and if it is possible to use multiple years

Greg recommends drafting something and then bring to committee to review and discuss

Topic: College and Career Ready – Potential Indicators

Many different kinds of kids so we need to be diverse and prepare them the best we can

We will be able to show different measures

Opportunity to show growth at the high school

Concern that state assessment wasn't reflected so it has been added for discussion

Also examples regarding industry credential and also technical assessment under military

Discussion on handout:

All support the concept

Are we in agreement on the three categories and what's within them?

Like Choice Ready and could add Life Ready at some point

Need to be able to track these

Struggle with including NDSA

Isn't it better for them to have more choices to use?

It is an option to demonstrate readiness so it makes sense to include

Discussion on handout on Choice Ready

- PowerSchool is tool that is used
- Students need to identify a pathway
- Work with a counselor

Discussion on 98% attendance – should it be lowered?

- Excused absences are different from school board to school board
- Having schools report what the absence was for
- This tool is in PowerSchool and data we can attain
- Drill down data to school absences
- Every school determines whether it is excused or unexcused
- Schools need to report all absences even if excused
- Message is important that attendance is important
- This would count non-school related absences; however, PowerSchool is not configured this way
- Working group could work out these details from PowerSchool
- For kids with medical needs, this should be optional instead of mandatory
- The attendance calculation is for the entire high school career
- Learning toward this factor being optional at 98%
- PowerSchool would need a check to indicate that they have identified a career cluster at some time in their high school career

Kids could be ready for all three choices and shouldn't be just one

Where do ELs and Special Ed fall into these categories

Do we want conversation on how to make this work for these two areas?

Yes, and bring back information that could be added and also for GED

This is not per student; it is to show schools where their school is

This does not indicate whether a student will be accepted into college, it is to determine how a school is doing

Student engagement is also a large piece of readiness

Need to empower kids, we do not need any more training on identifying, we need to teach resiliency

Data was given with regard to percentages of graduation rates in both high schools and colleges

Discussion on bullets under Military Ready discussed

Topic: Advanced Student Subgroup Discussion

Presenter: Julie Jaeger

Should we include this as a subgroup?

Provide them an accelerated activity

Levels of Service have been used

Move away from this to identify or serve the Gifted and Talented group because there is no cohesiveness

There are screeners available but are we in a position to do it

Want to give an idea of questions:

- How are we going to identify?
- What are short and long term goals?
- Funding?

Have kids who are on an IEP but IQ is very high

In a regular classroom situation, these kids do not do well

Need to be identified by a qualified professional

Finances received for this subgroup are minimal

95% and above would be considered Gifted

Do not call it Gifted and Talented

Do not call it High Achiever because identification would be hard

There are different characteristics of gifted students:

Creative Learner

Gifted

High Achiever

Whatever is done, it needs to be sure and include growth

Some have positive behaviors but others have negative behaviors

A lot of socio-emotional issues

Standardized tests are much different than the cognitive test given to identify these students

Funding:

\$400,000 per year

Special Education request these funds

Mostly large districts

No separate line item for this

Do we want to put something in our plan on this and are we prepared to do this or should there be more research and possibly include in the future?

There are pieces all over the state in both large and small districts that have plans in place

We need to be able to support this so more information is needed

Topic: Elements to Include in the Accountability System – Pie Chart

Feedback on the handout pie chart

This graphic will be illustrated so do we need to change verbiage?

Dashboard will show different information – this graphic is behind the scenes percentages

This graphic is to determine weight of factors

Dashboard will have a lot of parent friendly information and will give links so parents can always find additional information

It is not a parent training tool

Do we want to signify which factors are academic and can we asterisk or flag them?

Or use a key sentence at bottom to signify which are academic

Once Climate/Engagement are defined, parents will understand more clearly

Topic: Establishing Long Term Goals

Discussion of goals chart

Goals for state assessment

Greg advises removing Novice, Proficient as they are not appropriate

Would level I, II, III, IV?

Yes, but with definition as to what each level is

Discussion on scatter plot charts

Are goals used for identification – no they are not

This should be as minimalistic as possible and meets the law but not to put much focus on this

Can we use the growth rate from the past five years, chart it, and project it forward?

We need to be realistic and aggressive

Use some statisticians to look at what the numbers should look like

We will put information into the template and bring that to the January meeting

NEXT STEPS:

- One-page summary
- Minutes
- Doodle for January meeting
- Same for full group meeting; minutes and doodle

For January meeting:

- Report from Jennifer
- Bring data regarding goals
- Met with military so have information for Choice Ready
- Need to make decisions on additional school quality factor
- Decide whether to move forward with climate and add engagement when ready?

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----|--------------|-----|
| Next Meeting: | January based on doodle | Location: | TBD | Time: | TBD |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----|--------------|-----|



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 |
|---------------|------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------|---------------|



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 |
| <p>On the Call:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | |
| <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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</p> <p>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%</p> | |