ESSA Accountability Work Group
Pierre School District Administration Building, Pierre, South Dakota
October 18, 2016

The fifth and final in-person meeting of the Accountability Work Group began at 10:01 a.m. on October 18, 2016, at the Red Rosa Restaurant meeting room, Pierre, South Dakota. The ESSA Accountability Work Group was formed to make recommendations to the South Dakota Department of Education pertaining to changes in school accountability in the new reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act known as the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA).

Work Group Membership
Members of the work group who were present were: Linda Foos, Wagner Community School District; Kelly Glodt, Pierre School District; Becky Guffin, Aberdeen School District; Bonnie Haines, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate; Lara Hanson, Sioux Falls School district; Thomas Holmes, State Legislator; Paul Turman, Board of Regents; Karen Whitney, Todd County School District; Wade Pogany, Associated School Boards of South Dakota, Charles Sykora, Wall School District, and Jeremy Wollman, South Central School District. Steve Obrien, Vice President of the South Dakota Education Association attended as substitute representatives for their organizations. Several SD Department of Education staff persons were also in attendance.

The group was welcomed by Terri Bissonette, consultant for McRel International North Central Comprehensive Center, facilitator of the group. Throughout the meeting Laura Scheibe, SD DOE Office of Assessment and Accountability, provided background information on the current accountability system and changes under ESSA.

Review of the Recommendations of the School Improvement Work Group
Bissonette asked the work group to consider each of the recommendations made by the School Improvement Work Group and determine whether they are in agreement.

School Improvement Recommendation #1 – July 21, 2016
<u>The work group recommends that the school district along with the school board and all the administrative team, signs an MOU to support all designated schools throughout the school improvement process. This process must take place within six weeks of an official designation. Efforts must be made to align district initiatives to building/school improvement needs.</u> The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #1 (Extension) – September 7, 2016
<u>We recommend that the MOU to support all designated schools throughout the improvement process should be reviewed and signed annually by the district and approved by the board. Any revisions, supported by evidence of need, should be incorporated in the MOU.</u> The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #2 – July 21, 2016
<u>The work group recommended that the ESSA defined “comprehensive support schools” remain in school improvement status for four years after designation with the first year as a planning year.</u> The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #3 – July 21, 2016
The work group recommends that "comprehensive support schools" re-designated after four years must choose between a peer review and an external comprehensive needs assessment. The school district would be financially responsible for this process as stated in the MOU. Comprehensive needs assessment or peer review would take place in year 5 with implementation in years 6 through 8 for re-designated schools. The process of peer review and identification of comprehensive needs assessment providers will be determined at a later date. Re-designated schools may exit when established exit criteria has been met. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #3 (Extension paragraph #1) – September 7, 2016
Exiting Criteria for Comprehensive Schools
The work group made the recommendation that a school in comprehensive school improvement should submit a 3-year sustainability plan in their fourth year of school improvement that will be implemented upon exiting. The plan should outline what will be continued **(upon exiting)**, how it will be carried out, and the evidence that demonstrates success. The plan should be included in the MOU. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #3 (Extension paragraph #2) – September 7, 2016
Exiting Criteria for Comprehensive Schools
The work group made the recommendation that a demonstration of student growth in reading and math should be a major factor in the criteria established for exiting school improvement (in addition to demonstration of consistent implementation of the school improvement plan). The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group with the addition that "growth" is determined with guidance from the school district and that the "MOU should specify the goals for growth as the school's Title I goals and that the goals are measured by the metric identified in the Title Consolidated Application."

School Improvement Recommendation #3 (Extension paragraph #3) – September 7, 2016
Exiting Criteria for Comprehensive Schools
The work group further recommended that those comprehensive schools that show significant student growth should be officially recognized by the state even if that schools is unable to exit school improvement. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #4 – July 21, 2016
The work group recommended that ESSA defined "targeted support schools" be designated for two years, one year of planning and one year of implementation. A school that is re-designated after two years would not get a planning year, the school would go into third and fourth year of targeted support. Re-designated schools may exit when established exit criteria has been met. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #5 – July 21, 2016
The work group recommended that SD DOE provide professional development opportunities for school board members and district leadership that includes Title I programming and school improvement information. The work group decided that a school board member should not be required to be on the school improvement team. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #6 – September 7, 2016

Background Information: The Indistar system (SD LEAP) has many indicators with the SD DOE pre-selecting a group of the indicators that are presented to schools from which they may select and work towards. The indicators are accompanied by WiseWays, a manual of research based processes that may be implemented by the school. Schools have indicated that WiseWays and Indistar are very helpful in the first year of school improvement. Schools involved in the process for multiple years have expressed a desire to have a less cumbersome system. TIE has developed spreadsheets that are being used by two districts, the Systemic Collaborative Data Review Process (CDRP). These spreadsheets do not have the benefits of Wise Ways research processes. SD DOE is attempting to provide some flexibility without creating too many systems that cannot be monitored due to limited DOE capacity. Concern was raised that a district may have schools using two different processes with a principal of two schools expected to handle two processes.

The work group made the recommendation to keep Indistar as ~~a~~ **the primary** comprehensive needs assessment tool, planning tool, and resource for evidence-based practice. Indistar should be required for those schools in their planning year **unless permission has been given by the State Title I office** . Schools in subsequent years of school improvement should have the option to use Indistar or **another approved system validated by the state** ~~the TIE Systemic Collaborative Data Review Process (CDRP)~~ for ongoing monitoring of the school improvement process. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group with the bolded additions and strikethrough deletions.

School Improvement Recommendation #7 - September 7, 2016

The work group made the recommendation that a school's improvement plan needs to align evidence-based best practices. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #8 – September 7, 2016

School Support Team Members

The work group made the recommendation that the state continue its efforts in ensuring that School Support Team members have a clear understanding of their role, which includes monitoring, mentoring, coaching, and providing technical assistance, and are properly trained in the state's expectations of the school improvement process. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #9 – September 7, 2016

Technical Advisors

The work group made the recommendation that the Technical Advisor (TA) role be more clearly defined and be assigned to districts based upon a risk assessment and matched to the TA's expertise in either program and/or fiscal responsibilities. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #10 – September 7, 2016

Technical Advisors

The work group made the recommendation that there be a process in place to ensure that new administrators have a clear understanding of the responsibilities and requirements under both Title I and School Improvement. The recommendation was ratified by the Accountability Work Group.

School Improvement Recommendation #11 – September 7, 2016

Background: ESSA gives schools more flexibility. Under ESSA, priority and focus schools are no longer required to withhold 10% of Title I funds for school improvement interventions or professional development. Concerns with the 10% Title I funds for professional development makes it more difficult to provide PD for only that school to avoid supplanting of federal funds. In many schools, 10% of the funds are too little to accomplish much and, in some schools, the set aside is so large it can be overwhelming and use.

Set Aside of Title I Funds

The work group made the recommendation that the SD DOE maintain the required 10% set aside of the school's Title I budget for intervention or professional development. The Accountability Work Group did not ratify the recommendation of the School Improvement Work Group.

Substitute Recommendation: The Accountability Work Group recommends that the SD DOE discontinue the priority and focus school 10% Title I set aside for academic interventions and/or professional development.

5th Indicator – Student Success/School Quality Measure

Background: ESSA requires that each state have a 5th indicator for their accountability system. Currently, South Dakota is using attendance as the additional indicator at the elementary and middle school levels. We must report attendance, however, attendance does not have to be a component of the School Performance Index (SPI) for accountability purposes. Schools reported an increasingly difficult time with the attendance of chronically absent students because of changes in the truancy laws.

At the September 14, 2016 the Accountability Work Group made the recommendation that South Dakota create a Safe and Healthy indicator to replace the attendance 5th indicator. The 5th indicator must be disaggregated by subgroup and must be differentiated (not all schools can achieve 100%). ESSA does not define differentiation, our state can define differentiation.

At the last meeting, the work group brainstormed a partial list of programs/strategies that would demonstrate a Safe and Healthy School. The list will need to be less program specific and will need to be expanded before it can be implemented.

Recommendation

The Accountability Work Group made the decision to keep the September 14 recommendation that South Dakota create a Safe and Healthy indicator to replace the attendance 5th indicator. The work group also decided that a sub-committee be formed to work on the list of options. Members indicating that they will work on the committee are Kelly Glodt, Becky Guffin, Linda Foos, and Karen Whitney with a note going out to those not in attendance offering an opportunity to be involved on the committee in determining the categories and how they will be measured.

The Accountability Work Group made the recommendation that South Dakota create a Safe and Healthy indicator to replace the attendance 5th indicator for elementary and middle school only, not for high school (which will retain College and Career Readiness).

Consideration of Data Collection

At the July 27, 2016, the Accountability Work Group made the following recommendations for determining college and career readiness. The work group revisited this topic. Some of the items used

in the readiness calculations are only collected at the district level, not at the state level. In order to make the calculations, the information would need to be collected at the state level. Discussions followed on whether the data could be compared across the state pertaining to course grades, course schedules, attendance, Grade Point Average, Advanced Placement classes, etc. Also, with more collection of data at the state level, the state would be required to fill public data requests.

After a lengthy discussion, it was concluded to adjust the recommendation made in July by striking the Gateway indicators and Benchmark grades as follows:

College Readiness

~~Gateway: Cumulative GPA of 2.8 out of 4.0~~

Benchmarks: One or more of the following:

- English (18) and Mathematics (20) ACT sub-score
- Advanced/Proficient Scores on 11th grade Smarter Balanced Assessment
- Elementary Algebra (76 or higher) and Sentence Skills (86 or higher) for Accuplacer
- Advanced Placement Examination (3 or Higher)
- ~~Advanced Placement Course (A, B or C)~~
- ~~High School General Education Dual Credit and Concurrent Credit Completion (C or higher on all coursework)~~
- ~~College Developmental/Remedial English and/or Math (A, B or C)~~

Career Readiness

~~Gateways (one of three):~~

- ~~94% attendance in final school year (equates to two weeks' vacation in the professional world)~~
- ~~94% attendance from the time first entered 9th grade until graduation~~
- ~~Cumulative GPA of 2.8 out of 4.0~~

Benchmarks: Choose Option 1, 2, 3, or 4:

1. CTE Concentrator
2. Two or more technical dual credit courses (A, B, or C)
3. NCRC certificate of Silver or above
4. ~~Two or more of the below: • Completion of a Capstone Course (A, B, or C)~~
   - ~~Completion of a CTE Foundational Course (A, B, or C)~~
   - ~~Completion of one technical dual credit course (A, B, or C)~~

Criterion vs. Normative

In simple terms, normative ranking of schools is ranking based on the guidelines applied to one school compared to the ranking when the guidelines are applied to another school. In other words, it is one school compared to another school. A criterion based system consists of benchmarks established and in determining where schools rank on a spectrum of the benchmarks. In other words, criterion ranking is each school measured by the benchmarks not by their ranking compared to other schools ranking.

After a lengthy discussion, it was determined that the current normative system provides the necessary information and most readily understood by the public.

The Accountability Work Group recommended keeping the normative reference system and, after two years, conducting a review of the system.

After collecting more data through the years, the SD DOE may create reports that would establish benchmarks so that districts could make the decision for themselves on where their ranking is on a criterion classification.

Levels of Classification

The Work Group discussed the requirements of identifying classifications of schools under ESSA. The only requirement under ESSA is 1) to determine comprehensive schools as the 5% of Title I schools ranking the lowest, any high school not graduating more than two-thirds of their students, and any school for which a subgroup is consistently underperforming in the same manner as a school under lowest 5% category for a State-determined number of years; and 2)targeted Title I schools as those schools that have subgroups that are consistently underperforming. All other schools are in the third classification of schools. All other classifications of schools are not required under ESSA. ESSA does not require establishing priority districts.

The Accountability Work Group recommended setting the three classifications as 1) comprehensive schools and continue identifying the schools as priority schools; 2) targeted schools and continue identifying the schools as focus schools; and 3) all other schools as progressing schools.

Weights of Indicators

High School

Indicator	Maximum Points Available	
Student Achievement	Math	20
	English Language Arts	20
	Total	**40**
High School Completion	High School Completion	12.5
	Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	12.5
	Total	**25**
College and Career Ready		**25**
English Language Proficiency		**10**
Total		**100**

Elementary and Middle School

Indicator	Maximum Points Available	
Student Achievement	Math	20
	English Language Arts	20
	Total	**40**
Academic Growth	English Language Arts – All Students	10
	Math – All Students	10
	English Language Arts – Lowest Quartile	10
	Math – Lowest Quartile	10
	Total	**40**
Safe and Healthy Schools		**10**
English Language Proficiency		**10**
Total		**100**

Targeted Support/Focus Schools

Background: Under ESSA each State must annually notify LEAs with schools which have consistently underperforming subgroups. Schools which are notified must develop and implement a "targeted support and improvement plan" to improve outcomes for subgroups which generated the notification. These plans must include evidence-based interventions and be approved and monitored by the LEA.

The Accountability Work Group recommended that a formula be developed using the 5% of comprehensive schools newly identified in a given year and establishing the highest score for each indicator in each subgroup and make a comparison with the others schools to determine the schools with an underperforming subgroup. (Comprehensive/Priority Schools = all students are underperforming, Targeted Support/Focus School = at least one or more subgroups are underperforming)

Defining Consistently Underperforming Subgroup

Background: ESSA does not require moving a consistently underperforming school to comprehensive/ priority school support.

The Accountability Work Group recommends defining "consistently underperforming subgroup" as follows: Determine any subgroup that under performs by 75% every subgroup below the gap group for no more than two years.

- If that definition does not pass US ED muster when the state plan is submitted, the work group recommended using the criteria outlined in the proposed rules of: Performing significantly below the state average for all students or significantly below the highest subgroup

Adjournment

Scheibe thanked the members for giving of their time and expertise to this process. This concluded the work of the Accountability Work Group and the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.