

## South Dakota's State Plan Revision: Stakeholders Workgroup

June 19, 2019 ~ Drifters Conference Center ~ Fort Pierre

### South Dakota ESSA State Plan Workgroup Session Notes

**Recommendations from the Workgroup:** This list of recommendations includes areas the workgroup was asked to consider. In these areas they were able to reach a decision regarding their recommendation for a change or not to the state plan.

1. **Coding High School SPED Completion:** Students coded as 7, 20, or 21 in the General Education tab of Infinite Campus should be a completer and counted in the year they received the code.
  - a. **Code 7:** Aged Out
  - b. **Code 20:** Discontinued Education – completed IEP team modified course requirements
  - c. **Code 21:** Aged Out – completed IEP team modified course requirements
2. **SPI Points for High School Completion:** Completer points within the SPI should remain at 12.5 points (no change).
3. **College & Career Readiness:** Keep the NCRC section within accountability as is (Silver Level).
  - a. **Yes, agree:** 14 votes
  - b. **Undecided:** 2 votes
  - c. **No, do not agree:** 2 votes
4. **CTE Department:** Complete the steps to create the “bridge” for the dual credits, AP credits, CTE and Capstone credits to be captured in the data.
5. **Special Schools:** Recommend the changes proposed for students attending unique facilities.
  - a. Changes:
    - i. In certain circumstances, students attend institutions whose mission is not primarily education, but rather to address unique needs student may have.
    - ii. Where district controls the enrollment of a student in the program-students are counted at both school and district levels through the special school audit.
    - iii. Where district doesn't control the enrollment, students are counted at both state and school levels through the special school audit; this would include state placed students.
6. **ELP:** Continue to use growth to target model and keep at 10 SPI points.
7. **ELP N Size:** When the district meets the N size of 10 but an individual school does not, the ELP points will not roll down from the district level.
8. **School Improvement:** Continue to identify schools every year (leave as is).
9. **SPI Growth Points:** Keep the growth points as they currently are.
10. **ATSI:** Leave the current identification model as is.

All recommendations given above were through unanimous decision by the workgroup with the exception of the College & Career Readiness recommendation which has been noted above.

## South Dakota's State Plan Revision: Stakeholders Workgroup

June 19, 2019 ~ Drifters Conference Center ~ Fort Pierre

### South Dakota ESSA State Plan Workgroup Session Notes

#### Notes regarding the discussions from the workgroup session.

##### **K-8 School Quality Indicator:**

An update was given regarding the previous recommendation and possible pilot of the health screens as a measure of school quality for K-8 schools. It was determined by SD DOE leadership not to move forward with this recommendation for the change to the K-8 school quality indicator, so there will not be a pilot.

##### **SPED Completer:**

- Districts need to receive credit for these student completers.
- Completer needs to be defined which could include aged out and/or transition goals met.
- SD DOE proposed changes to the General Education Tab within Infinite Campus were shared (see recommendation list page 1).

##### **Civics Measure:**

- Civics/Social Studies stakeholder group has been created and will be meeting July 25. They will be looking at how a school can demonstrate it provides a well-rounded education; how can the report card reflect civics/well rounded education efforts. There is not to be an assessment but will be reflected on the school's report card within school quality indicator. Look to also examine equity and how to measure at all grade levels.
- The group did not have feedback or recommendations regarding this topic for the Civics stakeholder group to consider.

##### **College & Career Readiness:**

###### *Discussion on this Issue:*

- Could other credentials be added: Industry Certificates? Who covers the expense?
- Decided not to include other certificates; recommended leaving the NCRC as is with the silver level.
- Dual Credit: the CTE department is looking for ways to collect more of this data accurately. This would include an "all call" to schools to share the courses allowing course codes to be updated and captured. They would need to create a "bridge" to pull the codes. This bridge would also solve the issues pulling the AP, CTE, and Capstone course codes.

###### **Further Investigation:**

- Too many of the pieces are optional.
- How do we solve getting "dinged" twice for the SBAC?
- How do other states' results compare under their individual models?
- What percentage of kids meet each option in our current model?

**College & Career Readiness – Further Investigation Cont.:**

- How many of our kids would have had endorsement: Numbers for the graduation endorsement scenarios.
- Look at the Nebraska model.

**Special Schools:**

Following the presentation given on the proposed changes to this area there was no discussion (see recommendation page 1).

**Growth Model:**

*Discussion:*

- Keep the growth points as they are.
- What we have does work.
- We need to receive credit for all our kids.

**Further Investigation:**

- Would like more information and the numbers run on both of the following:
  - Add typical growth
  - Scored gain and SPG (merged model)

**English Learners Proficiency:**

- It was reported that EL funding for level 4 and 5 students is a legislative topic SD DOE is working on.
- EL workgroup is convening this fall to review all the exit criteria data.
- ELP indicator currently uses a growth to target model.
- The ten SPI points are currently redistributed when no EL students are within a school.
- Change how districts/ points are distributed to schools when a school does not meet the N size for EL.

**School Identification – ATSI & TSI:**

*Discussion:*

- ATSI:
  - Other states are currently looking at our model as one to potentially follow.
  - Even though we did not have schools identified in this category this year, USED was good with our model. We ran the numbers and no one simply fell here at this time.
  - It is working, so leave it alone.
- TSI:
  - A rough run using Maine’s model would increase the number of TSI schools identified in South Dakota. This was a model that the group previously asked to be looked at.
- Confidence Intervals (C.I.):
  - Currently using a 95% C.I.
  - This is part of the issue causing schools who are high performing being flagged because of subgroups.

***School Identification - Further Investigation:***

- TSI Designations:
  - Compare subgroups to subgroups
  - Run numbers using a percentage threshold from 20% to 40% (increments of 5%)
    - Run the numbers for all indicators
    - Potential here of using bottom 25% for each of the required subgroups.

**Next Steps:**

The workgroup has a list of areas that were not able to be resolved at this meeting as they require additional information and further investigation. Information that was requested that can be gathered will be put together for the next session.

The next workgroup session will be determined at a later date.