Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Stakeholder Committee

MINUTES

October 20, 2016

9:30 – 11:30 AM

State Board Room

I. Welcome and Introductions
   • Karen welcomed the committee
   • Board has agreed with the recommendation to submit Maryland’s Consolidated State plan to the U.S. Department of Education in July 2017

II. Update on Process
   • With July submission- draft for public comment will go out in April 2017
   • However, first draft will be ready by Thanksgiving to be shared with State Board in December- then put out for public review with a survey for input
   • Working on town halls to share across the State once the December draft is ready- expecting to be scheduled in January 2017
   • Regulations from USED on ESSA are expected end of November/early December- hopefully, format for completion of State Plan will be available then and current work will be transferred to new format with feedback and input included- then another draft in February/March for further comment

III. Accountability Discussion
   • Achievement Indicator- See Powerpoint
      o Long Term and Interim Goals
         ▪ Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)
         ▪ State Determined Target- similar to Annual Yearly Progress (AYP)
   Committee Comments:
      - Option B is NCLB- Option A is better for EL and SPED student groups- it is still quite rigorous for these specific student populations – taking into account that we have various student populations in the State Option A would be better
      - Is there a third option?- it looks like higher expectations for the lower performers and lower expectations for higher performing students-
         o The timeline of the years through 2030 may be arbitrary but it takes into account students having 12 years of the new curriculum
      - Perceptually harking back to NCLB will not get us anywhere- there are elements within NCLB that are good and helpful, but something that is initially seen as an NCLB target will not speak to people and will not seem achievable
      - Option A positions ourselves to exceed thresholds and allows creativity and room to improve without the pressure to teach to the test
      - Option A is not the end result, it is about the growth.
   - Consensus is around Option A
   - Reporting on the report card would be the four categories (met, improve, no change, decline)
      o No change- caution is that because you already met goals?
      o Decline-caution- because you met goal and then went down?
   o Index
      o This is where you can decide to weight differently- AMO has one weight and index as the other weight- what is valued more?
         ▪ More meaningful measure than just a target
• Growth Indicator (see Powerpoint)
  o Value Matrix
  o Student growth percentiles (SGPs)
    ▪ You compare the student to his/her peers- more normative approach
    ▪ Works with PARCC because it is vertically aligned
  o Can select one or the other or do both – will keep running both models until a decision is made
• Recommendations on these two indicators:
  o Timeline- 13 years- based on long term goal- committee approves (LEAs are at different places in implementation and gives everyone time to adjust- improves integrity of what we put in place)- this is more of an apples to apples comparison even if different kinds of apples
  o Proficiency Level- data was indicative of 4 and 5 as proficiency
    ▪ Level three could be recognizing growth but 4 and 5 are most aligned with what we want for our students
    ▪ Consider how this impacts students with disabilities- and students who take the Alternative Assessment
    ▪ High school diploma is not college acceptance- and that is what it is becoming- we do not want students to feel that they are not proficient or cannot be productive citizens because they got a 3 – also concerns about what a score of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, is and how we are labeling the proficiency levels
    ▪ We have to be consistent- what does the high school diploma really mean?
    ▪ A proficiency level of three is labeled as “approaching expectations.” This label makes it problematic to say students are college and career ready- and these students may be on a career pathway
    ▪ Folks want to take back and discuss with their constituencies
• English Learner (EL) Proficiency Indicator (See Powerpoint)
  o Reclassified ELs (RELS)
    ▪ Committee recommends 4 years for RELs
  o Recently Arrived English Learners (RAELs)
    ▪ Option 1
    ▪ Option 2
    ▪ Possible weighted model (tweak on option 1)
      ▪ Committee is pleased with this approach
      ▪ Should not be testing students in ELA their first year

IV. Future steps and future 2016-2017 school year meetings
• December 15, 2016
• February 16, 2017
• April 27, 2017
All materials from today will be posted online
  Note: All meetings are 9:30 – 11:30 in the State Board Room at MSDE

Charge for the ESSA Stakeholder Committee:
• Provide guidance to the transition from ESEA to ESSA
• Provide recommendations for the Superintendent and the State Board on Maryland’s ESSA Plan
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