

MSDE

# Stakeholder Feedback

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Feedback as of  
7/14/2016

## **Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)**

What are your recommendations, items for consideration, etc.?

<b>Goals and Interim Goals</b>	<b>Accountability Indicators</b>
<b>Student Groups</b>	<b>School Improvement</b>

# Stakeholder Recommendations for the Implementation of ESSA

<u>GOALS</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Keep science optional/implement new science assessment. Move towards including it as we transition to the new standards</li><li>• Where is State funding from to support PARCC</li><li>• Not enough info yet to identify a gap/still need to work through new standards and curriculum</li><li>• Provide a clear timeline of activities that the state will follow; identifying places where LEA input is needed</li><li>• Describe how decisions will be made</li><li>• Interim goals would be valuable to target</li><li>• Make these reasonable</li><li>• This is a hard test and student growth over years must be considered</li><li>• Do not set graduation requirements at a 4 <u>ever</u> – This is not fair to many of our students</li></ul>	Assistant Superintendents for Instruction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Address integration in Maryland Schools.</li><li>• Regional data for Mid-Atlantic region indicates that Maryland has the most segregated schools in the region. Is there any consideration of this trend in informing policy?</li><li>• SEA/LEA has not addressed equity literacy or indicators to address gaps. Specifically racism.</li></ul>	Multicultural Network
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The process and State strategies should not be politicized by the legislature and the Governor</li><li>• When education policy experts determine the best course through a workgroup such as this one, it needs to be allowed to run unencumbered by manipulations of funding or other political gamesmanship</li><li>• Consistent with Goal 2025</li><li>• National career readiness goals</li><li>• Closing gaps</li><li>• Align ESSA accountability system and college and career readiness</li></ul>	ESSA External Stakeholder Committee 2

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of discussion with MSEA and principals that problems with implementing PARCC</li> <li>• Will assessment commission recommendations be part of discussion/consideration?</li> <li>• Need to keep standards high</li> <li>• Improved attendance not specific attendance levels</li> <li>• Science fair, robotics competitions, science Olympiad, MESA, other competitions</li> <li>• EL/MS goals – include science otherwise it doesn't get taught</li> <li>• Can the “ambitious” goal take into account the starting point? Can it be growth not just proficiency?</li> <li>• “ambitious”? “much greater weight”? “substantial weight””</li> <li>• Statewide common educators</li> <li>• State to determine validity, reliability, etc.</li> <li>• “consistently underperforming” = 2 yrs. + every indicator</li> <li>• How will Maryland determine these definitions and will USED exert authority/approval</li> <li>• How will the State ensure stakeholders representing diverse interest have meaningful participation in the decision-making process</li> <li>• How to tie ESSA state plan to state/district funding that is adequate and equitable for all</li> <li>• 95% participation rate on a singular measure needs to be reconsidered to allow CCR to be determined with other acceptable measures</li> <li>• Student achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth</li> <li>▪ Gap</li> <li>▪ Achievement</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Student social/emotional support</li> <li>• School culture/climate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Climate surveys</li> <li>▪ Discipline</li> <li>▪ Attendance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should the long-term student achievement be measured by proficiency or by growth</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will goals grow incrementally overtime?</li> </ul>	ELA Supervisors

## **ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Science – reconfigure <u>integrated</u> courses</li><li>• School quality/will state use climate study or fund one for all LEAs similar to Tell?</li><li>• Attendance, discipline data?</li><li>• Timeline for the fiscal accountability aligned with budget/fiscal year timeline</li><li>• Meet with all LEA CFOs suggest accounting piece</li><li>• Flexibility is paramount!!! LEAs need options</li><li>• What is long term prognosis for PARCC?</li><li>• Need a lot of support &amp; guidance regarding reporting of per pupil expenditures</li><li>• LEAs should be able to identify their own school quality indicator – state could provide exemplars but not mandate any</li><li>• Aligning systems for self-reporting of active military assignments</li><li>• Reporting of state report card (intensified ask for data sources)</li><li>• Growth is fine but minimize overall</li><li>• Avoid SPI-like measures thru combined tests into one formula</li><li>• Allow for local flexibility</li><li>• School progress should be measured against themselves - i.e., not an arbitrary target for all schools - trajectory vs growth varies make a starting point</li><li>• Support reclassified ELLs being kept in accountability for 4 years</li><li>• Stay away from an “SPI” style measure</li></ul>	<p>Assistant Superintendents for Instruction</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For the non-academic indicators, have students answer questions on inclusion, equity, and cultural competency.</li></ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are English Language Learners expected to exit by the end of the 4 year requirement? SIFE (Students with Interrupted Formal Education) implications when language is needed.</li> <li>• EL dropout rate and the concern that students will be “pushed out.”</li> <li>• Consider coordination between accountability assessments to reduce burden on students, especially ELs. For instance consider PARCC, WIDA, HSAs, and CCRCA. It’s too much.</li> <li>• Ongoing crosswalk needs to be in place between ESSA and the Equity Plans.</li> </ul>	<p>Multicultural Network</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focusing separately on elementary and middle schools;</li> <li>• Increased disaggregated – good thing</li> <li>• Difficult to assess indicators at different quality schools</li> <li>• Weighted accountability indicators?</li> <li>• Working with Baltimore Promise?</li> <li>• Dual enrollment for 12<sup>th</sup> grade year</li> <li>• Keep n size smaller why increase it?</li> <li>• There needs to be a lot of education for students and families about why testing participation is critical</li> <li>• Dual enrollment – credits earned not taken</li> <li>• Can the indicators for EL/MS include science? Otherwise doesn’t get taught</li> <li>• Can the indicators for science (NGSS) be phased in? need to collect data to see if any curriculum is effective for all groups before know what to use in interventions (evidence based)</li> <li>• I’d rather see NGSS be performance based instead of test based. Can a student do an experiment or engineering design piece?</li> <li>• Index</li> <li>• Will we run simulations in advance to demonstrate alignment with predicted outcomes?</li> <li>• Measurable</li> <li>• Actionable</li> <li>• Meaningful</li> <li>• Parent choice to “opt” out of assessment (95%) impact</li> <li>• Waivers for students who have experienced trauma</li> </ul>	<p>External Stakeholder Committee</p>

- How to enforce the 95% participation when so many parents so alienated about testing? What will MSDE do to help parents understand why
  - Why should those of us who represent subgroups(children w/disabilities, ELL, FARMS) not be warned by change in “n” size from 5 to 10?
- Is it 95% PARCC + alt assessment or 95% PARCC + 95% alt-assessment
- Will cross-tab include accountability and reporting only categories
- Don’t change N to 10 – keep is at 5
- Need definition for proficiency/vs advance students that shows growth of each student over time
- Based on support
- Incentive school/districts growth
- \*TPE has no place in state/federal accountability state application
- Teacher quality
- School climate
- Class size/case load
- Advanced coursework/specials (above core subjects)
- A social-emotional climate and culture index
- Chronic absence
- Culture/climate – could use the statistically valid climate survey that

MSDE is releasing

- Suspension
- SEL Skills
- Modeled on the core school districts from California
- KRA data by performance levels – (particularly emerging level)
- KRA meets requirements for valid and reliable and statewide to provide data Indicator
- Potentially look at dual enrollment
- Teaching to standards vs teaching to tests – is it a “good” test
- How will assessment report affect this
- More than one school quality indicator
- Survey climate
- Related arts access and availability to advance coursework
- Class size

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caseload</li> <li>• Chronic attendance up info academic indicators</li> <li>• Advanced certification and teaching in area of certification</li> <li>• Keep n size low – maybe 10</li> <li>• Clarification – how will assessment with PARCC work with ESSA? Will assessments change?</li> <li>• It is critical that access to rigorous classwork is included as an indicator as well as accessibility to STEM programs</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there specific language about how these indicators will be tied to teacher evaluation?</li> <li>• Reporting of per pupil expenditure could vary from LEA to LEA. Are we prepared for the public response?</li> <li>• Worried about no highly qualified teachers</li> <li>• There needs to be some level, some standard</li> </ul>	ELA Supervisors

## **STUDENT GROUPS**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EL students – waive</li><li>• No English – no test</li><li>• What is the size of subgroup reporting?</li><li>• Will subgroup # stay the same?</li><li>• Must define military connected versus active duty (big difference)</li><li>• On issues with confidentiality regarding homelessness, foster care children</li><li>• EL population – idea of resources and support beyond year 2</li><li>• Keep n size large enough not to be a burden on small districts</li><li>• Rethink how compare subgroups<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Special Ed versus Non-Special Ed</li><li>- African American versus Non-African American</li></ul></li><li>• Need clarification on “active duty”</li><li>• For new student – how long are they tracked in disaggregated data? E.g. military status or homeless status change</li><li>• Compare subgroups by race and then compare ELL vs. non-ELL, Spec Ed vs. Non-Spec Ed, etc.</li></ul>	<p>Assistant Superintendents for Instruction</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It is important not to subgroup some students identified by race, under students identified as FARMS.</li><li>• Measures of proficiency between and among student groups should be disaggregated with specific attention to the intersection of student group identification i.e. disability vs. disability, FARMS, and race. Then, reporting should be directly linked to MSDE Equity Plan.</li><li>• English Learners specifically:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ “N” number is crucial.</li><li>▪ How will proficiency be established if we only report for High School, can we back map as part of interim goals to assure accountability from LEAs for trend data?</li></ul></li><li>• Consider assessments that are conducted and the progress expected for each.</li><li>• Considerations for students with interrupted formal education and newcomers alike.</li><li>• Mental health for students with trauma.</li><li>• Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) addresses college and career readiness with student groups (low income, 1<sup>st</sup> generation college students, historically underserved, etc.)</li></ul>	<p>Multicultural Network</p>

<p>so can we consider a state buy-in/push for more districts to adopt this system and some state level support (backing) like FL?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disaggregate the “Asian” student groups. There are differences between the various ethnic groups.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New reporting groups for military, foster care, homeless, etc. – what is the policy behind this and what does it mean for Maryland</li> <li>• Should these also be account indicators</li> <li>• Closing the achievement gap through targeted cost-effective evidence-based interventions- a winning approach</li> <li>• Impact of N-size from 5 to 10. The impact per school smaller schools...more clarity for index and dashboard</li> <li>• Need to choose standards high enough to ensure that all students receive proper interventions for CCR and won't need remedial intervention</li> <li>• Schoolwide interventions should be implemented to help all students meet targets</li> <li>• N size – look at # of schools eliminated in reporting by going from 5 to 10 to see impact</li> <li>• Dashboards – use to focus on subgroups</li> <li>• Use “student group” rather than “subgroup”</li> <li>• impact on ELL (range for English proficiency)</li> <li>• impact on students receiving special education services (diploma/certificate bound)</li> <li>• gender disaggregation for transgender students</li> <li>• will student group size pertain to foster and homeless</li> <li>• Gifted and talented students via the Talent Act are in ESSA, how will data be collected, reported and used to improve student growth for GT, high ability, high achieving students</li> <li>• Compare ELL to Non ELL not to racial subgroups</li> <li>• ESSA requirement: indicators for state to state comparison – how will ensure MD is not disadvantaged in definition of “substantial weight”, “much greater”, consistency”</li> <li>• N size – look at schools to determine what makes sense</li> <li>• Subgroups requirements transgenders – student data</li> </ul>	<p>External Stakeholder Committee</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Will the student groups include a “group” for the lowest performing %?</li><li>• How are we tracking the growth of all students, ex. High-performing students, and not just marginalized populations?</li><li>• Will specialized teachers work with ELL students?</li><li>• Will ELL Students have specialized instruction?</li></ul>	ELA Supervisors
---	-----------------

DRAFT

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Share LEA curriculum design and thinking to meet accountability pieces</li><li>• Timing of school improvement is essential/guidance will be needed</li><li>• Share LEA processes to deal with EL student needs (newcomer program, etc.)</li><li>• Continued support from MSDE for LEA</li><li>• School-level, system-level school improvement targets</li><li>• If LEAs have the level of approval for Title I schools – can LEAs determine the SIP planning process and format?</li><li>• How does ESSA affect Master Planning process?</li><li>• How will all of this fit with the Master Plan?</li><li>• Will these be enough “rules” in place to make a solid connection with the master plan?</li></ul>	Assistant Superintendents for Instruction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Language access such as translation and interpreting at school levels for diverse families.</li><li>• Will targeted schools based by subgroups now unveil low performance at LEAs like MCPS where overall district/school data might have masked gaps?</li><li>• Explicit correlation should be noted regarding range of support that must be accounted for, for teachers who are servicing students who are performing below level.</li></ul>	Multicultural Network
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Smaller class sizes</li><li>• More effective teachers</li><li>• Charter schools are not necessarily the answer</li><li>• Impact</li><li>• Cross sector collaboration and coordination</li><li>• Eg. Baltimore College access consortium prior attempts to support BCPS priorities via workgroups</li><li>• Develop parallel goals/funding opportunities for non-profits as ESSA (evidence-based)</li><li>• Data sharing with nonprofits or nonprofit submit program data to MSDE to support</li></ul>	External Stakeholder Committee

dashboard indicators

- How are we looking at the gap in achievement?
- What are the gap causes?
- Proactive work vs reactive work
- Use of term evidence based should include promising practice
- Identify schools/kids early – diagnose/proactive
- Instead of cutting funds when school reach exit criteria, ratchet it down (because otherwise not sustainable)
- How will decisions about funding be made?
- Priorities determined?
- Who decides?
- Technology to support effectiveness of intervention
- LEA or State format for school improvement plan
- Impact on principals and teachers evaluation system – SLO's
- Need to change standards that are high enough to ensure that if the gap is closed, all students are achieving actual career and college readiness and won't need remedial work. Schoolwide intervention needs to be provided to meet targets
- Massive outreach and public relations with families to explain why accountability testing is important. See op ed by Director of LaRaza for importance of not opting out – MSDE too isolated from how families feel about testing
- Parent/community stakeholders representing all major student population groups must be part of school improvement development, charter collection and reporting at the state, district and school level
- Will MSDE provide an evidence based intervention list from which LEAs can choose based on need?
- Reporting requirements – why report per pupil expenditure when state cannot impact resource allocation from county government?
- Define “long-term” ELL
- Postsecondary enrollment should include military
- Defining evidenced-based interventions appropriate for prek-2 students
- KRA sample size needs to be large enough not to mask subgroup performance at state and district level

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about assessing student achievement progress more effectively to better inform interventions</li> <li>• How do we factor in the various moving parts between the accountability system vs high school graduation vs college and career readiness while we are implementing ESSA?</li> <li>• Comprehensive support – in the past when the “state” took over a school, the perception was perceived as the school was an extremely low performing school where parents did not want their students to attend. Is there a plan to prevent this negative perception when a school is identified for comprehensive reform?</li> <li>• Where is the parental and community involvement? As stakeholders, feedback is needed. Please consider how parental and community involvement would impact school improvement.</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the State /LEA attract and keep “highly qualified teachers” at low-performing schools? (extra pay/stipends?)</li> <li>• Interested to know more about expectations for school improvement for comprehensive or targeted schools, especially the 7 turnaround strategies</li> </ul>	ELA Supervisors

### **Other recommendations to consider:**

Items in the State Plan to encourage effective implementation of support for Gifted and Talented students

### **Assistant Superintendents for Instruction**

- Please consider doing the minimum. We are already overregulated and overburdened
- Do the minimum – don’t go beyond what has to be done. Survey other states to see what they’re doing - we always seem to do more than other states.

- Don't be part of the states who experiment with assessments.

## **English/Language Arts Supervisors**

- Is there a plan in place to share concise information about the state's interpretation with LEAs?

## **ESSA External Stakeholder Committee**

- Is there adequate funding to address taking action?
- Why make it competitive funding? If the evidence is there and grants are there to address the issues, what's the best system to get help right away?