

# 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
  - 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-
  - 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)
  - No change- caution is that because you already met goals?
  - Decline-caution- because you met goal and then went down?
- Index
  - 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)
  - Value Matrix
  - Student growth percentiles (SGPs)
    - You compare the student to his/her peers- more normative approach
    - Works with PARCC because it is vertically aligned
  - Can select one or the other or do both – will keep running both models until a decision is made
- Recommendations on these two indicators:
  - 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
  - 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)
  - Reclassified ELs (REs)
    - Committee recommends 4 years for REs
  - 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