

ESEA Advisory Council

January 27, 2016

Kansas State Department of Education
900 SW Jackson St.
Topeka, Kansas

Members (voting) Attending:

Tammy Austin, USD 501 Topeka	Bert Moore, USD 282 West Elk
Ron Ballard, USD 470 Arkansas City	Suzan Patton, USD 382 Pratt
Marcy Clay, USD 500 Kansas City	Matt Ramsey, Benedictine College
Juanita Erickson, USD 501 Topeka	David Rand, USD 500 Kansas City
Mark Farr, KNEA	Charles Rankin, Midwest Equity Assistance Center (KSU)
Adrian Foster, Kansas Hispanic & Latino American Affairs Commission	Kristen Scott, USD 500 Kansas City
Neil Guthrie, USD 259 Wichita	Denise Seguire, USD 259 Wichita
Stephanie Harsin, KNEA	Bryan Wilson, USD 259 Wichita
Steve Karlin, USD 457 Garden City	Corbin Witt, USD 475 Geary County
Karen Kroh, Archdiocese of Kansas City	

Ex-Officio (non-voting) Members Attending:

Bill Bagshaw, KSDE	Tony Moss, KSDE
G.A. Buie, USA	Scott Myers, KSDE
Zach Conrad, KSDE	Brad Neuenswander, KSDE
Kelly Gillespie, SWRSC	Colleen Riley, KSDE
Jane Groff, KPIRC	Idalia Shuman, KNEA
Kathi Grossenbacher, KSDE	Kelly Slaton, KSDE
Kyle Lord, KSDE	Scott Smith, KSDE
Tammy Mitchell, KSDE	Kelly Spurgeon, KSDE
Doug Moeckel, KASB	

Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions

Brad Neuenswander welcomed everyone and thanked them for their attendance and participation at today's meeting. There is a lot to be covered today and we need your voice in how we want to move forward. Today we're going to walk through the important key things that we, as a state, have a voice in. Plans are for the group are to present their plan, the direction that Kansas wants to go in over the next 10 years, to the State Board in May 2016.

Proposed timeline for upcoming meetings:

- March (date to be determined) – webinar
- May (date to be determined) – in person meeting

Everyone introduced themselves and where they're from.

Purpose/ESEA Overview

ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) is not new; however, ESSA (Every Student Success Act), is new and replaces NCLB. This group is the ESEA Advisory Council, not the ESSA Advisory Council. The purpose of this Advisory Council, is to be the overall umbrella over the work of the ESSA Act. There are several subcommittees which have been formed and are already working. It is not necessarily the intent of this Advisory Council to “get into the weeds.” The purpose is provide you with a broad understanding of the authority we have to work and design around the ESSA Act.

ESSA aligns with key priorities for ESEA reauthorization:

- Maintains annual assessment and authorizes innovative assessment pilots
- Gives states increased flexibility to design school accountability systems, school interventions and student supports
- Gives states flexibility to work with local stakeholders to develop educator evaluation and support systems
- Increase state and local flexibility in the use of federal funds

Assessments

- ESSA maintains a requirement that every state have annual assessments in reading or language arts and math for grades 3-8 and once in high school, as well as science assessments given at least once in each grade span from grades 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12
- ESSA includes the Secretary of Education authority to provide up to 7 states initial authority to carry out innovative assessments such as competency-based, cumulative year-end assessments. *Right now, this is not on our radar unless you tell us you want it. Why do you give other assessments in your districts, e.g., Aspire, MAPS. What if we, as the state, could design something for free that gives you what you want.*
- Authorizes funds for states and local educational agencies to audit their state and local assessment system with the goal of eliminating unnecessary assessments and streamlining assessment systems.

Accountability

We get to design and set “ambitious state-designed long-term goals with measures of interim progress for all students and subgroups of students on:

- Improved academic achievement on state assessments
- Graduation rates
- Each statewide system will “meaningfully differentiate” schools using:
 - Academic proficiency on state assessments
 - Graduation rates for high school
 - English Language Proficiency
 - Growth or another statewide academic indicator for K-8 schools
 - Not less than 1 other state-set indicator of school quality or student success
 - 95% assessment participation rate
- “Substantial weight” is required to be given to the Academic Indicators (first 4 described above) and these 4 indicators must, in the aggregate, be given “much greater weight” in the differentiation process than any Measures of School Quality or Student Success.

School Improvement

Comprehensive Support and Improvement

- Lowest performing 5% of Title I schools on state accountability index;
- High schools with <67% graduation rates, and
- Schools with underperforming subgroups that do not improve after a state-determined number of years

Targeted Support and Improvement

- Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups, as defined by the state

SIG models no longer required; improvement strategies must be “evidence based.” \$’s will still be available; however, it allows for us to design it and to have more flexibility.

Transition

If you were a state that had a waiver or a state that did not submit a waiver, those expire August 1. 2016-2017 will be a transition year to ESSA, with the new accountability systems going into effect the 2017-2018 school year.

There are several initiatives that we are interested in and will aggressively go for, including:

1. Early childhood grants
2. College and career ready grants

Brad shared that he does not remember a time when ESSA, the State Board’s vision, and the accreditation model all happening at the same time, which we get to design.

What Changes/What Stays the Same

Colleen reported that the Footprint will be smaller. Our job is to articulate and provide professional learning regarding where we are going. The key to all of this are our principals. We’re going back to targeting students who are the most in need. Every student counts. As a state, we are trying to be good partners with you. We need every resource we can get. We are very fortunate in Kansas to have the support from our regional and comprehensive centers. We are not waiting for the regulations to come out. We have a number of workgroups across the agency, as well as statewide focus groups who are providing assistance.

Key things that will change and we’ll know more within the next couple months:

- More state control
- Annual Measurable Objectives
- Flexibility with federal funding
- Title IV-A funding is back (formula and competitive)
- School Improvement Grants (SIG) -- The agency used to put out large grants for schools to apply. They are now part of comprehensive support (KLN).

What does not change:

- The term “Highly Qualified” has been eliminated in the majority of the law, but state licensure requirements remain the same.
- Local Consolidated plan, that will stay the same
- Maintenance of effort stays the same
- Funding formula remains the same

Our agency has been advocating for years to have early childhood under one roof, our roof. Early this month, the Governor announced the consolidation of all early childhood programs under KSDE. There is a lot of details that we'll have to work through.

5% Identification

Tammy Mitchell shared that we have to identify 5% of the lowest performing buildings, previously called Priority Schools. As we move forward, we will go from providing support to 99 schools to 31-33 schools. We need to change the conversation from schools being on improvement to schools who are eligible for support. As we rank those schools:

- If a school has less than 100 students, they're off the list.
- Graduation rates less than 67%.
- Schools with underperforming subgroups

Our plan is to use 2014-2015 and 2015-16 data to identify the 5% and then 2016-2017 will be a transition year to work out the comprehensive support.

We have to decide if we want to:

- A. Retain the same list of priority and focus schools, which we don't like.
- B. Identify a new cohort of priority and focus, which we don't like either.
- C. Preferred Option: We want to identify a new cohort for 2016-2017 under the guidelines of ESSA, not under the requirements of the waiver; they don't have an Option C.

After visiting with USDE at the National Title I Conference, we believe that Kansas can identify just the 5%.

5% Comprehensive Support

- Identification – Gaps/SpEd same criteria? Is this fair?
- Poverty, economic and demographic change
- Kindergarten readiness > indicator of need.
- Exit criteria?
- Poverty #'s expanding – identification criteria?
- Concentration of barriers
- Resources and support > barriers
- New API is realistic (8 categories)
- How can schools not in the 5% receive KLN support? (previous Focus Schools)
- Exit criteria based on what schools do – not just API growth
- API/subgroups – subgroup is a label
- # of at-risk factors (multiple)
- Weightings for schools with more factors
- Scale score definition
- Special needs index
- Away from 1 measure for identification
- Factor in staff turnover in special needs index
- Student mobility
- Grades a factor

Kelly Spurgeon walked through the process of how schools were identified in the past and how we're wanting to moving forward. The Assessment Performance Index (API), used the old assessment with

five performance categories, which we only used for one year. Awarding points for performance categories and rewarding points moving from category to another category.

We also have to come up with an idea exit criteria. The idea sounds good but we've never tried it. Exit criteria needs to be realistic and ambitious.

At tables, members were to think about this topic, what would this look like for you and what are your ideas and suggestions? The detailed work of this will be hammered out by the subgroup.

Targeted Support:

- ESSA Support
- "Disabilities" are at different levels and multiple factors
- Accountability that measures real growth
- Underperforming/targeted support/definitions needed
- Not parallel process (Title I/Accreditation)
- Duplicate counting – how to be fair?
- Consistently? What does this mean?
- Prioritize subgroups to focus on
- Targeted support: trauma, counseling
- Comparing subgroups
- Suspension/expulsion data
- ACT data
- Equal access for all students
- Parent engagement
- Early warning systems – match supports to students
- Different measures – not just the test. Pulling data from the past.

Ambitious Long-Term Goals (ALTG), which used to be called AMO's. How do we do what we have to do and at the same de-emphasize state assessments and do what we need to do for schools?

- Holistic
 - Weighted measures
 - State assessment one weighted measure
- Multiple measures – not just assessments
- Fair, ambitious, valid?
- Growth index taking into account multiple factors and resources available.
- Chart
 - Looks like AYP
 - What's not there – grades mobility, other factors
- Formative assessments needed, not just a summative
- Records/data follows the child
- Set aside

Bill Bagshaw shared information on Teacher/Leader Evaluations. Quite simply, we do not have to do anything drastically different. Following are recommendations from the subgroup:

- Replace "student growth" with "student performance"
- Allow districts to determine student performance based on local expectations
- Student performance should be part of reflective conversations

- Locally-developed performance assessment is valuable
- Align student performance with individualized teacher goals
- State assessments are not required for student performance conversation. They are optional.

We will do what we can to provide professional support. We do not want to lose good evidence of student performance. All good teachers want an honest evaluation and feedback. How do we make it meaningful? It's about the growth for teachers. Districts are willing to invest the time for teachers. Building leaders have to be able to speak to the accountability system. The most effective way to make a difference is with building leaders/principals. They need to lead and not react. Principals will be one of our biggest focuses.

Conclusion

Brad said that everything we talked about today is just a sliver or a piece of the Accreditation pie. This group is the umbrella advisory group that will fit in to where we are heading. We will keep in communication with you and as we learn more regarding regulations, etc.

Again, we will look at scheduling a webinar in March and then meet again in May to lay everything out to make sure we have a plan in place to move forward.

If you have additional thoughts or suggestions, please let us know.