

ESSA COMMENTS FROM EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS MEETING AUGUST 25, 2016

GOALS

Greater Baltimore Urban League

- Plans should be consistent with evidence-based practice
- Regular computation and reporting and data informed decisions with equity as outcome

Disability Rights Maryland

- Partially approached expectations standards – distinction is too complicated and will not be easily understood by parents

SESAC

- Need to be able to easily explain proficiency measures to families
- Growth needs to compare a student to that same student versus grade to grade
- Support July submission
- support including 5-year graduation cohort

MASSP

- MASSP supports Option II in setting goals, starting with students in Kindergarten in 2014-15 as baseline. Target Year would be 2026-27.

MULTIPLE MEASURES

Greater Baltimore Urban League

- Attendance works index:
 - Chrome absence
 - Suspension
- By race & gender
 - FARMS
 - Special Ed
 - EL
- Gap closure should be a measure of progress for subgroups

Disability Rights Maryland

- Non-academic indicators need to be the same across all local school systems and public agencies
- Choose more than one non-academic indicator but keep number limited to maybe 2-3 at most

SESAC

- Closing the gap should be included as one of the measures
- Suggest including dual enrollment as non-academic indicator since this is also an option for students with disabilities that may not attend college for a variety of reasons

MASSP

- Academic indicator should be based on a proficiency index, not a mean
- A five-year graduation rate is very important to include
- Include science, but do NOT include additional subjects such as social studies (need to reduce number of assessments)
- Include AP/IB access and scores
- EL student progress should not be based on a fixed point, but rather growth from year to year
- Include CTE Concentrators
- Include Dual Enrollment/College Enrollment
- Other measures of post-secondary readiness such as rigorous coursework
- Consider measures that credit a school for moving students into advance coursework and fully meeting the needs of advanced students
- Non-academic measures to be considered include:
 - Suspension rates
 - Chronic absenteeism
 - Measures of school climate and student engagement

DIFFERENTIATION

Disability Rights Maryland

- Select non-academic indicators that are meaningful across all the subgroups

SESAC

- Non-academic indicators should be the same across the state
- Limit number of indicator categories

MASSP

- Most importantly, the key differentiation factor should be year to year **GROWTH** by a school.
- It is critical to avoid **ONE** overall designation by a school. Rather, provide differentiation (low, medium, high) on a variety of indicators.
- Critiques/Comments on the three state examples inform this position:
 - Ohio is commended for providing a rating in six separate areas. However, why provide **ONE** summative grade if that is not required. Areas of strength and weakness speak for themselves.
 - Massachusetts is commended for limiting measures to only seven areas, with other areas designated for extra credit. Measuring improvement over two years and then four years is also a plus.
 - Nebraska's visual dashboard is outstanding. In addition, a system that intentionally avoids A-F classifications is a huge plus.

OTHER

ACLU-MD

- N-size of 10 or smaller is critical
- Can you share the names of subgroups so that if we have specific feedback we will know where to direct and that it's getting specific attention of experts?
- EL options – prefer option 1 where you assess year one followed by review of growth year two
- Prefer scale score - more opportunity for movements at all levels
- Where will growth fit in for the high school level

Prince George's County Public Schools

- For the non-academic indicators if there is some allowance of LEA choice for at least 1 or 2 that is crucial. It could allow for greater buy-in and allow LEAs to determine focus areas for their district.

Disability Rights Maryland

- Utilize July application date – need to do this well and need to ensure meaningful input on plan from broadest possible group of stakeholders - March date makes process too rushed.
- Ensure that school quality indicator can be disaggregated by subgroup?
 - Choose an indicator that is applicable to all subgroups and disaggregate
- Assign each stakeholder group members to a subcommittee or offer stakeholder group members the opportunity to participate on subcommittee(s)
- Keep N size no larger than 10

- Ensure more robust stakeholder input and participation by not just listening to groups or accepting comments but engaging in discussion – share meeting agendas ahead of time, ensure that disability community doesn't get lost as this moves forward – subgroup is more than the 1% of students taking the alternate assessment.
- Do not participate in Pay for Success.

SESAC

- The indicators should NOT differ between districts – a state system should not be differentiated
- As the accountability subcommittee looks at growth, they should include representatives from disability groups/advocates (i.e. SESAC)
- Giving extra credit for students scoring advanced should NOT be used to “hide” areas of weakness. The process needs to continue on subgroup growth and achievement
- What are the subcommittees? Who is represented?
- Stakeholder committee members should be assigned to appropriate subcommittees

MASSP

- Much work is left to be done. As the thinking of the State Board is revealed in future work sessions, please ensure stakeholders are informed so that feedback can be provided.
- Please ensure that the goal of this system is to drive school improvement not label schools.