

**NC DPI**  
**ESSA Webinar 20160727**

**Brown:** Donna Brown  
**Hobe:** Karen Hobe  
**Howard:** Dr. Tammy Howard  
**Sonoman:** Curtis Sonoman  
**M/F:** Male/Female Speaker

Hobe: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Karen Hobe. We want to thank you for joining us, and again apologize for the late start, but we're ready to go now. This is the third in our five-part series on the Every Student Succeeds Act. Today we're going to be talking specifically about what the ESSA law says in sections C, D, and H on accountability, school support and improvement, and reports.

Before we get started with the actual meat of the discussion, we'll go back over some of the housekeeping and reminders. The webinar is being recorded. You'll have access to the recording in one to two days after today. We will be addressing questions periodically throughout the presentation today. We've been holding questions until the very end, but we're covering so many topics, we thought it would be less confusing if we take periodic breaks, but do enter your questions as we go, and if you would, enter those questions with as much information about specifically what you're asking in reference to, so that we can make sure that we understand.

We also want to remind you that your questions and comments may be used in documentation of stakeholder input into the plan. And based on questions that we received in the previous webinars, we want to remind you that ESSA is

effective with the 2017-'18 school year; the 2015—'16-'17, excuse me. The 2016-'17 school year is a transition year that is not yet under ESSA, so everything that we're discussing is in preparation for the plan that will be submitted to be implemented in 2017-'18.

Let me just give you an overview of the many topics that we will cover today. We will talk about the statewide accountability systems, which will include information on subgroups, the minimum n, description of the system—it has to have several characteristics including long term goals, indicators. These indicators have to have meaningful differentiation. There is information on how schools are to be identified. We will talk about annual measurement of achievements, and partial attendance rules within ESSA.

In addition, we'll talk about school support and improvement, comprehensive support and improvement as part of that; it's known as CSI, which we'll talk about later; targeted support and improvement, which we will refer to as TSI, and then there's continued support for schools and local education agencies, and finally we will cover the reporting requirements that ESSA guidelines give us. So it's important for today's conversation to understand what we mean when we say elementary, secondary, and high school. So up front, we thought we would go ahead and assign these—it'll be apparent that some of the things that we say are particular to elementary, secondary, or high school. And elementary school means a non-profit institutional day or residential school, including public elementary, charter schools that provide elementary education as determined under state law.

A secondary school means a non-profit institutional day or residential school, including public charters that provide secondary education as determined under state law, except the term does not include any education beyond grade 12. The distinction for a high school is a secondary school that grants a diploma, and defined by the state and includes at least grade 12, but may go beyond grade 12. At this time, I will turn the conversation over to Dr. Tammy Howard, who will talk to us about the ESSA law around statewide accountability systems.

Howard: Thank you, Karen, and good afternoon to everyone. So this respect to the state accountability systems, each stage has to describe a statewide accountability model that complies with the requirements in the Every Student Succeeds Act, section C for accountability, and section D for school supports and improvements. And as Karen Hobe already explained to us, those are two of the sections that we're going to be looking at during this webinar this afternoon.

So in looking at this state accountability system, there are some similarities that you will see and many of you are familiar with, with our previous No Child Left Behind legislation that was part of the elementary, secondary education, from 2001 until very recently, with the passing of ESSA. What is familiar between the two, of course, is this focus on subgroups. So with every—with No Child Left Behind, of course, we had to report data by subgroup. We refer to that as disaggregating the data, so that we could see how different groups of students are performing on the state assessments in other accountability measures. And you can see here that that is, of course, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children

with disabilities, and English learners. The state could add additional subgroups if they wanted to, but those are the ones that are required by the federal law.

Now, I will pause here for one moment and address something that is a recent change that we are going to transition to internally, and that is it was brought to some of our attention—different individuals in the agency—that perhaps rather than using the term subgroups, that it might be better to use the term student groups, rather than using the term subgroups. So that is something that you'll see as we go forward in some of our publications, that we'll start using that terminology. And of course, I'm sure you agree with me, the word subgroup is very much apparent in all of our documents, and we have many, many, many documents, so it will take some time to make that change, so just to share with you that you will start seeing us refer to it as student groups rather than subgroups. And I'm sure as we speak, you'll hear us, for some time, probably use them interchangeably, but hopefully eventually we will get to the point where we use the term student groups rather than subgroups.

So when we're talking about these student groups, we have to establish in the plan for ESSA the minimum number of students that would constitute a student group that would then be recorded. Now, as many of you are familiar with, North Carolina at one time, had a minimum of 40, and then of course, with ESEA flexibility, which has been in place for three years in North Carolina, we of course have been using 30, and so the question on the table is, what will be the number for the minimum n for student groups going forward? And this conversation really is centered around trying to find the sweet spot, if you will, of

the number that optimizes the number of student groups that would be reported by schools across the state, with also making sure that it's a valid reporting, because we of course wouldn't want a number that was so low that we would question the validity of what we're actually reporting. So we're trying to find that optimal number, if you will.

So this is something that you'll continue to see more conversations around. We have done some analysis on the different potential numbers in the law, if we are to go below 30, then we have to give a rationale for why we are going below 30, and that's actually in the regs. Right—I always say that wrong. I apologize. So if we go above 30—I apologize—if we go above 30, we have to rationalize why we're going above 30. We of course can go below 30. 30 is where we have been, so that's kind of our home base number, if you will, in thinking of whether we're going to go higher rather than going lower. But if we go higher, then we have to have evidence for why we determined that number, that it was vetted with stakeholders, and that it will, of course, protect personally identified information for students but most importantly, that it is a valid number to make sure that any data we report on student groups is valid and worth reporting.

So in looking at the statewide accountability system, it has to be based on challenging state academic standards for reading or language arts and mathematics, and of course the goal is to improve student achievement and school success. The important note here, I think, is a couple things: one is those challenging state academic standards, and of course, we also oftentimes we'll talk

about the content standards, and then there's the achievement standards as well. And so our previous webinars, we went through the content standards, and I think we also touched on the achievement standards, also, and so that is really the foundation of any accountability system. The other thing to remember is that the law requires for reading, or language arts, and mathematics. And you'll notice what is not mentioned here is science. And for those of us that are very familiar with No Child Left Behind, with No Child Left Behind it was the same way; it was reading and math, primarily, and then science was for participation.

So we're required to administer science assessments, and those assessments, of course, have to be challenging—and aligned for challenging state academic standards, but what is required in federal law is that we report the participation of students on those science assessments, not that they're necessarily included in the statewide accountability system. Now, we—meaning North Carolina—could decide to include science in some aspect of its overall accountability model, and we of course would include that in our plan to the US Department of Education for their approval. But what we're focusing on here is what is actually required in the law. And I would just say that your thoughts on that is part of the feedback that we need to get, and you've—really many of you have experienced it both ways, your science as participation, and more recently where science was in with the accountability system for performance. And so you have a basis with which to share your viewpoints with that—on that with us.

So in the state accountability system, there are several different things that we're going to be looking at this afternoon. I will be talking about the

establishment of long term goals, in just another slide. And some of the other members of our team will be covering these other bullets that you're seeing on this particular slide. To go to the long term goals, the state has to establish long term goals, and the best way to think about this without actually maybe giving it a different meaning than we really want to, because there is a difference here, but to think about it in terms of it's very similar to the annual measurable objectives that were established under No Child Left Behind.

The difference here is that the state has more latitude in determining how those long term goals are going to be developed with respect to interim progress along the way, and that ultimate goal at the end, with No Child Left Behind, of course, many of you remember, it was 100% of students proficient by 2014, with ESEA flexibility. We had a system of making sure that we reduced by half the non-proficient students within six years, so we're really back to the drawing board on this, and we have the opportunity to think about how we would like to do this. And just to remind us all, the other big difference was ESSA is that unlike No Child Left Behind, there are no federal sanctions associated with those that were like those associated with No Child Left Behind, if you think of the school sanctions that were in place—the consequences—those aren't coming directly from the federal law.

So the state does have specified for it in the law that we have to establish ambitious state-designed long term goals which include measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals. And so I'm sure you can see with that slide, while I'm drawing the comparison to the annual measurable objectives,

because they had a long term goal and also we have to show progress along the way. So this is definitely something that we are going to be having lots of conversations about, and we will share that we have not designed this yet; we're still at the gathering point and if any of you would like to share your suggestions because you're in the districts for the schools and you know what works and what doesn't work, and you might have some strong thoughts on why it might actually be a good way to approach this task within the accountability system.

So we have to have these long term goals with interim progress for all students and separately again for student groups. For a minimum, we have to have academic achievement that is measured by proficiency on the annual assessments, and so that would be reading and—or language arts, and mathematics, again. We also have to have these goals for high school graduation rate, and of course, I think we've said this previously, that includes the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, and we can, at the state's discretion, also use the extended year cohort graduation rate, or what we often times refer to as the five-year graduation rate. It is important to note that that five-year rate has to be a more rigorous long-term goal as compared to the four-year. So I think the qualification there is we can't just take the four-year goal and then see if we met it in—on year five, if there has to be a separate goal set for year five. So that becomes two separate goals, if you will; your goal and your interim progress for four-year, and then your goal and your interim progress for five years. So that is one thing to consider as you give feedback on whether you would like to see the five-year included.

Again, for all students and separately for each student group of students, we have to have the same multi-year length of time for all students, or each subgroup of students, and we have to take into account the improvement that is necessary to close gaps between student groups. But again, that is a very important piece that you see across the across the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, going back to 1965, probably more emphasized with No Child Left Behind, but it's still evident in the laws, and that is this emphasis on closing gaps, and making sure that we're achieving increased proficiency for all students across all student groups, not just some.

And with that, I believe that is my last slide, and—I apologize, I have one more. The last piece of this, of course, is the English learners, and the English learners, we also have to have long term goals to increase the percentage of English learner students making progress and achieving English language proficiency. The state has to define what that actually means, and it is measured by the English language proficiency assessment, which for North Carolina is WIDA, and it has to be within a state-determined timeline. We are working with our colleagues in the department—in the English language learners area—to do this work, and it—and likewise, we were working with many of you and getting your input, and I believe that the English language learners group has an advisory group that they are going to be sharing some information with, as well. But I would put this in the same category as overall all the long term goals, but we are not to the point that we have reached any conclusion on anything. It is still very

much in the beginning stages of having this conversation. So with that, I will now turn it over to Curtis Sonoman, and I apologize.

Sonoman: Thank you, Tammy. Our next section is going to be to discuss the indicators, and here's where we'll begin to see some of the difference between the long term goals that need to be established, and the indicators, and how all of this builds on one another to get us through all of the pieces of the accountability system. So under the indicators, again, we are measuring the all students and separately for each subgroup, information, and in this case, for all public schools and we base it on those long term goals that Tammy just talked about—the academic achievement, and so that is the proficiency on the annual assessment of reading or language arts and math, and in—under this one, for the—at the state's discretion, for each public high school, student growth as measured by the annual assessments.

So section where we are looking for feedback as to whether or not we should include growth on reading or language arts and mathematics assessments, that are used at high school to measure growth for high schools. The next area of an indicator is for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, and so think back to our definitions at the beginning; these are the schools that are not used—do not have a graduation rate because they do not graduate students. We are looking at requiring—being required to do either a measure of student growth, if it's determined appropriate by the state, or another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for a meaningful differentiation in school performance. So here, again, the question to you all is

would we use growth as our other academic indicator, or is there another valid and reliable academic indicator that could be used? One example would be this would be the area that we could put science in because it is a valid reliable statewide academic indicator that has meaningful differentiation, because we have been using it in our accountability system in the past. So this is one of those areas that we're looking for feedback and continue to have discussions about how to do this for our other academic indicator.

For public high schools, we are required to use the four-year cohort graduation rate, and again, we have discretion to use the extended year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Again, this is for public high schools; these are the ones that graduate students. In addition to those indicators, we also have to have an indicator that it measures all students separately for each subgroup for all public schools. Not less than one indicator of school quality or student success, so this is the school quality indicator that we have talked about in the past, or you may have heard about in some of the research that you've been doing online over the last few weeks. This indicator needs to allow for meaningful differentiation; again, it has to be valid, reliable, and comparable across the state, but in this case, the same indicator, or indicators, are used at the grade span, and grade spans are determined by the state. In other words, this measure of student quality or student success could be different for elementary schools than middle schools, and again different for middle schools than high schools.

So we could come up with varying indicators for each of the grade spans that we would identify in our accountability systems. And this indicator may

include something that measures student engagement, educator engagement, access to and completion of advanced coursework, post-secondary readiness, school climate or any other indicator that we choose that meets the requirements above, so meaningful differentiation, valid, reliable, and comparable, and statewide. So this is another area where we're looking for a lot of feedback on what types of indicators or indicator we should use in this section of the model.

And then one final indicator that we have is that we have to have an indicator that measures the progress of English language proficiency for English learners, and again, that's defined by the state, measured by the English language proficiency assessment, which is currently WIDA, and within the state determined timeline. And we must do this for all of grades three through eight, and we must also measure it once in high school, in the same grade level that English learners are assessed or evaluated on reading or language arts, and mathematics. And so we have to measure that progress of English learners based on the previous grade's administration of the English language proficiency assessment.

Hobe: Okay, I think this is a good breaking point for just a couple of questions that we have. The first question is regarding student groups, and it says, will you continue to include AIG as a student subgroup—student group or subgroup? We've had positive feedback on that—in doing that, and so as we continue to gather feedback on that, one of the difficulties with it is it really doesn't differentiate, and when you think about that more than 95% of the students in that student group meet whatever benchmark we're looking at with that, but having

said that, it seems that it has been useful for some individuals, so perhaps we'll put that on our discussion list.

Howard: Right, because we can always report it and it not necessarily be in the actual accountability model with outcome, because anything that's in that accountability model has to be able to differentiate across the population.

Hobe: Okay, this next question comes from someone whose sound went out, and so I'm not sure if the question is based on them thinking they missed something, but the question is: what is the minimum number for a student group going to be?

Howard: So we had a discussion about that, and shared that that is the question that we are discussing, and of course just to recap that very quickly, we currently were at 30; at one point in time, we did have 40 in North Carolina. If we were to have 40, which is higher than 30, in the regulations for the US Department of Education, it's been specified that we would have to explain or provide evidence for why that 40 is actually fulfilling all the requirements of that minimum n. We could go below 30 of course if we wanted to, but to go above 30 would probably require a little bit more discussion and evidence with the US Department of Education on why we wanted to go above 30. And of course we've done analysis that shows at the different numbers in a student group, the number of schools in North Carolina that would have a certain number of student groups being reported, and I don't think any of our numbers are 100. It's probably lower than you would think, but we do have that information and I'm sure we'll be sharing that fairly soon as we continue to have this conversation.

Sonoman: One thing I'd like to add there is that reporting is still at 10. When we're talking about a minimum n size in this conversation, we're talking about the number of students needed in a subgroup to be used in the accountability system. As many of you know, we've moved to reporting in our data, and things like the school report card, and in our accountability reports, that we have ten students as the minimum number for reporting, so this would be much like it is now, or has been in the past, for the annual measurable objectives, we had 30 in determining whether the student's subgroups would be in that part of the accountability system. And again, this is—this discussion about minimum n size is for the accountability system and how we would include them into the accountability system under ESSA.

Hobe: Okay, thank you for answering those questions. We have one more here. If growth is not an indicator in the new model, would growth still be provided for school performance grades?

Howard: Yes, because the law requires growth in the school performance grade.

Hobe: Exactly.

Howard: North Carolina law—so North Carolina law requires growth in school performance grade. The school performance grades will remain as they are now, defined in state statute, unless the general assembly takes action to change that. With the ESSA plan that will be submitted to the US Department of Education, there may be discussions on how those two reporting systems could be lined up, but that would be a conversation with the General Assembly. Federal law cannot

force the General Assembly to change their laws, as long as we're fulfilling the federal law.

Hobe: Okay, so that is the questions that we have at this point. Keep your questions coming, if you have more as we go along. Now we're going to move into further discussion of the statewide accountability systems, and talk specifically about annual meaningful differentiation, and I'll turn it over to Curtis for that.

Sonoman: Thank you. So under our annual meaningful differentiation, we're required to establish a system that meaningfully differentiates on an annual basis all the public schools in the state. We have to use all of the indicators, which we just discussed; it has to be for all of students and each student subgroup. It has to be consistent with the requirements for the indicators, and we have to give substantial weight for proficiency on the assessments, and—including growth in high school if we select to use that, student growth or other academic indicator, the four-year cohort graduation rate, and English language proficiency.

And then the next statement is where things start to get confusing, and we'll talk a bit more on the next slide on how to clear this up. And so it says that in the aggregate, we have to provide much greater weight to the indicators that are noted above, than the indicators that we use under school quality and student success. So what we have to do is we have to provide an overall rating to the schools, which combines the academic indicators, and the school quality and student success indicators. And those indicators, which we had noted on the last slide—the proficiency, the graduation rate, the other academic indicator, and

English learner's proficiency—all have to be included in the academic indicators. And then there are the school quality and student success indicators.

Those academic indicators have to weigh more in the overall rating than the school quality and student success indicators, and those school quality and student success indicators cannot change a rating for a school if they are not improving on their academic indicators. Now, you can see down below where these indicators, and the SQSS indicators all are the same; that is not required under the law. That simply is for viewing purposes. Those indicators can have different weights under those academic indicator and school quality and student success indicators. So we're not saying that they all have to have equal weight underneath those; it's just simply the presentation provided us with this type of layout.

We're now going to discuss the identification of schools, and I'm going to turn it back over to Tammy.

Howard: Okay, thank you, Curtis. Now, with the identification of schools, based on the meaningful differentiation, the state has to have a determined methodology to identify, beginning with the 2017-'18 school year, and at least once every three years after that, a statewide category of schools for comprehensive support and intervention. And what will be included in this category are schools that do not have less than the lowest performing 5% of all schools receiving Title I funds, all public high schools in the state failing to graduate 1/3 or more of their students, and public schools in the state who have consistently underperforming subgroups

under targeted support and intervention. And at the discretion of the state, the state could add additional statewide categories.

So we're going to look next at the annual measurement of achievement, which we've had many conversations around this, and of course this is the participation; it is the expectation that 95% of all students participate in the assessment, and again, this is looked at from the student group perspective, and it is looking at the students who are enrolled in public schools, on academic assessments. And for the purpose of measuring, calculating, and reporting, we include the denominator of the greater of two things, and this piece is new to our practices of how we have been doing participation, so this is in the law, and it is specified that we can either use the 95% of all students and student subgroups, or the number of students participating in the assessment—must use, I apologize—must use.

So if you look at this example for School A and School B, you can see School A tests 80% of all students, and for accountability, we would use 95% of all the students expected to test as a denominator. And then of course in School B, they tested 97% of all students, and so for them, for accountability purposes, we would use 97% of all students as the denominator. So I think this will be familiar to many of you, with all the conversations that we've had about participation over this past several months, and that the US Department of Education and the federal law is trying to convey the importance of making sure that students participate in the assessments, so that the data is representing the

school fairly and with validity, rather than having students drop out of that calculation.

The next area that we're going to look at is partial attendance. This is something that we're all familiar with, as well, because in North Carolina, of course we have what we call the 140-day rule, and that is that students have to be in attendance for 140 days to be included in the accountability calculation. The federal law with ESSA actually states that for students who have not attended the same school with any local education agency for at least half of the school year, the performance of those students may—with the exception of graduation, that's an exception—may not be used in the system of [NOISE] schools, and of course that is a may, but it shall be used for the purposes of reporting on the state and local agency report cards. And so that is a difference there.

And then for high school students who have not attended the same school within an LEA for at least half of a school year, and exited the high school without a regular high school diploma, and transferring to another high school that grants a regular high school diploma, during the school year, in order to calculate the graduation rate, the law is specifying a way that we can determine or have a choice in determining which schools those students are assigned to for calculating the graduation rate. And the two options, of course, are which school was the student enrolled for the greatest proportion of school days while they were in grades nine through twelve, or it can be the school in which the student was most recently enrolled. So this is a different approach that is new to this law,

as well, that we would want your feedback on to know how you feel about that.

And I think we're going to pause here again for question.

Hobe: We did build in a break for questions here, but we have not received any questions, so at this point, we will move on and turn the discussion over to Donna Brown, to talk to us about school support and improvement in ESSA law.

Brown: Thank you, Karen. As we have under the current authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was then No Child Left Behind, we will continue under the Every Student Succeeds Act to have to identify lowest performing schools and schools that have some underperformance with subgroup. So the first group of schools that will be identified are a group called comprehensive support and improvement, or CSI. These schools will be classified according to the requirements under the identification of school's section in the accountability model. So this is actually a component of the state's accountability plan.

For each of these schools, in partnership with stakeholders, local education agencies must develop and implement a comprehensive support and improvement plan. Some of the requirements of that plan are unchanged from what we have been accustomed to in the past; for example, the state education agency will continue to be responsible for monitoring and periodically reviewing the implementation of those plans. At some point the plans are submitted to the state for an approval.

The identification of resource inequity is something new in the law, and you will find it interspersed throughout ESSA, and it's the whole notion of

looking at how both the budget is being implemented at the district level, and at the school building level in support of whatever this plan is that's designed to help meet the needs of this school. It's always based on a school level needs assessment, and of course, you will have to consider as part of that needs assessment, all of the outcomes, all the indicators that are within the accountability system, including the long term goals.

This is a little different under ESSA; for the schools that we consider now to sort of be in the same category as the CSI schools, those would now be the priority schools. There actually were no exemptions; you basically rank the schools, and then you counted up to get to the minimum number that was required. You heard Tammy say earlier that will continue to be at least 5% of all Title I schools in the state. There are a few exceptions built into ESSA, and for CSI schools that were identified by low graduation rates only, the state has the discretion to permit differentiated improvement activities for those schools that predominantly serve students who are returning to education after having exited secondary school without a regular high school diploma, who based on grade or age, are significantly off track to accumulate sufficient academic credits to meet high school graduation requirements, or in the case of schools with enrollment of less than 100 students, permit the LEA to forgo the implementation of improvement activities. And you're probably already relating the descriptions that you're seeing on the screen with some of the schools that were identified under the priority categories, at being our alternative schools. And so we feel like

these new opportunities would afford some flexibility around the plans they have to implement in those schools serving very small populations.

The local education agencies may provide what will be familiar to some of you as public school choice. You will see the word may is in bold, so this would be an option; it would not be a requirement, and the provisions that you see outlined on the screen are pretty much what you thought you were accustomed to under No Child Left Behind for public school choice. So it is an option that you could use some of your Title I funds to transport students to a school of choice, if their base school has been identified as a CSI school.

And as a part of the state's meaningful differentiation of schools, the state must also determine a methodology for identifying schools who have any subgroup consistently underperforming, and they're going to be identified as a targeted support and improvement school, or TSI. This is similar to the current identification for focus schools, in that, upon initial identification, the TSI schools plans and oversight for that plan, the authority will reside with the local education agency to develop and implement and oversee.

States will be required under ESSA to develop an exit criterion for both the CSI and TSI schools. For schools identified for CSI, if they have not satisfied this exit criterion after a specific number of years, which are going to be determined by the state, it would result in more rigorous state determined actions, which could potentially be state intervention. Schools identified for TSI who are unable to meet the exit criteria would also result in them being identified as a CSI, so they would kind of escalate to a higher level of identification in whatever we

describe initially in terms of the state support for CSI schools will then apply to those continuing TSI schools now identified as CSI.

The SEA now would also have to be responsible for some resource allocation and technical assistance in local education agencies that serve a significant number of schools identified for CSI and TSI. And as you've heard throughout the presentation today, this will be one of those things that we'll be interested to get some stakeholder feedback on, what would significant be? And now I'm going to turn it over to Curtis to discuss reporting.

Sonoman: Thank you. For this section, we are discussing reports as they are identified in subsection D of the law, and this would be the state, local, and school report cards. In this part, report cards are required to be developed, so we must continue to do the state, local, and school report cards. They are required to be concise, and presented in an understandable and usable format. They have to be— continue to be widely accessible to the public; it does require the state to make all local and school report cards available on a single webpage, which is something that we are currently doing in the school report card webpage. It also requires local education agencies to have all of the report cards for all of its schools on the local education agency webpage, and each school has to have their school report card accessible on their school webpage.

Inside the school report cards, we have to make comparisons to the state and local education agencies on the reporting requirements. This is something that we're currently doing in the model; we are reporting the comparison of how

state—how the school is performing to the LEA and also to the state. So this is not different reporting than we are currently doing.

The minimum requirements are that we have a clear and concise description of the accountability system, including an explanation of the minimum end size that was chosen, the long term goals, and the measurements of interim progress. We also have to include the indicators used to meaningfully differentiate all of the schools. And to explain the system of meaningful differentiation, and specify what the weights are of the indicators, what the methodology was for differentiating the schools, what the methodology was for differentiating consistently underperforming subgroups of students, so that would be how the TSI schools are identified, and the methodology to identify the CSI schools.

We would also have to explain the exit criteria within the school report cards, so there's going to be quite a bit more information on the accountability model embedded into the school report card. The report cards also have to report at each achievement level on the academic assessment, which is something that we are currently doing, so that's the achievement levels one through five as we are currently using them, and we have to do that for all students, and by each subgroup required in the assessment system. And in addition, we have to identify students with their homeless status, their status as a child in foster care, and a status as a student with a parent who is an active member of the Armed Forces. So we have to add those additional groups of students in our reporting, in the school report cards, on the academic assessments.

We also have to provide the performance on all the other academic indicators used in the accountability system for the all students group, and by each subgroup. We have to report before your adjusted cohort graduation rate, and if we're going for all the subgroups, and by each subgroup. In addition, we have to do homeless status, and status as a child in foster care for that adjusted cohort graduation rate.

We also have to report the information on the number and the percentage of English learners achieving English language proficiency. We have to do that, and we also have to do it by all students, and each subgroup of students in the accountability system the school quality and student success indicators, the long term goals, the percentage of students that are assessed and not assessed, so that's the 95% participation. We—and we also have to do other additional information as required.

There is further information in the report section on the requirements by the other section for Every Student Succeeds Act, but for our purposes today, we really were focusing on what are the accountability systems and assessment requirements for reporting in the school report card. There are other things like educator effectiveness and school safety, and things of that nature that are currently in the school report card, that will remain in the school report card under ESSA.

Hobe: Okay, we do have one question, and that is how will you get the status of a child in foster care? We do not track that in PowerSchool.

Brown: We actually are working with the Department of Human and Health Services. PowerSchool is a part of that discussion; child nutrition is a part of that discussion; Title I is a part of that discussion, and I probably left someone out, but those are the three divisions that I'm aware of are currently working with the Department of Health and Human Services to determine how we can accomplish what's going to be required under ESSA.

Howard: And just to remind us that is in effect in 2017-'18.

Hobe: Okay, that is all of the questions that we have. So let's just talk about where we are in this webinar series. We have completed webinars one through three, where we have gone in detail—into detail about what the law covers in terms of accountability and the many things that affect or touch accountability. Next time, on August 11th, we will have our fourth webinar, and we would like to get feedback from you at that time on what you think the accountability model should include. And I'm going to let Dr. Howard tell you a little more about that.

Howard: All right, thank you, Karen. So as you are aware, Dr. Atkinson [ph] asked that the LEAs convene teams to give us feedback on what they think the accountability model should look like, and we are in the final stages of drafting two documents that we hope will be distributed by tomorrow to you, for use with those teams, that kind of walk through really focusing, though, on the academic indicators, and the school quality of student success indicators. And these two documents—one document gives some information and poses the questions, and the other document is a—is in a format where those teams can enter their input in and then

share those documents back with us, either electronically or hard copy, so that we can get that feedback.

So coupled with that, we also have this August 11th webinar, where we also want to hear from you and see some of the suggestions that you have, some of the concerns that you have, some of the issues that you think we should be aware of that we may not be thinking about, because we quite frankly do not have the same perspective always that you do, where you're seeing it implemented at the local level. So for certain, you will also have access to these documents that have been drafted for the LEA feedback team that's requested by Dr. Atkinson, but we're also thinking about possibly sending you another document that covers more of the content, some of what we've covered today, and in the previous two webinars to just pose some thinking questions, not that we're at the point yet that anything has been decided, because I can assure you, it has not. But just to pose from the standpoint of, so, you know, what do you think the minimum n should be?

And then of course, we would like—on that webinar on August 11th, to hear back from you, and so what we're kind of grappling with now, and realizing we don't want to take up too much of your time but it may be useful if we pose some questions to you, then if you gave us some feedback, and then we could share back in that webinar some of the things that we're hearing. So August 11th is what? Two weeks from today or tomorrow? We're all looking at the calendar behind this monitor. Two weeks from tomorrow. So we could probably get you a document rather quickly, but since we do have this opportunity now, would that

be useful? Do you have another suggestion for how you would like for us to approach that webinar August 11th? We really want to use that as an opportunity to hear from you and to perhaps share with you some information maybe that you pose to us, that needs more clarity to get more focus on. So I'll pause there and see if anybody is entering anything.

Hobe: We don't have anything now, so—oh, we've got one. Questions to answer would be beneficial for us to focus on.

Howard: Okay, and that's only one person saying that, but that is kind of what we were thinking as well, that we could give you some questions by Monday at the latest, possibly Friday, because I think we could pull that together pretty quickly. You will already be able to see as soon as it goes out what we're posting to the LEA feedback team, and then if you'll share back your input on those questions, then we'll be able to share more globally and have some more input on that webinar on things we should consider, going forward.

Hobe: We'll just wait a second to see if anyone enters anything else. I think the questions—the questionnaire is the best way to focus on these decisions, is one person's comment, and then another person has asked, will that document be sent to superintendents or to us, as well?

Howard: I think it would probably be sent—I'll have to think about that, but I'm sure probably we would also—you know, we actually want to make it available to everyone. You know, typically we put a lot of our communication on TNN; the LEA feedback documents, those are going to the superintendents directly, initially, and then we'll probably post it on TNN, as well. So this document we

would absolutely want to make sure of that the superintendents have access to, as well.

Hobe: Okay, I'm not seeing any more comments or questions, so I will wrap up by saying thank you so much for your interest in ESSA, and your willingness to learn about it, and to give us feedback. Look for more information from us by Friday, or Monday at the latest, with some questions that we would love to get your answers on, and then we will compile those and share them in our next webinar, so you can see what your colleagues are saying, and perhaps have further discussion at that point on what your thoughts are on ESSA, and how we should implement the accountability model. Thank you very much, and we hope you have a great rest of your afternoon.

[END RECORDING]