ESSA Accountability Work Group
MacKay Building, Pierre South Dakota
May 12, 2016

The second meeting of the Accountability Work Group began at 4:00 p.m. on May 12, 2016, and was held as a webinar/conference call.

Members of the work group who were present were: Joan Dunmire, Douglas School District; Linda Foos, Wagner Community School District; Bonnie Haines, Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate; Thomas Holmes, State Legislator; Mary McCorkle, South Dakota Education Association; Rob Monson, School Administrators of South Dakota; Wade Pogany, Associated School Board of South Dakota; Charles Sykora, Wall School District; Paul Turman, Board of Regents; and Jeremy Wollman, South Central School District. Kerri Whipple, ESL Consultant, along with several SD Department of Education staff persons were also in attendance.

Terri Bissonette, consultant for McRel International North Central Comprehensive Center, acted as the facilitator. She reviewed the three goals of the meeting 1) learn the key priorities of the three other work groups pertaining to accountability, 2)review any areas that require feedback from the work group, and 3) assign members of this work group to sub-committees to discuss certain items in depth.

Review of the Key Points from Other Work Groups
The work group was reminded that the complete notes for each of the four workgroups may be found on the SD DOE ESSA webpage. The School Improvement and English Language Learners work groups summary of topics were presented by Shannon Malone and the Educator Effectiveness work group topics were reviewed by Carla Leingang. (A summary is attached).

Survey
The Accountability Work Group was asked to complete a survey of questions from other work groups and return to the department by June 1. The responses will be compiled and provided back to the work groups. Questions on the survey included:
School Improvement Work Group

- Should we change the labels for school classification (Focus and Priority) or keep them?
- Should the College and Career Readiness Indicator be kept as one combined indicator or split into two separate ones?
- Should points (bonus or otherwise) be awarded for school climate?

English Learners Work Group

- What number should be used for the cell size for English Learners (ELs)?
- How do we account for all ELs?
- Are there other ways to account for ELs in low-incidence districts?

Subgroups
The work group members were asked to volunteer for subgroups. Other subgroups will be formed as more members are contacted. Each subgroup will provide information/recommendations back to the larger work group for further discussion at the June meeting. The SD DOE will provide the subgroups with sample models from other states and other research. A decision matrix was provided to the members. The subgroups will discuss the following questions.

1. Full Academic Year (FAY) must be “at least” half the school year. How do we set that time frame?
2. Should a school’s science performance translate into points?
3. Should South Dakota maintain a normative-based system or shift to criterion based?
4. Should Gap and Non-gap groups be retained?
5. Irrespective of other decisions, should attendance be retained?
6. What are other means of earning points for college and/or career readiness?

Next Meeting
The next meeting of the work group will be June 14 in Pierre.

Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Summary of ESSA Work Groups – April Meetings

Educator Effectiveness:
Recommendations:

- Teacher Effectiveness and Principal Effectiveness systems should not be included in the accountability system
- The two evaluation systems should mirror each other
- The implementation of both systems should be monitored by DOE through the state accreditation process
- Rules regarding SLOs should not require teachers in tested grades and subjects to write their SLO on that particular subject area and should not reference the state assessment
- The implementation timeline for Principal Effectiveness should remain the same (2016-17 school year)
- Language regarding the plan of assistance for principals should be removed from the Principal Effectiveness rules

Areas still under discussion:

- Frequency of evaluations for continuing-contract teachers
- Flexibility for component selection (all six domains) for assistant principals
- Requirement to combine Professional Practice Rating and School Growth Rating into one overall rating
- Requirements for Principal Effectiveness School Growth measure to include, at a minimum, 25% based on SPI or AMOs

School Improvement:

- Keep attendance, but modify the 94% target
- Require School Board members to be a member of the SI planning team
- If only Title I schools are held accountable for the bottom brackets of schools (Focus/Priority), then should only Title I schools receive the other designations (Reward/Progressing/Status)

English Language Learners:

- For EL students that become proficient, we would allow for those students to be counted for four additional years, but only if it helps the subgroup
- Use the ACCESS test scores for growth
- For First Year in Country Students, recommend:
    - Year 1 – exempt and students would not test;
    - Year 2 – students would take the test (ELA/Math) and count for participation;
    - Year 3 – students would take the test (ELA/Math) and the scores would be used for growth, but not for proficiency;
    - Year 4 – students would take the test (ELA/Math) and the scores would be used for all accountability measures.