Minnesota’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver Stakeholder Update Meeting

January 30, 2014

“Leading for educational excellence and equity. Every day for every one.”
Waiver Highlights

• Minnesota set forth a goal in the waiver to reduce achievement gaps by 50 percent by 2017
• Minnesota has been a leader in setting high standards and aligning assessments to these standards
• A stronger accountability system is in place – one that focuses on reducing achievement gaps and improving graduation rates
  – The World’s Best Workforce legislation reinforces the state’s commitment to strong accountability
• We continue to improve the implementation of our waiver by working collaboratively
Today’s Agenda

• Commissioner Introduction
• Waiver Extension Process
• Federal Monitoring Overview
• Update on Waiver Implementation
• MMR Technical Changes
• Next Steps
Waiver Extension Process

• DOE invited states to request a one-year extension of ESEA Flexibility through a streamlined process

• States are to:
  – Submit a letter to DOE requesting extension; and
  – Resolve any issues or “next steps” from monitoring

• MDE is to submit a request for extension of ESEA Flexibility no later than February 28, 2014 or 60 days from receipt of its monitoring report
Federal ESEA Flexibility Monitoring

• Minnesota’s implementation of ESEA flexibility was reviewed across key areas:
  – Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for all Students
  – Principle 2: Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support System
  – Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership
Federal ESEA Flexibility Monitoring Process

- A cross-agency team consisting of staff representing academic standards, assessment, accountability, Federal programs, English learners and special education participated.
- Minnesota submitted documentation and engaged in a series of phone conversations.
- DOE assessed MDE’s implementation to determine whether expectations are being met.
Monitoring Outcomes

- Results provided by DOE demonstrate that Minnesota has no next steps
- DOE noted Minnesota’s strong implementation of ESEA Flexibility and suggested no required changes
Principle 1 - Academic Standards

• All schools are currently implementing college- and career-ready academic standards
  – 2007 math standards: implemented since 2010-2011
  – 2010 ELA standards: implemented since 2012-2013

• Minnesota is pioneering efforts to broadly apply the findings of implementation science to help schools implement rigorous academic standards
Principle 1 - Academic Standards Initiatives

• Major Implementation Initiatives
  – Regional Centers of Excellence
  – Minnesota Blueprint for Literacy
  – Reading Well by Third Grade
  – Local Literacy Plan and Incentive Aid
  – Standards Implementation Toolkit
  – Minnesota Math and Science Frameworks
  – Math and Science Teacher Academy
  – PRIME Leadership Academy (math—for principals)
  – Collaboration in cross-agency teams to support students with special needs and English language learners
  – Webinars and workshops offered by MDE in collaboration with professional content organizations
Principle 2
Differentiated Accountability System

• The NCLB Flexibility Waiver strengthens Minnesota’s accountability system by:
  – Setting a new goal and targets to reduce the achievement gap by half by 2017
  – Giving every school an achievement gap measure
  – Raising the graduation rate goal to 90% for every subgroup, not just for students overall
  – Acknowledging the importance of growth for ALL students
  – Providing more, better data to parents and communities
Principle 2
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR)

• Multiple Measures are used to compute two different ratings and determine designations and recognition for Title I schools
• All schools receive an MMR and an FR
  – MMR
    ▪ Proficiency
    ▪ Growth
    ▪ Achievement Gap Reduction
    ▪ Graduation Rates
  – FR
    ▪ Focused Proficiency
    ▪ Achievement Gap Reduction
Principle 2
How are Title I schools identified for support?

• Priority Schools
  – Bottom 5% on MMR
  – Initially identified in 2012; new schools will be identified in 2014

• Focus Schools
  – Bottom 10% on FR
  – Initially identified in 2012; new schools will be identified in 2014

• Continuous Improvement Schools
  – Bottom 25% on MMR not already identified as Priority or Focus
  – Identified annually; new schools will be identified in 2014
Principle 2

How are Title I schools identified for recognition?

• Reward Schools
  – Top 15% on MMR
  – Identified annually; new schools will be identified in 2014

• Celebration Eligible Schools
  – Next 25% on MMR (in the 60th to 85% percentile)
  – Celebration Eligible schools are then invited to apply for the Celebration recognition
  – Identified annually; new schools will be identified in 2014
Principle 2
Differentiated Support and Recognition

• The NCLB Flexibility Waiver strengthens Minnesota school accountability by:
  – Transitioning from a punitive, compliance-based system to one of targeted, strategic support
  – Empowering a statewide system of support that can provide professional development to teachers through the work of the Regional Centers of Excellence
  – Creating opportunities to learn from the best practices of our highest-performing schools
Principle 2
Progress in Priority Schools

• 17 Priority schools were removed from the Priority status because of their progress
  – 13 of these Priority schools were receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds
  – Seven Priority schools received the Celebration Eligible recognition and two are Reward schools

• 78% of Priority schools demonstrated improvement on the MMR from 2012 to 2013
  – 33% of which improved by 20 MMR percentage points of more
Principle 2
Progress in Focus Schools

• 10 Focus schools have demonstrated great improvement and no longer have the Focus designation
  – 14 Focus schools received the Celebration Eligible recognition and one is a Reward school

• 71% of Focus schools demonstrated improvement on the Focus Rating (FR) from 2012 to 2013
  – 30% of which improved by 20 FR percentage points or more
Principle 2
Minnesota’s Highest Performers

• 99 schools have received multiple years of Reward recognition
• Reward schools are designated annually; however, some Reward schools have demonstrated consistent high performance for multiple years
  – 79 schools received the Reward recognition twice
  – 20 schools received the Reward recognition three times
Principle 3
Principal Development and Evaluation

• Minnesota Statutes 123B.147 are the SEA guidelines for the waiver

• Districts are receiving support through:
  – Minnesota’s example model (piloted in 2012-13)
    ▪ Designed in cooperation with MESPA, MASSP and other stakeholders
    ▪ Model revision and communication
    ▪ Stakeholder feedback survey
  – Regional information sessions during 2012-13
  – Ongoing technical assistance

• A letter of assurance was issued in September 2013
Principle 3
Teacher Development and Evaluation

• Minnesota Statutes 122A.40/41 are the SEA guidelines for the waiver

• Districts are receiving support through:
  – Minnesota’s example model (piloting in 2013-14)
    ▪ Stakeholder work group consulted with Commissioner
    ▪ Independent pilot evaluator from U of M – CAREI
    ▪ Student engagement perception surveys in grades 3-6 and 6-12
  – Regional information sessions during 2012-13
  – Ongoing technical assistance

• A letter of assurance will be issued September 2014
Principle 3
Educator Evaluation

• MDE will send a survey to assess the needs of districts in implementing educator evaluation
  – Considering training for evaluators, peer reviewers and teachers

• MDE will provide training to districts:
  – Defaulting to the state model
  – Choosing the state model or close variations

• MDE will develop surveys, including:
  – A stakeholder perception survey for principal evaluation
  – Student perception surveys for teacher evaluation
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) Proposed Minor Technical Changes

• MDE assembled a group of experts to provide input on technical improvements to the MMR

• After a series of meetings, the group made some key recommendations for MMR calculation changes

• The proposed changes strengthen the system by:
  – Stabilizing results from year-to-year
  – Ensuring all four areas of the MMR count equally in a school’s overall results
  – Improving transparency of school performance for stakeholders
  – Increasing the number of schools receiving an MMR
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) Proposed Changes – Graduation Rates

- **Recommendation:** Lower the graduation rate minimum n-size from 40 to 20

- **Value of recommendation:**
  - Holds more schools accountable for graduation rates overall and for subgroups
  - Increases the number of schools receiving a graduation rate domain in MMR
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) Proposed Changes - Participation

• Recommendation: Ensure schools have participation rates over 95% to be eligible for the Reward or Celebration Eligible designation

• Value of recommendation:
  • Makes certain that results are valid for schools recognized for high performance
  • Proactively alleviates future issues with low participation rates (no indication that this is currently a widespread issue)
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) Proposed Technical Changes

• Eliminating percentile ranking mechanism in Proficiency and Graduation domains to determine points earned out of 25
  – Recommendation: Assign points in the Proficiency and Graduation Rate domains using the percentage of subgroups reaching targets times 25 possible points
  – Value of proposed method:
    ▪ Mitigates the current “cliff effect”
    ▪ Minimizes swings in points earned from year to year
    ▪ Better demonstrates school performance against targets (maintains the “hard marker”)
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) Proposed Technical Changes

• Eliminating percentile ranking mechanism in Growth and Achievement Gap Reduction domains to determine points earned out of 25
  – Recommendation: Assign points in the Growth and Achievement Gap Reduction domains using a statistical methodology based on a normal curve
  – Value of proposed method:
    ▪ Better balances the weight of these two domains with Proficiency and Graduation to ensure all four domains count the same in a school’s overall score
    ▪ Recommended by DOE technical advisors
Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) Proposed Changes

• Recommendation: Utilize multi-year averaging when designating Priority and Focus schools
  • This has already been approved and applied in Minnesota

• Recommendation: Decide on the number of years to average and whether to average MMR results in years in which Priority and Focus schools are not designated
  • Average two or three years of MMR?
  • Average MMR in all years or only years in which Minnesota designates Priority and Focus schools?
Next Steps

• DOE anticipates issuing waiver extensions during spring 2014
• Extensions are granted through the 2014-15 school year
• 2014 MMR results and new MMR designations will be released in early fall 2014
• Waiver renewal for the 2015-16 school year and beyond will likely be required next year
  – Stakeholder input will be sought in the development of the next phase of Minnesota’s waiver