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Welcome

**Today’s Objectives:**
As a result of this meeting, ESSA CoP members will:
- Review feedback on the full ESSA draft plan
- Reflect on the feedback on the full ESSA draft plan

**Today’s Agenda:**
• Welcome and updates
• Review and discussion of public comment and changes to state plan
• Closing and next steps

**Reminders:**
• This meeting is being broadcast and recorded via webinar.
• All participants will be muted during the review of the public comment and changes.
• ESSA Committee of Practitioners members will be un-muted for questions afterwards.
• There will be no public comment at this meeting.
Process Update

We are here.

Feedback on Initial Recommendations (Feb. – May)

State Approval of Draft Plan (Jun. – Aug.)

Submit Draft to US Dept. of Education (September 18th)

Input on Key Questions (Aug. – Jan.)

26 RI Leaders on Committee of Practitioners

11 Public Forums

2 Public Surveys

35+ Feedback Meetings

50+ Stakeholder Groups
Presentation: Public Engagement and Feedback on Rhode Island’s ESSA State Plan
Public Engagement Process

• Ensure every voice is heard as we create our ESSA state plan

• Since August 2016, engaged with Rhode Island communities through:
  – 2 public input and feedback surveys
  – 35+ feedback and 50+ stakeholder group meetings
  – 11 public forums, and
  – Rhode Island Leaders on the ESSA Committee of Practitioners

• Latest round of public engagement through the Public Comment Period from June 1-30 on entire draft of Rhode Island’s ESSA State Plan
  – USED does not require ESSA state plans to undergo public comment
  – Over 30 individuals or organizations submitted feedback
  – Comments received via survey, email, or letter
  – Feedback informs plan clarifications as well as implementation guidance

• State plan sections, this presentation, and public comment document all posted online at www.ride.ri.gov/ESSA
Public Comment Feedback Statistics

Total Submissions*:

• Letters or emails from individuals or organizations: 9

• Survey sections (counts in parentheses; some individuals/organizations responded to multiple survey sections):
  – Title I, Part A ... (26)
  – Title I, Part C ... (0)
  – Title I, Part D ... (2)
  – Title II, Part A ... (2)
  – Title III, Part A, Subpart 1 ... (4)
  – Title IV, Part A ... (3)
  – Title IV, Part B ... (2)
  – Title V, Part B, Subpart 2 ... (0)
  – Title VII, Subtitle B ... (0)
  – Appendix A ... (0)

Feedback Analysis:

• Feedback submissions that referred to several topics in a single submission were separated into individual topic-specific comments and coded accordingly

• There were more topic-specific comments than total feedback submissions

• Analysis of submissions:
  – 48 feedback submissions
  – 147 topic-specific comments
  – 45 category codes
# Title I, Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Goals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Culture/Climate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>High School Growth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Student Growth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments in Other Languages</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>BEP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Cards</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Proficiency Index</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DCYF MOU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Absence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Early Warning System</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Innovation Grants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Suspension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RIDE Support for Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Advisory Boards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Emotional Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Proficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student Transitions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher Recruitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Title I, Part D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCYF MOU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Program Section</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title II, Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIDE Support for Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title III, Part A, Subpart 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Enrollment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Entrance Criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Exit Criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title IV, Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Activities Title IV(A)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Title IV, Part B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Code</th>
<th># of comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st CCLCs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st CCLC Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Funds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback Review

• Comments reviewed by program leads
• Each comment classified as one of four types:
  – **Clarification in Plan** (17 out of 147): clarification or revision was made to the state plan draft in response to the comment
  – **Add to Companion Guide** (4 out of 147): clarification was more appropriate to be made to the companion guide than the state plan
  – **Implementation Guidance** (66 out of 147): complexity of the topic is better addressed in implementation guidance upon ESSA State Plan approval by USED
  – **Comment** (60 out of 147): considered when reviewing the plan, but no action taken
Examples of Feedback

• Clarification in Plan:
  – Example:
    “...I would like to suggest that the Community Advisory Boards also include students at the high school level (there are a variety of community organizations in RI that support student voice and could assist in this area)...”
  – Resolution:
    This is a comment that resulted in a direct edit to the plan: students were added in the plan to the types of representatives that may be included on the Community Advisory Boards.

• Clarification in Plan:
  – Example:
    “In regards to the new school classification star rating (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)), I would love to see the incorporation of student feedback from the SurveyWorks student survey on school climate and student / teacher relations factored into a schools rating...”
  – Resolution:
    It compromises the intent of SurveyWorks to use it for accountability. We have adjusted the language in the plan to state that the overall report card will have additional school climate and other indicators (including SurveyWorks data) which should be used to drive change just as strongly as the accountability indicators.

• Add to Companion Guide:
  – Example:
    “Graduation (p.9-10) – We do not find language about 5 or 6-year graduation rates until later in the metric section. Should it also be mentioned here? The Appendix A charts are based on a 4-year rate. The language appears incongruent.”
  – Resolution:
    ESSA requires that states set a 4-year graduation rate long-term goal in their state plans. The addition of 5-year and 6-year graduation rate goals (95%) are more appropriately included in the Companion Guide.
Examples of Feedback

• Implementation Guidance:
  – Example:
    “DLM assessments: parents will need clarification”
  – Resolution:
    The DLM assessment was mentioned in the state plan. After state plan approval by USED, RIDE will provide guidance and resources to support implementation of this particular element of the plan.

• Implementation Guidance:
  – Example:
    “We were very pleased to see a plan to include a “broader range of measures” on state, district, and school report cards. However, we were disappointed that the design and list of indicators to appear on report cards has not yet been publicly released and is not in this draft plan. We strongly support the plan to include performance data for students experiencing homelessness, students in foster care, students in the juvenile justice system, and military-dependent students on report cards and hope that such data will include not just results of achievement tests but also chronic absence, suspension, and high school graduation rates.”
  – Resolution:
    All of the federally required elements will be on the first iteration of the report cards. Additional enhancements and indicators will be announced prior to future releases.

• Comment:
  – Example:
    “I appreciate the School Improvement Resource Hub as well as the flexibility that LEA's have in selecting their Community Advisory Boards.”
  – Resolution:
    This comment represents an individual’s level of satisfaction with an element of the state plan.
Examples of Feedback

• Comment:
  – *Example:* “The 95% participation threshold is high for a test of this nature and at the high school level.”
  – *Resolution:* Although the 95% participation rate is not popular, the 95% participation threshold is set by Federal law and cannot be changed.

• Comment:
  – *Example:* “adjust star rating system to reduce reliance on tests”
  – *Resolution:* Several voiced dissatisfaction with the use of assessment data for classifications. However, the data used for the accountability system needs to meet certain standards for quality, reliability, and validity. At this point, assessments are one of the few sources we have for that type of high quality, reliable, and valid data. As additional data are collected that meet these standards, there may be the possibility to incorporate them into the accountability system.

• Comment:
  – *Example:* “I do not see a clear path to reimagining schooling.”
  – *Resolution:* This ESSA State Plan is a high-level document that sets forth overall goals as required by Federal law. The Companion Guide provides a stronger narrative and strategic background for many of the decisions and goals we have made as a state. Reimagining schooling is will happen as a result of local decisions made by LEAs, schools, teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders in alignment with these overall goals.
Next Steps

• Governor Raimondo reviews Rhode Island’s ESSA State Plan: August 1-30
• Final version submitted to USED: September 18, 2017
• End of USED review period: January 18, 2018

Rhode Island’s ESSA State Plan will be in effect for the 2017-18 school year, pending final approval by USED
Discussion:
Questions, impressions, and looking ahead to plan implementation
Looking Ahead

Rhode Island’s ESSA State Plan and Public Comment Feedback Submissions documents are available at www.ride.ri.gov/ESSA

Discussion:

• Do you have any clarifying questions about the feedback?
• What are your impressions on the amount of feedback and/or topic frequency?
• As we move forward in implementing the plan, how do you see your role as a partner organization?
Thank you!

For this presentation or other materials:

www.ride.ri.gov/ESSA

For more information:

ESSA@ride.ri.gov