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Welcome & Introductions

Catherine Truitt, *Superintendent of Public Instruction* – NCDPI
Dr. Michael Maher, *Deputy Superintendent* – NCDPI

Advisory Group Introductions

1. Name
2. Organization
3. Why are you excited to be a part of this work?
Purpose for Today’s Work Session

• Review ESSA requirements and state accountability systems
• Examine and explore North Carolina’s state education values
• Identify characteristics of a “ready” student & high-quality school
• Brainstorm a “long list” of accountability indicators
About the Center for Assessment

• Founded September 1998; a 501(c)3 not-for-profit organization.
• **Our Purpose:** to improve the educational achievement of students by promoting improved practices in educational assessment and accountability.

• **Key Clients:** 40 states, districts, USDOE, Foundations
• **Key Partners:** CCSSO, KnowledgeWorks, Education First
• **What We Provide:** Independent, Credible, Technically Sound information and advice
  • We are currently conducting an independent evaluation of North Carolina’s Personal Assessment Tool (NCPAT) under IADA; we also serve on the NCDPI TAC
Federal Accountability Requirements

ESSA
ESSA Assessment Requirements

• Required annual assessments:
  • Reading/ ELA and mathematics in grades 3-8 and once in high school
  • Science once each in elementary, middle, and high school
• Assessments must be aligned to challenging state academic standards and provide information on whether a student is performing at grade level
• Assessments must meet high standards for technical defensibility which is evaluated through a federal peer review process. Requirements include:
  • Reliability
  • Validity
  • Comparability
  • Accessibility
ESSA Participation and Reporting Requirements

- Assessments must be administered to all public elementary and secondary students in the state (95% participation rate enforced through accountability)
- States must produce individual student interpretive and descriptive reports:
  - Performance must be reported with respect to at least three levels of achievement
  - Reports must include descriptions of the competencies associated with each level
- States must provide summary reports disaggregated by required groups/ categories
## ESSA Accountability Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use student outcome information...</th>
<th>to identify schools for support and improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Required assessments and other indicators  
• Optional indicators and assessments | • **Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI):** “Bottom 5%” of all schools  
• **Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI):** Consistently underperforming student groups  
• **Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI):** Schools with a *student group* lower than “bottom 5%” of all schools using same method as CSI |

**And provide support for improvement**

Districts and state provide support for improvement (cascade if school does not exit by schedule determined by state)
ESSA Accountability Requirements

States must include the following indicators…

- Academic achievement in language arts and mathematics
- Graduation rates for high schools
- “Other” indicator of academic progress (elementary/middle school)
- English language proficiency
- At least one indicator of school quality or student success (SQSS)
ESSA Accountability Requirements

States must meaningfully differentiate schools via a summative determination to identify CSI/TSI/ATSI schools…

Academic factors must be given “much greater” weight.

**CSI**
- Lowest performing 5% of schools based on summative score
- Schools with graduation rate <66.7%
- Identification in NC every 3 years

**ATSI**
- Schools with a subgroup scoring lower than the highest identified CSI school.
- Identification in NC every 3 years

**TSI**
- Grade of “F” for the most recent and previous two years.
- Identification annually
ESSA Accountability Requirements

States set their own interim and long-term progress goals.

North Carolina Measures of Interim Progress, Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>2.439</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged Students</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>2.464</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.062</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.985</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accountability in North Carolina
North Carolina Theory of Action (Vision)

If we...
• Create adaptive learning environments for personalized, digital-age learning
• Allow students to determine the pace at which they learn
• Support individualized PD of educators
• Empower educators to adopt innovative ideas, and
• Replicate and scale proven programs, and

Then...
• Students will be inspired to take ownership for their own path to success via an immediate career, post-secondary education, or both

(Consolidated State Plan, p. 8).

Guiding Principle
• Transform from industrial age practices of providing the same inputs and opportunities...
• To digital age practices in which all students and educators have access to unique learning experiences based upon their individual needs and aspirations”
North Carolina’s Current Accountability System

ESSA Accountability Model
School Performance Grades

- **Elementary/Middle School**
  - ELA/Reading EOG Scores
  - Math EOG Scores
  - NC Math I EOC Scores
  - Science EOG Scores

- **High School**
  - English II EOC Scores
  - HS Math EOC Scores
  - Growth (High School ELA & Math)
  - Graduation
  - English Learners Progress
  - Biology EOC Scores
  - ACT/ACT WorkKeys
  - Math Course Rigor

**PARTICIPATION**
- Identify Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)/Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools

**Long Term Goals**

- Reading 3-8
- Math 3-8
- Reading High School
- Math High School
- Graduation
- English Learners Progress

**PARTICIPATION**

- Within 10 Years an Increase in Student Achievement for All Students and Each Subgroup
- Reduces the Achievement Gap
North Carolina School Grading Scale

• Schools graded on a weighted A-F scale
  • A = 100-85
  • B = 84-70
  • C = 69-55
  • D = 54-40
  • F = 39 and below

• Composite score calculation is weighted as follows:
  • Achievement = 80% [# Proficient (Rdg + Math + Sci)] + EL Progress)
  • Growth = 20% (EVAAS Reading and Math Composite Score)
### Scoring Example: Annual Measurable Differentiation (AMD)

#### Elementary/Middle School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>Score used in final calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOG Reading</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOG Math</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOG Science</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Progress</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Achievement</td>
<td>900 (sum of numerators)</td>
<td>2004 (sum of denominators)</td>
<td>900/2004= 44.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Composite Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Growth Score (Reading, Math, Science Composite)</th>
<th>Score used in final calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Score** = 44.9 (.8) + 75.2(.2) = 51.0
## Low-Performing Schools and Districts

### State Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>2018–19</th>
<th>2021–22</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>+376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Performing Districts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>+41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continually Low-Performing Charter Schools</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schools Identified for Comprehensive or Targeted Support and Improvement

**Federal Designations per ESSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Identified at beginning of 2018–19</th>
<th>Identified at beginning of 2022–23</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSI-Low-Performing Schools</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI-Low Graduation Rate</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI-Consistently Under-performing Subgroups</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSI-Additional Targeted Support</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>-742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a total of 114 CSI schools. CSI schools can be identified as both CSI-Low Performing and CSI-Low Graduation Rate.
Questions and Discussion
Other State Accountability Designs

Examples
Main Points

• States have wide discretion concerning their accountability systems under ESSA
  • What to include
  • How to include
  • When to make CSI and ATSI school identifications
  • Etc.

• States can also choose to create separate state and federal accountability systems to pursue what is valued by the state
# ESSA Accountability Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use student outcome information</th>
<th>To identify schools for support and improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required assessments and other indicators</td>
<td>Required to identify TSI annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional indicators and assessments</td>
<td>Required to identify CSI through “bottom 5%” of all schools and ATSI of schools with a student group lower than “bottom 5%” of all schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And provide support for improvement

Districts and state provide support for improvement (cascade if school does not exit by schedule determined by state).

*And note that today’s session focuses on indicators/measures for a state model.*
## Flexibilities in ESSA Assessment Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements for assessments, other indicators</th>
<th>Flexibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reading/ELA and mathematics (grades 3-8 and once in high school)</td>
<td>• State sets content standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science (once in elementary, middle, and high school)</td>
<td>• Reading or ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Progress in English language proficiency for English language learners (grades 3-12)</td>
<td>• State can add assessed grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High School Graduation rate (4-year cohort)</td>
<td>• State can determine “other academic indicators” (e.g., growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Weight of academic indicators must be substantially greater than SQSS indicator</td>
<td>• State can determine “school quality/student success” indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measures must meet Peer Review (related to valid, reliable, fair)</td>
<td>• State can add additional grad rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State determines how to measure, criteria, other rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Flexibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required to identify low-performing schools TSI annually</td>
<td>• TSI: State can determine rules, criteria for identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required to identify CSI through “bottom 5%” of all schools</td>
<td>• CSI, ATSI: State determines when (maximum of every 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Required to identify ATSI of schools with a student group lower than “bottom 5%” of all schools</td>
<td>• State determines criteria, weights, and other rules for determining identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State has broad discretion in how, what of supports offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State determines exit criteria, timelines, and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• State determines “additional consequences” if a school does not exit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States’ accountability designs: two\(^+\) approaches

- Take advantage of flexibilities provided in ESSA law
  - State has federally approved accountability system or system striving for approval
    - State system is not fully approved and state is slowly interacting with USED about becoming compliant
  and/or
  - Have separate state and federal accountability systems
    - State has federally approved accountability system \(\textit{and}\)
    - State has another state accountability system, which it usually emphasizes in consequences and communication

- Some states threatened to decline federal ESEA funds and not have a federally compliant system… but to date no state has done so
ESSA-compliant accountability systems: considerable variation in indicators

• Several different possible indicators of what states use to portray student outcome and school quality
  • E.g., see ECS survey (2021) https://www.ecs.org/50-state-comparison-states-school-accountability-systems/

• What
  • Chronic absenteeism; college/career/military ready; percent of students Advanced; reduction in percent of students scoring at lowest level; etc.

• Weights and Rules
  • Choose Status or Growth, whichever is higher
  • If performance is X, then rating cannot be higher than Y

• Who
Example 1: A state accountability system with local variation in indicators

• Unusual example with local variation in indicators
• Texas allows local accountability measures
  • When district performs high enough
  • Local accountability measures are approved by the state
  • Performance on local accountability measures count up to 50% of total (state measures are at least 50%) for state accountability results
• Note: ESSA and state accountability systems: local does not affect ESSA district ratings or school identifications
• Increases individualization, decreases comparability

https://tea.texas.gov/texas-schools/accountability/academic-accountability/performance-reporting/2022-accountability-rating-system
Example 2: ESSA-compliant accountability system w/ separate state system w/ different indicators, weights

- State has federally approved ESSA-compliant accountability system AND
- State has a separate state system, with the state’s communication and consequences focused on the state system. (Wisconsin [https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/accountability/pdf/State_vs_Federal_Accountability_Crosswalk_2018-19_Final.pdf](https://dpi.wi.gov/sites/default/files/imce/accountability/pdf/State_vs_Federal_Accountability_Crosswalk_2018-19_Final.pdf))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>State Accountability System</th>
<th>ESSA Federal Accountability System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Goal</td>
<td>All schools and districts in the state are meeting or exceeding accountability expectations covering academic outcomes and student engagement, reflecting the college and career readiness of all students.</td>
<td>Within six years, cut the gap in half for English language arts proficiency rates, mathematics proficiency rates, and graduation rates. Within six years, increase the percentage of English learners on-track to English language proficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 2: ESSA-compliant accountability system w/ separate state system w/ different indicators, weights - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>State Accountability System</th>
<th>ESSA Federal Accountability System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Purpose</strong></td>
<td>To provide robust and detailed performance reporting to drive continuous improvement and meaningfully differentiate the performance of all schools in the state.</td>
<td>To appropriately identify public schools, based on overall and subgroup performance, most in need of support and systems improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Primary Product** | State Accountability Report Cards
*Report cards are generated for both schools and districts.* | ESSA Accountability Reports
*Schools receive ESSA Accountability Reports as part of district Joint Federal Notification Packets (which include additional federal reporting and accountability requirements).* |
| **Applicability** | All schools and districts, including public, charter and private schools participating in the choice program. | Only public schools (including charters) and subgroups within a school; does not apply to choice schools. |
Example: ESSA-compliant accountability system w/ separate state system w/ different indicators, weights - 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>State Accountability System</th>
<th>ESSA Federal Accountability System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reportings (include ratings and identifications)</td>
<td>Annual reporting covers five performance ratings, ranging from <em>Fails to Meet Expectations</em> to <em>Significantly Exceeds Expectations</em>, with corresponding star ratings and accountability score on a scale of 0-100.</td>
<td>Annual reporting for all public schools, leading to one of three ESSA identifications: 1. <em>Comprehensive Support &amp; Improvement (CSI)</em> 2. <em>Targeted Support &amp; Improvement (TSI)</em> * Additional Targeted Support &amp; Improvement (ATSI)* 3. <em>Not Identified.</em> Any public school may be identified for CSI if it graduates less than 67% of students. Title I receiving schools may be identified for CSI for overall performance in the bottom 5% of all Title I receiving schools. Any public school can be identified for TSI with student group(s) in the bottom 10% of statewide student group performance and ATSI with student group(s) in the bottom 5% of Title I school performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Timeline</td>
<td>Annually by November 30.</td>
<td>Annual reporting; identification timelines differ: CSI &amp; ATSI identifications occurs every three years; TSI identifications occur every year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: ESSA-compliant accountability system w/ separate state system w/ different indicators, weights - 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th>State Accountability System</th>
<th>ESSA Federal Accountability System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report Type</td>
<td>Public (redacted) report cards published as PDFs on DPI website since 2011-12. Secure (unredacted) report cards also available to schools and districts. Report cards include summary and detailed versions.</td>
<td>Public reports published as PDFs on DPI website since 2018-19 (for 2017-18 accountability). Reports are released securely to schools and districts prior to public release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>100 point accountability index Scores are based on performance averages and normative data.</td>
<td>Indicator outcomes on a 0-100 point scale Scores are based on percentile ranks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• States have **wide discretion** concerning their accountability systems under ESSA
  • What to include
  • How to include
  • When to make CSI and ATSI school identifications

• States can also choose to create separate state and federal accountability systems to **pursue what is valued by the state**

• Decide **what** you value, then create **how** to accomplish that
Questions and Discussion

• What measures and indicators from other state models are relevant in North Carolina?
• How do (or don’t) these other states’ indicators reflect important values in NC?
• What are the advantages and disadvantages of specific indicators and measures?
• What are the advantages and disadvantages of more vs. less prescriptive systems?
Portrait of a Graduate
Envision the Future: Brainstorm Possible Student Outcomes for Accountability

Activity 1
Activity Overview

1. What are the outcomes you expect a student to demonstrate if they were fully prepared for success at three key milestones (Grade 12, 8, and 5)?

2. Write down as many outcomes and/or indicators as you can (1 sticky note/outcome)
   A. End of Grade 12 (5 minutes)
   B. End of Grade 8 (2-3 minutes)
   C. End of Grade 5 (2-4 minutes)

3. Individual members will place sticky notes with individual outcomes on the chart paper (Grade 12, 8, and 5) with their small group.

4. Small groups will organize outcomes into common categories (e.g., 21st Century Skills, Academic)

5. Small groups will go on a gallery walk to review other groups’ outcomes and categories (Group 1 to Group 2, Group 2 to Group 3, etc.)

6. Each person will be invited to add any new outcomes or indicators that were not reflected in the original brainstorming process.
Rules

• Brainstorm outcomes, indicators, and/or measures
• Consider conversations from the morning session
• Avoid self-censoring
• Be creative; don’t worry about whether or how an outcome can be measured. This step comes later.
• Judgment free zone
Envision the Future: More Complex Outcomes Involving Combined Student Data

Activity 2
Activity Overview

1. Accountability systems may find it valuable to consider more complex outcomes that involve combinations of student data.

2. Some examples

3. Brainstorm: Use a different color sticky note to write down additional “combined data” outcomes you think might be valuable to consider for accountability

4. Paste sticky notes with the appropriate category in your small group’s final list of outcomes (may create new categories).

5. Discussion
Post-Activity Reflection

• What outcomes stood out to you and why?

• How might you decide which outcomes to prioritize? Consider…
  • How might these outcomes shift priorities for schools?
  • How might these outcomes – when applied to an accountability system - affect teaching and learning in North Carolina schools?
  • What unintended consequences might emerge, and how can we address these moving forward (e.g., Campbell’s Law)?
Next Steps

• Summarize today’s information (Center for Assessment)

• Gather feedback on possible indicators
School Performance Grade Redesign Timeline

**September ’21 - August ’22**
Operation Polaris - Testing & Accountability Committee Formed, Research on Multiple Measures

**September ’22 - November ’22**
Advisory Group Convenes Monthly, Stakeholder Engagement (Survey + Feedback Sessions), New Measures Identified

**October ’22 - January ’23**
New Measures Examined by Content Experts, Advisory Group Considers New Criteria for School Performance Grades

**January ’23**
Policy Recommendations Shared with General Assembly

**RESEARCH**

**DESIGN**

**IMPLEMENTATION**

’23-’24 School Year
New Measures Potentially Piloted, Data Collection Processes Refined
Advisory Group Meeting Schedule

• October 17, 2022 at 2:00PM – Virtual

• November, 2022 (Date/Time TBD) - Virtual

• December, 2022 (Date/Time TBD) - Virtual

• January, 2023 (Date/Time TBD) - In-Person