

**Minutes of the  
Committee of Practitioners Meeting  
September 29, 2009  
Ramkota Inn, Pierre, SD**

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 8:25 am by Chairperson Becky Guffin.

**Attendance**

Members present were: Becky Guffin, Mike Elsberry, Gary Briedenbach, Joyce Larsen, Susan Buekelman, Lucy Grant, Lori Bouza, and Liz Venenga.

DOE staff members present were: Jenifer Palmer, Betsy Chapman, Shannon Malone, Dawn Smith, Diane Lowery, Janet Ricketts, Tom Morth, Judy Merriman, Laura Ellenbecker, and Beth Schiltz

Introductions were conducted.

**Minutes of the June 4, 2009 Meeting**

Motion by Elsberry, second by Bouza, to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2009 meeting as printed. Motion passed.

**Accountability Workbook**

Guffin led the discussion of the revisions to the SD DOE Accountability Workbook that provides the guidelines for LEA accountability – assessment, AYP, and improvement. The committee recommends all of the listed proposed changes and suggestions.

**Element 1.1 - How does the accountability system include every public school and LEA in the state?**

No recommended changes

**Element 1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?**

*Discussion:* The areas of concern were: (b) alternative school -- mapped back to the resident school, (d) placed in SD private/non-profit facilities - mapped back to the resident district, and (e) placed by other state agencies -- always a concern. These requirements seem to be guided by US Education. Students need to be tracked back to a district rather than float up to the state level only. A resident school or resident district is where the parent or legal guardian lives.

**Proposed changes** -- (b) map back to resident district (get rid of original), (c) map back to resident district (change school to district), (e) map back to resident district, (b) alternative schools -- what are these alternative schools? - (such as Abbot House, not including virtual schools)

Need to look at elements 1.2 and 2.1 -- they need to match. DOE staff will work at rewording this language to more completely define the meaning of “if the district has a say” and what is meant when a district does not have a say. The language in 1.2 will reflect what is included in 2.1 and resident district will be defined.

**Element 1.3** - Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of basic, proficient, and advanced student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?

**Proposed change** - Remove the sentence starting with “Cut scores for proficient...” as these are explained in Element 3.2

**Element 1.4** - How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?

**Proposed change:** Change the phrase “by August each year” to “14 calendar days prior to the beginning of school”.

**Proposed change:** - 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph take out the word August; Take out sentence starting with “DOE will send each district .....”; and take out the next sentence also.

**Element 1.5** - Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?

No changes recommended

**Element 1.6** - How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?

**Spelling error** -- Rewards section -- word minimum n size?

**Element 2.1** - How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?

Make 2.1 and 1.2 match. For readability in the second sentence, change to all students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 will be tested in reading and math.

**Element 2.2** - How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?

No changes recommended

**Element 2.3** - How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?

*Discussion:* If student enrolls in a school 2 days before the end of the testing window, the district may not have time to get the student tested.

No recommended changes.

**Element 3.1** - How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?

No recommended changes

**Element 3.2** - How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?

No recommended changes

**Element 3.2a** - What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?

No recommended changes

**Element 3.2b** - What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining yearly progress?

**Typing error** -- Paragraph #2 - The year should be 2009 -- take out the 5.

**Typing error** -- Put percentage signs in the chart for reading.

**Element 3.2c** - What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?

**Typing errors** -- Put in percentage signs in the intermediate goals for reading.

**Recommended change:** The starting point should be July 2009 change from July 2005.

**Element 4.1** - How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?

No changes recommended

**Element 5.1** - How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?

*Discussion:* Next year there will be new ethnicity guidelines. The DOE is not sure how this will affect AYP and 2 year averaging. Hispanic will be broken out as a (yes/no) and then require a selection of two or more ethnicities (Hispanic and Latino, etc) must be

made for any person indicating Hispanic in the yes/no box. This appears to be in conflict with the current legislation. (The changes will occur during the 2010-2011 school year)

*Discussion:* Districts start registering students for the next school year in December. Could DOE send out reminders about this big change in race/ethnicity? The districts will need to revise enrollment forms to incorporate the change. In Dec/Jan, the changes will be available in Infinite Campus.

No changes recommended

**Element 5.2 - How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?**

**Typing error** – Add a period at end of last sentence.

**Element 5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State’s definition of adequately yearly progress?**

*Discussion:* It may be helpful if districts and schools knew how they made AYP and may be something DOE could provide

**Proposed change:** In the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph the DOE should change the dates and consider changing some of the wording as Math was completed the year before.

**Element 5.4 - How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress?**

**Proposed change:** Incorporate into the language on the top of page 26 scores - 4.8 composite score and a 4.0 in reading and a 4.0 in writing as a standard for the first administration of the ACCESS for ELLs®.

*Discussion:* 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph page 26 - The discussion centered around the need to have this paragraph located here or whether it should be moved under the heading labeled - “First Year in Country”.

**Proposed change:** Remove the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph page 26 that starts with – “LEP students enrolled”.

**Proposed change:** Remove from the top paragraph on page 26 this sentence – “After the second administration...”

**Proposed change:** On page 26 in the first bullet under “First Year in Country”, add the word W-APT as the last word at the end of the first bullet. Also, in the last sentence in first bullet take out ELP and insert ACCESS. The sentence now reads “Students who enroll for the first time in a school in the U.S. after the testing window for the ACCESS test has ended in South Dakota will meet

participation requirements for reading through the completion of the LEP eligibility assessment, W-APT.”

**Typing error** -- remove spaces between bullets 2 and 3

**Proposed change:** -- 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet (page 26) - In the last sentence revised the language to “Results of that assessment will be reported to the district and State by the contractor and used for participation.”

**Element 5.5** - What is the State’s definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?

**Proposed change:** 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph -- Remove last sentence starting with “The state will also employ ....”

**Element 5.6** - How does the State protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?

**Proposed change:** - Remove the last sentence starting with “The state will also incorporate ....”

**Element 6.1** - How is the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?

No recommended changes

**Element 7.1** - What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate? Judy Merriman, Administrator from the DOE office of Data Management, provided a power point presentation created by US Education to address the new requirements. A draft of the proposed changes was presented to the committee and is attached (yellow).

**Section (A)**

*Discussion:* Graduation rate starts when a student is first enrolled in 9<sup>th</sup> grade. A potential problem occurs for those 8<sup>th</sup> graders who are taking a 9<sup>th</sup> grade classes such as Algebra. Is there a way to not count them as a 9<sup>th</sup> grader?

**Proposed change:** The denominator in the formula needs to be changed from 2005 to 2006.

**Typing error:** Change the word dominator to denominator in the formula.

*Questions about enrollment of students and when they are considered a freshman:* The following questions will need to be addressed: How will 8<sup>th</sup> grade students taking 9<sup>th</sup> grade classes be considered in the graduation rate? How will students with private school /public school enrollments be considered in the graduation rate? How will home school students be considered in the graduation rate? How will virtual high school students be

considered in the graduation rate (need to be enrolled in a public school to participate in a virtual high school class)?

Lowery will include a paragraph such as: Requirements come from Regulation 200.19 and Section 1111 (h)(1)(2) of ESEA with the workbook example.

**Proposed change:** Paragraph 1 -- The term adjusted cohort means the students who enter grade 9 at least 50% of the time and any.....

- need to consider virtual high schools such as Chester in which students may only take 3 classes the first semester
- questions about point of entry

**Proposed change:** Change to “Extra time will not be allowed for individual subgroups to attain a regular high school diploma.” (May want to include this in an earlier paragraph)

**Proposed change:** - Add the definition of a regular high school diploma. Use the administrative rules, laws, or common definition.

**Proposed Definition:** High school diploma is awarded to students completing all state and local graduation requirements. (also include a paraphrase from 24:05:27:12 about what is not included as a high school diploma)

**Proposed change** – A definition of enrollment needs to be added.

**Proposed change:** Add a statement that the burden of proof is on the district/school in which the student is/was enrolled to document reported information.

*Questions to be considered:*

What constitutes an enrollment period? What constitutes office written documentation? What trumps what? Is written documentation for records transfer enough or does non-enrollment in Infinite Campus database trump the records request? What about open enrollments? (This can only be denied because of capacity.) How will home school students be addressed? Can be considered transfer if meeting compulsory attendance, refer to guidance.

#### Section (B)

**Proposed change:** Additional information needs to be included to address when the student information captured? Prior to the meeting, comments were made that the information should be captured at the end of the testing window because of the SPED sub-group. An IEP meeting may recommend that a student be removed as a SPED student just prior to the end-of-school year or graduation. (reference - Guidance A-10)

### Section (C)

*Discussion:* The graduation percentage will be calculated and is expected to be lower than what is currently the rate.

*Discussion:* What is substantial improvement?

*Discussion:* If the cohort is less than 40 students, no more than 2 students could cause the percentage points to not work any more, small schools and the small sub-groups need to be considered. (Seems to work better for the bigger sub-groups and not so good for the smaller ones)

*Discussion:* Is 5% points improvement in graduation rate too much? Should it be 1% point or 2% points across the board?

*Discussion:* What about minimum n? Is there a confidence interval figured? What is a small group? Options to consider would be a) If 10 or under you aren't responsible for that sub-group. b) What about if between 10-20 kids, no more than 6 can be counted as drop-out. c) What about those groups who are between 10-25 kids?

### Section (D)

Look at (C) for discussions

### Section (E)

*Discussion:* We are not sure we have all the information to be able to determine the required information so may have to use this year's information.

### Section (F)

**Typing error** - change dominator to denominator

*Discussion:* Page 28 - timeline chart in guidance -- We will need to apply new graduation rate to all subgroups because we were given a grace year last year.

**Element 7.2 - What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?**

*Discussion:* There is no consistency across the state as to what constitutes attendance -- each district's attendance policy is different. Middle school may be calculated different than elementary school because of the structural nature of the schools. Middle school students move to different classrooms for different periods and attendance is taken each class period whereas elementary student attendance is only taken at beginning of day and possible at noon.

**Element 7.3 - Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?**

**Recommended change:** 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph needs to replace the wording to "... consistent with methodology set by Title I standards."

**Element 8.1** - Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?

No recommended changes

**Element 9.1** - How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?

No recommended changes

**Element 9.2** - What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?

**Recommended changes:** In the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph - add Dakota STEP-A. In the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph - add Dakota STEP-A.

**Element 9.3** - How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?

No recommended changes

**Element 10.1** - What is the State's method of calculating participation rates in the State assessment for use in AYP determinations?

No changes recommended

**Element 10.2** - What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?

No changes recommended

**School Improvement Grants - 1003(g)**

Lowery presented a powerpoint developed by US Education on the competitive school improvement grant, 1003(g). The DOE will submit a state application and request that the COP members review the application before it is submitted to US Education. A school application will be developed also and COP will be invited to participate in review of the application before it is published to the districts. The applications will require a quick turn-around to get the funds distributed as quickly as possible. A School Improvement conference may be provided along with another conference, Summer Symposium, this summer. Plans have not been finalized.

**Next meeting**

June meeting will be next face-to-face meeting

**Adjournment**

Motion by Bouza, second by Larsen to adjourn the meeting at 2:30 pm. Motion passed.