

## Comments for waivers South Dakota is apply

**Waiver #2:** N-size Waiver: In order to enable the State to generate new lists of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools for its FY 2010 competition, waive the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" to permit the State to exclude, from the pool of schools from which it identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools for Tier I and Tier II, any school in which the total number of students in the "all students" group in the grades assessed is less than 10.

- We are a small school and do have some grades with less than 10 student. I agree with this waiver
- Agree with the State's position and request for waiver.
- Yes, apply for this.
- The size of 10 should not be used. This is not enough children to make a determination--this should be waived.
- It costs more to educate the students when smaller number of students exist, therefore it makes sense to waive the groups that are less than 10.
- I agree with this waiver.
- The state should apply for this waiver. While I do not know the number of schools this would affect, it makes sense that this size of group is statistically so small that one student may be the reason the school is persistently low achieving--and you cannot generalize from one student that the school itself is the problem.
- Agree that schools with low N size be removed from the list of persistently low achieving schools Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III.
- This will allow very small school to be excluded. I agree with this because the small numbers will skew the data.
- some country schools may have less than 10 students and could probably use some help if they are low-achieving.
- Yes, I think that would be good to do that
- Agree

**Waiver #4:** School Improvement Timeline Waiver: Waive section 1116(b)(12) of the ESEA to permit districts to allow their Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Title I participating schools that will fully implement a turnaround or restart model beginning in the 2011-2012 school year a "start over" in the school improvement timeline.

- I agree with this waiver because it will take time for a new model to become effective
- Agree with the State's position and request for waiver.
- Yes, apply for this.
- Should be waived.
- This should be waved as it brings with it new funding sources to enhance student achievement.
- This is a good idea. Implementing one of these models should allow the school to restart the school improvement timeline.
- It makes sense to allow schools to start over in the school improvement timeline--although I do have concerns that allowing schools to start over may be erroneously used as "proof" that the Turnaround process itself was responsible for the school showing up as having improved.
- Agree
- Great!
- Good idea!
- Yes
- Agree

**Waiver #6:** Period of availability of FY 2009 carryover funds waiver: Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act to extend the period of availability of FY 2009 carryover school improvement funds for the state and all of its districts to September 30, 2014.

- Agree with the State's position and request for waiver.
- Yes, apply for this.
- Because of the dollars that came in to the state his waiver should occur. Prudent spending will occur if there is more time to make these important decisions over a longer period of time.
- We support the additional use of carryover funds as it only serves to enhance the abilities of schools to meet the needs of its students.
- This waiver would be very helpful. I am in favor of extending the carryover availability as stated above.
- This waiver is necessary to ensure that schools will have funds available for a long enough period of time to bring about the degree of change needed.
- Agree
- This will allow schools to work on long term solutions.
- Good idea!
- Yes, I think they should be able to carryover funds that have not been used.
- agree