

What to Change About NCLB?	Dawn Dawson Willi Webb Board Members	45
<p>Recommendations/Issues Related to <i>No Child Left Behind</i> (Notes recorded from meeting by David Ansbacher.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Dawson) SES – students who participate are selected by F/R, not academic need. Kids who are not F/R might be in need of assistance. • (Dawson) Request that district level Title I funds be used to provide transportation • (Dawson) Provide more differentiation in labeling a school deficient in making AYP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Problem of giving credit where it is due while simultaneously critiquing • (Holdzkom) – perhaps identifying additional subgroups (gender?) • (Holdzkom) – need different way to sanction schools aside from ‘one strike, you’re out’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ To label a 25 of 26 subgroup school as ‘failure’ could be seen as unfair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Impact of this sanction could be examined: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ranges? ▪ Are some subgroups more important than others? Levels of criticality for certain subgroups? • (Sturey) Fairness for students with disabilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Point of NCLB is to hold schools publicly accountable, but when this is based on one or two students (in five subgroups, for example) ◦ Students significantly impaired, working to track and scan, struggle with assessment process. • (Sturey) Schools of choice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ When identified as not meeting AYP, many of these schools have low-incidence classrooms. ◦ We then need to find other classroom locations for these settings. If we identify schools that can receive other students, we may not have classrooms for those students. Need to create additional locations, staff, and programs to move students by choice. • (Sturey) Natural conflict between NCLB, ESEA, IDEA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ No congruence between these statutory expectations for students with disabilities ◦ Law says individualized instruction, but how does this connect with standard curriculum. ◦ (Connely) performance of the student could be at 3rd grade level, but assessment is at 5th grade. Fairness. • (Holdzkom) If IEP doesn’t expect that student will perform at a certain grade level, then that student should be exempted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Then look to growth that student was expected to make in accordance with IEP ◦ Growth is in NCLB in a pilot way, but only after a school has failed to meet standard. Growth is as valuable for many students and schools as is proficiency. • (Sturey) legal definition of student with disability, student has already ‘failed’ to qualify for services – inherent unfairness in the standard. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ If student performs at grade-level, student would not qualify for services. • (Millberg) why are we allowing choice to students who are not being ‘failed’ by that school? Couldn’t it be limited to those who are not being served by the school? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Limit choice to students who are not on grade level? ◦ When you have school that fails because of one subgroup, the vast majority were served well. • (Holdzkom) If choice is the option, the assumption is that lack of choice contributed to the failure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ ‘failure’ is too quick a label for one subgroup. • (Holdzkom) We can now have subtle adjustments now that we have seen impact of NCLB 		

- Is there evidence that federal government has done program evaluation that will lead to refinements?
- (Goettee) Can we standardize the subgroup number? If a school has less than 40, that group does not 'count'
- (Goettee) First year should be in-house services, the second year should be choice. Give the school the opportunity to address the needs of the child then move to choice.
- (Webb) We do have the option to reverse that order as a pilot in NC. Prior to this year the district couldn't provide those services if in district improvement.
- (Goettee) One child counting in five subgroups is troubling. Draconian.
- (Goettee) LEP accountability – at what point do they fall under testing for regular classes.
 - (McCauley) There is a first year exemption. NCCCLASS for students who score a certain level are exempted, but this is on the way out.
 - Child who comes in with limited English skills and scores below a '4' within first year in US, the child is exempted from reading and writing testing.
 - (Holdzkorn) Law should not require us to violate ethics of testing.
 - (McCauley) If a student enrolls at the end of the year, the student is 'out' of the exemption. That year 'counted' as the first year, and there is no exemption for the upcoming year.
- McCauley) Title III. AMAO (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) set goals for LEP students: progress, proficiency, & AYP. Suggestion to get rid of AMAO 3 (AYP).
 - We are currently in improvement for Title I and Title III, but it looks differently in Title III – contradictions between regulations for different sections of legislation, and calculations are made using different clusters: 3-8 and 9-12 for Title III; 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12 for Title I.
- (Goettee) could we stratify the schools with number of subgroups in reporting AYP. There is a huge difference between a school with seven subgroups and those with twenty-five. Could we report out differently to recognize the additional challenge.
 - Suggestion: 1-10 subgroups in one group, 10-20 in another, 20 and above in a third
 - Schools at secondary that made AYP are those with very few subgroups.
 - (Holdzkorn) this year high schools looked 'worse' because of OCS
- (Millberg) When the state renorms tests, its makes it more difficult to make AYP.
 - (Holdzkorn) When the state renorms, they petition the feds to lower the requirement for that year. But to renorm, doesn't change the 2014 goal – makes the challenge steeper.
- (Hill) Until they change 2014, they are unlikely to change the issues with special programs and LEP.
- (Holdzkorn) When state BOE decided that students be more successful with more tests, this had tremendous impact on AYP.
 - Could we have flexible goals, so that 2014 could change? Then it could be an educational target, not political.
- (Millberg) what is the recommendation we want to make
 - (Holdzkorn) if we had two forms of the test that suggests a presumptive passing rate.
- (Hill) Could a recommendation focus on eligibility, holding students and teachers to a realistic target.
 - Need a realistic view of the level of education to give students. Yes, it means using categories, but it recognizes the reasons that some students will move at a different pace towards goal.
- (Millberg) How does this connect with idea of national curriculum. How will we know if the standard is connected?
 - (Holdzkorn) Assessments should be aligned with curriculum. SAT is not. We had a discussion about national curriculum, and it was rejected, but would national outcomes be a different discussion?
 - (Hargens) You would want a national assessment aligned with a curriculum. You have to do one with the other – must be aligned, or the kids will be surprised. When a student takes an assessment, the learning measured on the test should not be a surprise.
- (Goettee) I would expect in one year, one year's growth. If a certain skill level is acceptable for a certain student, then that should be the standard.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable progress. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ (Connelly) The growth per the IEP is the standard. • (Holdzkorn) 95% tested is a reasonable standard. The hardest test to make it on is the writing test. Challenge of connecting 1st semester juniors with test. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ (Millberg) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ We need a list of changes we believe should be incorporated. <p><i>Discussion continued on change recommendations. Donna Hargens stressed the importance of alignment – National assessment vs Local assessment. Additional input to consider is: National School Board Association suggestions, NEA, NCAE, and Susan Harrison's input from Legislative viewpoint. Donna will contact Susan to see if she can attend the next Student Achievement Meeting.</i></p>	<p>Next steps</p>	<p>Closing</p>
<p>Lori Millberg</p>	<p>Lori Millberg</p>	<p>5</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional input regarding NCLB recommended changes to be gathered and shared. • Update on Wilburn Elementary to be provided at September 22 meeting. • Dawn and Will to provide the Comparison Analysis and Effectiveness of Schoolwide Choice on October 27. 		

Next Meeting: September 8, 2009

Lori Millberg, Chair
Student Achievement Committee

Donna Hargens, Chief Academic Officer

Sandra Hux, Recording Secretary