Mission Statement: To ensure quality standards-based instruction to improve academic achievement for all students.

Thursday, December 4, 2014

8:00 AM Call to Order .................................................. Esther Cox, Chair
Roll Call................................................................. Esther Cox, Chair
Pledge of Allegiance ................................................ Esther Cox, Chair
Approval of Agenda for December 4, 2014..................Esther Cox, Chair
Disclosures of potential conflicts of interest ....................Esther Cox, Chair

8:15 AM Public Comment ................................................ Esther Cox, Chair
Public comment is open on agenda and non-agenda items. Comment at this oral hearing is limited to three minutes per person and five minutes per group. Public comment can be made for this meeting, during this time only, by calling 1-855-463-5009 if you are outside of Juneau. For participation from Juneau, call 463-5009. This meeting will be streamed through the Legislative Information Office over http://www.alaskalegislature.tv/ beginning at 8:00 a.m. on December 4, and 8:30 a.m. on December 5 (audio only). Click on the meeting name to listen to the meeting proceedings. When public comment is over, the meeting will continue to be broadcast at the above web site.

Comment can also be made by visiting your local Legislative Information Office (LIO). The following LIO’s will participate: Anchorage, Barrow, Bethel, Cordova, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai, Ketchikan, Kodiak, Kotzebue, Mat-Su, Nome, Seward, Sitka and Unalaska. For more information about LIO’s, call 465-4648. In the event there are more than two hours of public comment, the board may move to amend the agenda to extend the oral hearing to accommodate those
present before 7:55 a.m. who did not have an opportunity to comment. The board also reserves the right to adjourn at a later time.

**Work Session**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>1. Board Resolution for Naming SLAM</td>
<td>Commissioner Hanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Thibodeau, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 AM</td>
<td>2. Educator Certification Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Commissioner Hanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Susan McCauley, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sondra Meredith, Education Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>3. Alaska School Activities Association Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Billy Strickland, Executive Director ASAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 AM</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner Morse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 AM</td>
<td>5. June Retreat Ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 PM</td>
<td>6. Joint State Board/Board of Regents Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner Hanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>7. Report to the Legislature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner Hanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Fry, Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 PM</td>
<td>8. Charter School Reapplications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner Hanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner Morse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8A. Birchtree……………Cathy Busbey, Birchtree Charter Principal
…………………Brandt Bowen, Birchtree Charter Assistant Principal
…………………Donna Levesque, APC Member/Mentor Teacher

9. Regulations to go out for Public Comment……………..Commissioner Hanley

9A. APS Regulation……………………………………Erik McCormick, Director

9B. Assessment Regulation……………………………Erik McCormick, Director

9C. Type B Certificate……………………………..Dr. Susan McCauley, Director
……………………………………….Sondra Meredith, Education Administrator

9D. Teacher Certification Fees ………………Dr. Susan McCauley, Director
……………………………………….Sondra Meredith, Education Administrator

3:00 PM 10. Overview of the CAEPR Salary & Benefits Schedule and Teacher Tenure
Study for the Alaska Department of Administration……..Commissioner Hanley
………………Dr. Diane Hirshberg, Director for the Center for Alaska Education Policy
Research…………………………………………………………………………………..Lexi Hill, Senior Research Associate
…………………………………………Liz Brooks, Alaska Department of Administration
……………………………………………………………………………………………..Dr. Dayna DeFeo, Research Associate

3:30 PM BREAK

3:45 PM 11. Executive Session, Student Advisor Selection…………….Esther Cox, Chair

4:45 PM RECESS
Mission Statement: To ensure quality standards-based instruction to improve academic achievement for all students.

Friday, December 5, 2014

8:30 AM Call to Order and Roll Call……………………………………Esther Cox, Chair
Approval of Agenda for December 5, 2014………………….Esther Cox, Chair
Disclosures of potential conflicts of interest …………………Esther Cox, Chair

WORK SESSION CONTINUED

8:35 AM 12. Regulations to Adopt ………………………………………Commissioner Hanley

12A. Charter Schools……………………………………Elizabeth Nudelman, Director
………………………………………………………………………Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

12B. Correspondence……………………………Elizabeth Nudelman, Director
………………………………………………………………………Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

12C. Math Credits……………………………Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

12D. Restraint & Seclusion……………………….Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

12E. Residential School App………………..Elizabeth Nudelman, Director

12F. Natural & Cultural History Repository………Linda Thibodeau, Director

12G. Accountability Updates…………………Erik McCormick, Director

12H. Assessment Updates…………………..Erik McCormick, Director
12I. Standards...........................................Commissioner Hanley

10:45 AM    BREAK

Business Meeting

11:15 AM    13. Regulations to go out for Public Comment...........Commissioner Hanley

13A. APS Regulation.............................Erik McCormick, Director

13B. Assessment Regulation..........................Erik McCormick, Director

13C. Type B Certificate............................Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

13D. Teacher Certification Fees..................Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

11:30 AM    14. Regulations to Adopt.......................................Commissioner Hanley

14A. Charter Schools..................Elizabeth Nudelman, Director

14B. Correspondence..........................Elizabeth Nudelman, Director

14C. Math Credits............................Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

14D. Restraint & Seclusion..................Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

14E. Residential School App..............Elizabeth Nudelman, Director

14F. Natural & Cultural History Repository.....Linda Thibodeau, Director

14G. Accountability Updates..................Erik McCormick, Director

14H. Assessment Updates.....................Erik McCormick, Director

14I. Standards...........................................Commissioner Hanley
12:15 PM    LUNCH

Standing Reports

1:00 PM    15. Teaching & Learning Support Report ………….Dr. Susan McCauley, Director

1:15 PM    16. Assessment, Accountability & Information Management Report ………………….
                                          …………………………………………………………………………Erik McCormick, Director

1:30 PM    17. Rural Education Report………………………………Chris Simon, Coordinator

1:45 PM    18. Legislative Report………………………………….Marcy Herman, Legislative Liaison

2:00 PM    19. Mt. Edgecumbe High School Report…………………………….J Thayne, Director

2:15 PM    20. Libraries, Archives & Museums Report…………..Linda Thibodeau, Director

2:30 PM    21. Attorney General’s Report ………Rebecca Hattan, Assistant Attorney General

2:45 PM    22. Commissioner’s Report ……………………………………Commissioner Hanley

3:00 PM    23. Consent Agenda………………………………………………….Esther Cox, Chair

            23A. Approve Minutes of September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting
            23B. Approve Minutes of October 29, 2014, meeting
            23C. Approve draft annual report to the legislature
            23D. Approve Appointments to the Museum Collections Advisory Committee
            23E. Approve Birchtree Charter School Reapplication
            23F. Approve Resolution Regarding SLAM Building Name

3:15 PM    Board Comments

3:30 PM    Adjourn
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner

December 4, 2014

Agenda Item: 1

ISSUE
The board is being asked to consider a resolution supporting a name for the new State Libraries, Archives & Museums building now under construction in Juneau.

BACKGROUND
- In 2016 the Division of Libraries, Archives & Museums is scheduled to open a building in Juneau to house, protect and exhibit its collections.
- Under state law, the legislature has the authority to name state buildings.
- The division recommends that the new building be named after the Most Reverend Andrew P. Kashevaroff, who was the state museum’s first curator and the state library’s first historical librarian, serving from 1919 until his death in 1940.
- Fr. Kashevaroff was a descendent of Russian explorers and the Alutiiq people of the Kodiak region. He acquired for the library and museum hundreds of Russian objects and publications and thousands of Alaska Native artifacts.
- The division requests that the board approve a resolution in support of naming the new State Library, Archives & Museums building the Father Andrew P. Kashevaroff Library, Archives & Museum.
- Division Director Linda Thibodeau will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an informational item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 23F.
RESOLUTION OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION & EARLY DEVELOPMENT

To Name the SLAM building

Resolution 03-2014

WHEREAS, the Alaska Historical Museum and Library was established by an Act of Congress in 1900; and

WHEREAS, in 2016 the Division of Libraries, Archives & Museums in the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development is scheduled to open a state-of-the-art building to house, protect and exhibit its collections; and

WHEREAS, Alaska Territorial Governor Thomas Riggs Jr. appointed the Most Reverend Andrew P. Kashevaroff as the first Museum Curator and Historical Librarian in 1919 and he served as such until his death in 1940; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff was a vocal and energetic advocate for the Museum and Library and is fondly remembered as the institution’s “founding Father”; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff was a descendent of Russian explorers and the Alutiiq people of the Kodiak region; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff’s family connections, skill in languages, and experience working within Russian and Alaskan Native cultures afforded him special access to both cultures, a benefit to the Library and Museum; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff acquired hundreds of Russian objects and publications, and thousands of Alaska Native artifacts for the library and museum; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff was the leading historian of the Alaska Territory of the time and a highly respected scholar, educator, Russian Orthodox priest, and musician; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff took a serious approach to the study of Alaska’s history and ethnology, holding himself and other to a high standard of professionalism and accuracy, assisting both amateur and professional scholars who needed information on Alaska; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff’s own research, much of which is yet unpublished, focused upon Alaska, most specifically Tlingit culture, church history and specific objects within the Museum’s and Library’s collections; and
WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff was the first to open the Museum and Library to the public, personally welcoming tourists, assisting researchers and encouraging children to visit and explore the Museum and Library; and

WHEREAS, Fr. Kashevaroff was the first exemplar of scope and commitment of the Division of Libraries, Archives & Museum’s to protect and share Alaska’s history and culture collaboratively across disciplines, so that visitors of all ages and from all walks of life can learn more about Alaska;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the State Board of Education & Early Development recommends that the new State Library, Archives & Museums building under construction in Juneau be named the Father Andrew P. Kashevaroff Library, Archives & Museum.

PASSED and APPROVED December 5, 2014

Esther Cox, Chair,
On behalf of the State Board of Education & Early Development
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 2

ISSUE
The board will be briefed on recommendations for increasing requirements and/or rigor for teacher certification, endorsement, and highly qualified status.

BACKGROUND

• During the board meeting on March 14, 2014, the board approved changes to regulations regarding the use of Praxis II exams to gain highly qualified status, add endorsements, and qualify for professional certification.

• These changes were prompted by updates to the exam offerings by the publisher of the Praxis series of exams, Educational Testing Service (ETS), as well as inconsistencies among passing scores used for certification, highly qualified status, and endorsement.

• At that meeting, the board requested additional information regarding the advisability of, and future opportunities for, increasing requirements and/or rigor for teacher certification, endorsement, and highly qualified status.

• During the board meeting on June 5, 2014, the board requested that the department make recommendations regarding the following certification objectives:
  o Increasing the rigor of legacy content area exams;
  o Establishing a minimum score on a content area exam (i.e., Praxis II) for all endorsements;
  o Requiring educators to pass an exam to demonstrate proficiency in reading instruction and/or reading in the content area; and
  o Requiring a content-specific exam for administrators and special service providers.

• In order to bring to the board solid recommendations for possible implementation, the department convened an Educator Certification Advisory Committee composed of the following representatives:
  o Sue Hull, Alaska State Board of Education
  o Deb Lo, Dean of Education, University of Alaska Southeast
  o Heather Ryan, Dean of Education, University of Alaska Anchorage
  o Allan Morotti, Dean of Education, University of Alaska Fairbanks
  o Ann McCoy, Education Department Chair, Alaska Pacific University
  o Hilary Seitz, Associate Dean, University of Alaska Anchorage
  o Amy Vinlove, University of Alaska Fairbanks
  o Roy Roehl, University of Alaska Fairbanks
  o Richard Kern, NEA-Alaska
  o Steve Atwater, Superintendent, Kenai Peninsula Borough School District
The committee met on September 23, 2014, and November 14, 2014.

The committee considered the following topics:
- Current regulations governing testing requirements and educator certification;
- A national perspective of Alaska certification testing requirements;
- Technical considerations such as implementation timelines and to whom the requirements would be applied; and
- Impact of changing current certification requirements for recruitment and hiring of educators.

Based on feedback from the committee, EED’s recommendations to the board are as follows:
- Continue using the current passing scores for the legacy content area exams; increase rigor as new exams are adopted;
- Require a subject or content area exam for each endorsement area on an Initial and Professional teacher certificate;
- Allow teachers holding certification to add endorsements based on passing content area exams (excluding Reading, Early Childhood, Elementary and Special Education) and career and technical education professional certifications;
- Require individuals applying for Student Teacher Authorization to have passing scores on an approved basic competency exam; and
- Expand the approved list of basic competency exams to include the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American College Test (ACT);
- Require the multiple subject content area exam that provides separate scores for Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science for elementary teachers;
- Require individuals applying for a Type B Administrative certificate to demonstrate standards-relevant knowledge necessary for competent professional practice in educational leadership by examination;
- Do not add a reading examination to the requirements for teacher certification; and
- Do not add testing requirements for Type C Special Service Providers certification or for a Superintendent endorsement.

Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Sondra Meredith, Education Administrator of Teacher Certification, will be present to brief the board.

**OPTIONS**
This is an information item. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
December 4, 2014

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 3

♦ ISSUE
As requested, the board will be briefed on the activities of the Alaska School Activities Association (ASAA).

♦ BACKGROUND
  • The board has been given a report of activities in previous years from the ASAA Executive Director.
  • Billy Strickland, Executive Director of ASAA, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner

December 4, 2014

Agenda Item: 4

ISSUE

This is a briefing to the board on a study conducted by the Alaska State Policy Research Alliance (ASPRA). The study, “Alaskans’ diverse pathways from high school to higher education, employment, and postsecondary success,” was conducted to develop a deeper understanding of longitudinal data relative to pathways between high school and post-secondary options students choose.

BACKGROUND

- The Alaska State Policy Research Alliance (ASPRA) is part of the regional education laboratory, REL Northwest. ASPRA’s mission is to build capacity of stakeholders to use data and research evidence to address problems of practice.

- ASPRA provides a forum for Alaska policy makers, researchers, and other stakeholders to collectively examine evidence about challenges such as preparing students for college, career and community life.

- ASPRA currently is working on several projects: including the development of a guide for selecting policy for evaluation; supporting development of a college, career, culturally ready definition; and the study findings to be presented during this meeting on pathways from high school to post-secondary endeavors.

- The study, “Alaskans’ diverse pathways from high school to higher education, employment, and postsecondary success,” is a research project developed collectively by Alaska stakeholders participating in ASPRA, and carried out with the technical support provided by REL Northwest. The project included many participants, including the Department of Labor & Workforce Development, Alaska Commission on Post-Secondary Education, and Department of Education & Early Development. The focus of the study was to determine “what is known about pathways from high school to post-secondary options.

- Deputy Commissioner Morse will introduce the topic, and Havala Hanson, Senior Research Advisor, Education Northwest, will be present to brief the board. Also present to respond to questions from the board will be Dr. Terri Akey, ASPRA lead and Director for the Center for Research, Evaluation and Assessment; and Ashley Pierson, Senior Policy Research Advisor, both from Education Northwest.

OPTIONS

This is an information item. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

Agenda Item: 5

♦ ISSUE
During the September board meeting the board requested to discuss agenda items for the June 2015 retreat that will be held in Fairbanks on June 3, 2015.

♦ BACKGROUND
- Listed below are the June retreat ideas brought forward at the September meeting.
  - Pre-K policy – reaching more youth (sustaining growth)
  - Teacher Praxis Committee Recommendation
  - Practices of the board/policy discussion and budget
  - Members will brainstorm other ideas for consideration
  - Esther Cox, Chair, will facilitate the discussion

♦ OPTIONS
No action is required.
To:   Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development
From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 4, 2014
Agenda Item: 6

ISSUE
The board will be briefed on the activities of the Joint State Board of Education & Early Development – University of Alaska Board of Regents committee activity.

BACKGROUND

• In June the State Board of Education & Early Development and the University Of Alaska Board Of Regents met and agreed to form a joint committee to investigate, discuss and recommend activities based on common interests.

• The State Board of Education members include Chair Esther Cox and Kathleen Yarr.

• The committee met by video-conference on September 29, 2014. The topics at that meeting included:
  o Briefing on the UA “Shaping Alaska’s Future”
  o College, Career, and Cultural Readiness and Success definition development (CCCRS)
  o Teacher Quality
  o Dual enrollment

• The committee will meet again by video-conference on December 8. The focus of the agenda will be a follow up to the prior meeting. Topics will include:
  o Dual enrollment
  o Continued discussion on CCRS definition
  o Teacher loan forgiveness briefing
  o Report on PRAXIS discussion

• Chair Cox and Commissioner Hanley will brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

December 4, 2014

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 7

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to approve its annual report to the legislature.

♦ BACKGROUND
- During the 2011 legislative session, Senate Bill 1 was introduced. It requires the State Board of Education & Early Development to provide an annual report to the legislature. The bill was signed by the Governor on June 24, 2011, and became effective on August 25, 2011.

- The bill set out requirements for a report to the legislature to be made no later than the 30th legislative day of each regular session and it must be presented in person.

- The bill further set out that the report must describe efforts of the board to develop, maintain, and continuously improve a comprehensive quality public education system, as provided for under the bylaws of the board.

- The legislature added intent language that requested inclusion of the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress data in the written report.

- The first presentation to the legislature took place in January 2012.

- Behind this cover memo are the draft report and a copy of Senate Bill 1. The board may amend the report during its work session.

- Eric Fry, Information Officer, and Marcy Herman, Legislative Liaison, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
Action on this item will be taken under Agenda Item 23C.
Draft of 2015 version—actions refer to calendar year 2014

Alaska State Constitution education clause

Section 7.1 - Public Education.
The legislature shall by general law establish and maintain a system of public schools open to all children of the State, and may provide for other public educational institutions. Schools and institutions so established shall be free from sectarian control. No money shall be paid from public funds for the direct benefit of any religious or other private educational institution.

Mission of the State Board of Education & Early Development

To ensure quality standards-based instruction to improve academic achievement for all students.

REGULATIONS AND OTHER BOARD ACTIONS

Educator quality

In March, the State Board approved the use of the latest version of Praxis I and II tests for teachers and set the minimum acceptable scores. Teachers use Praxis to satisfy the state's basic competency requirement, gain highly qualified status, add endorsements, and qualify for the Professional level of certification.

In July, the State Board approved a superintendent endorsement program at the University of Alaska Southeast. The program will be offered online across the state. It is the state's only operating superintendent endorsement program.

Alaska regulations do not require school district superintendents to have a superintendent endorsement on their administrator's certificate. However, an endorsement program allows current and aspiring superintendents to study the elements of educational finance; district operations; use of technology; district governance; program planning, implementation, and evaluation; and communication with constituencies; and to participate in a leadership internship. See http://education.alaska.gov/State_Board/pdf/14_july_packet.pdf.

Technology

In July, the State Board approved regulations to implement a $5 million legislative appropriation to fund the improvement of Internet speed in public schools. The goal is to allow schools to participate in interactive videoconferencing, such as for courses under the new Digital Teaching Initiative, which will help prepare students for the Alaska Performance Scholarship and postsecondary education. See http://education.alaska.gov/State_Board/pdf/14_july_packet.pdf.
Student choice

In September, the State Board approved a regulation to require school districts to allow students in grades 7 to 12 to test out of courses in math, language arts, science, social studies, and world languages by demonstrating mastery of course material. The regulation fulfilled a requirement of House Bill 278, the Alaska Education Opportunity Act. See http://education.alaska.gov/State_Board/pdf/14_september_packet.pdf

Pupil transportation

In March, the State Board approved regulations to clarify eligible pupil transportation costs and how school districts must report pupil transportation expenditures under the Uniform Chart of Accounts. The regulations comply with AS 14.09.010(b), which required the department to provide oversight of, and support to, school districts in achieving a safe and cost-effective pupil transportation system.

Assessments

In September, the State Board approved a regulation to fulfill the student assessment requirements of House Bill 278. Repeal the high school exit exam and require 11th-grade students to take, at state expense, the SAT, ACT, or WorkKeys assessments. Accordingly, the State Board no longer requires all 11th-graders to take the WorkKeys assessments. The regulation also adopted the most recent state-allowed WorkKeys accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency. See http://education.alaska.gov/State_Board/pdf/14_september_packet.pdf

(Waiting for December actions)

In December, the State Board:

Align regulations for charter school applications, grants, and pupil transportation with a new state law.

Align regulations for correspondence study programs, including requirements for learning plans and student allotments, with a new state law.

Align regulations with a new state law regarding teacher exemptions for jury service and public reporting of aggregate enrollment and performance data about military children. Also, adjust the Alaska School Performance Index to reflect that WorkKeys assessments are no longer required of all 11th-graders.
Align regulations to a new state law regarding school districts’ applications to open residential schools. Also, give districts flexibility, in regard to variable-term residential schools, in deciding which day of the enrollment period will be used in determining state funding.

Allow waivers from required college-ready or career-ready tests, and adopt new guidelines for students to participate in state tests.

Set the criteria for the Alaska State Museum to designate local institutions as repositories of natural history and cultural materials.

Require students to have three credits of math as a condition for receiving a high school diploma.

Implement a new state law regarding the restraint and seclusion of students.

Implement a new state law prohibiting the state from spending money to implement Common Core standards.

**Accountability**

In June, the State Board approved regulations to provide fairer accountability, under the Alaska School Performance Index, for small schools in their graduation rates and for alternative schools in their graduation rates and student progress.

**The 70% instruction requirement**

In March, the State Board approved requests from five school districts for waivers from the state requirement that districts spend at least 70% of their operating funds on instruction. These waivers refer to the audited financial statements for fiscal year 2014. The districts are: Alaska Gateway, Galena, Klawock, Yakutat, and Yupiit.

In October, the State Board approved waivers for 23 districts from the state requirement to budget for fiscal year 2015 at least 70% of their operating funds for instruction. The districts are: Alaska Gateway, Aleutian Region, Bristol Bay Borough, Chatham, Copper River Hoonah City, Hydaburg City, Iditarod Area, Kake City, Kashunamuit, Kuspuk, Lake and Peninsula, Nome, North Slope Borough, North West Arctic Borough, Pelican City, Pribilof, Saint Mary’s, Skagway, Tanana City, Wrangell, Yukon Flats, and Yupiit.
New officers, members and staff

The State Board elected Esther Cox as Chair, James Fields as First Vice-Chair, and Sue Hull as Second Vice Chair, effective July 1, 2014, through June 30, 2015. Kobe Rzik of Fairbanks joined the State Board in July 2014 as student advisor for a one-year term.

The State Board approved Lisa Miller as its executive secretary, Heidi Teshner as the department’s administrative services director, and Troy Thayne as director of Mt. Edgecumbe High School.

Resolutions

The State Board approved resolutions in support of the Alaska Education Opportunity Act and in support of repealing the High School Graduation Qualifying Exam.

SIGNIFICANT STEPS

Implementing standards and assessments

AMP
ALASKA MEASURES OF PROGRESS

The department’s website provides easy access for educators, parents, the media, and the general public to understand Alaska’s new standards and assessments. See https://education.alaska.gov

The department regularly emails a newsletter to school districts and education organizations to alert them to resources and professional-development events. The department participates in conferences and trainings with educators. See http://education.alaska.gov/akstandards/ See http://education.alaska.gov/akassessments/ See http://education.alaska.gov/akaccountability/

The department provides paper copies of the Parent Guide to Alaska’s Standards for English Language Arts and Mathematics and a web page. See http://education.alaska.gov/akparentscommunity/#c3gtabs-standards

At the beginning of this school year, the department distributed 110,000 copies of a brochure to introduce parents to the new assessments in English language arts and math, the Alaska
Measures of Progress (AMP). The department distributed to all K-12 educators a four-page introduction to AMP.

Alaska will assess students in English language arts and math in grades 3 through 10 in the spring, as it has done since 2005. But there are some changes under AMP.

Before, students took separate tests in reading, writing, and math for three days in a row. Combined, the tests had up to 185 questions. The tests were untimed but, typically, students spent one to two hours on each test.

Now, students will take just two tests in those subjects -- English language arts and math -- with a combined total of 140 questions. The tests are still untimed. But schools don't have to give the tests on consecutive days. And schools can break up each test into shorter sections and give students just one section a day. If schools do that, students would answer 15 or 25 questions in a sitting. In 2015, the window for schools to give AMP tests is March 30 through May 1.

Students with disabilities may be eligible for accommodations. Students with severe cognitive disabilities may be eligible to take an alternate test.

AMP is more challenging and more engaging than our former tests. Students will fill in fewer multiple-choice bubbles. Instead, in some questions, students will have to analyze the question, perform multi-step tasks, solve problems, and apply what they know to new situations. In short, there are more opportunities to measure higher-order thinking.

Students will take the tests on a computer. In math problems, students might drag and drop items, put items in order, or plot points on a graph. In answering a language arts question, students might highlight text. Using computers, students actively participate in the test. With technology practice tests, students will learn how to answer questions using the computer's tools. See https://education.alaska.gov/akassessments/.

Schools that don't have enough computer capacity will use paper for now. The computer tests and paper tests have the same questions. The state will work with schools to increase their computer capacity.

The state will offer districts free tools to check whether students are on track while instruction is taking place. Short classroom tests on specific learning goals will have 8-10 questions. Longer computer-based interim tests will be available next school year.

Alaska hired Achievement & Assessment Institute at the University of Kansas to create tests for our standards. Alaska owns the tests. Alaskan educators are:
- reviewing the test questions for clarity, relevance, fairness, and cultural bias;
- helping define the achievement levels;
- helping decide which high school standards will be assessed on grade 9 and grade 10 tests; and
- writing passages of text for the English language arts test.
Students' scores will place them in one of four levels of performance defined by Alaska educators: Level 1, 2, 3 and 4, from low to high. Level 3 represents meeting the standards. But Level 1 and Level 2 do not represent failure by students or teachers.

Students' scores on AMP in 2015 will serve as a baseline. As students take AMP tests in future years, educators can see whether they are growing in their English language arts and math skills. Alaska needs a new baseline because it has a new goal: Students will graduate with the English language arts and math skills to succeed in the workplace, training, or education of their choice. Because the Alaska Measures of Progress are so different from our former tests, Alaskans shouldn't compare results from the two tests.

Parents and educators will receive reports about their students' results. No data about individual students will be released to the federal government. Alaska has never done so.

AMP scores are one source of information to help parents and educators decide whether students need more support in learning English language arts and math. Other sources of information are classroom assessments and parents' and teachers' observations. Together, parents and educators look at the whole student.

AMP scores also help school districts and the state decide if a school needs to make improvements and what those should be.

Schools and districts will receive reports on their assessed students in these 10 aggregates: all students; economically disadvantaged; students with disabilities; English language learners; Alaska Native/american-Indians; Asians/Pacific Islanders; African-Americans; Hispanics; Caucasians; and two or more races. The aggregate reports are public information.

**School Accountability System: the Alaska School Performance Index (ASPI)**

The Alaska School Performance Index measures schools by a combination of data: student achievement on the state's reading, writing and math assessments; growth in the school's student body in those assessments from the prior year; and attendance. Schools with high school students also are measured by graduation rates and student performance on college-ready and career-ready assessments such as the SAT, ACT, and WorkKeys.

The ratings released in fall 2014 reflect student performance in the 2013-2014 school year. Seventy-five of 501 rated schools earned five stars, the highest rating; 198 schools are four-star schools; 149 schools are three-star schools; 52 schools are two-star schools; and 27 schools are one-star schools. Collectively, 93% of students attended schools in 2013-2014 that earned three stars or above. See [http://education.alaska.gov/aspi/](http://education.alaska.gov/aspi/).

**Reward Schools**
Under the Alaska School Performance Index, the department recognized 41 schools as 2014 Reward Schools to honor their student achievement from the 2013-2014 school year. There are two categories: highest performing and high progress.

See

Grants to expand STEM in middle schools

The department awarded grants to two nonprofit organizations for pilot projects to expand STEM education for underserved public middle school students. The grants, which were proposed in HB 278, will provide funding for three years beginning in fiscal year 2015. The grantees — the Alaska Native Science and Engineering Program (ANSEP) and the Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC) — will partner with school districts from around the state.

ANSEP’s grant will expand its Middle School Academy, which is a two-week residential science and engineering experience. ANSEP has four academies now, and plans to have eight academies the first year and 12 academies the following two years.

SERRC’s grant will have four components: 1) three week-long STEM Career Awareness Academies; 2) one two-week STEM Summer Camp; 3) community-based after-school STEM Clubs; and 4) a supported technology-based social learning network for program participants.

SELECTED K-12 TOPICS

Awareness campaign for early literacy

In accordance with AS 14.03.072(a), the department continues to implement a campaign to improve parental awareness of the importance of early literacy. The department distributes brochures to inform parents about their schools' intervention strategies, home literacy plans, grade retention policies, and strategies and resources to help children learn to read. The department maintains a web page to serve as a resource for parents about literacy research and ways to help their children at home. See
http://education.alaska.gov/akparentscommunity/#c3gtabs-earlylit

State System of Support (SSOS)

The State System of Support, established in regulation at 4 AAC 06.872, strengthens school improvement efforts across the state through the following efforts:
The department designates districts as Tier I, II or III, to determine what levels of support SSOS will give. Tier III districts receive the greatest support.

The department designates Priority Schools and Focus Schools based on their Alaska School Performance Index rating and student-performance data. Priority Schools are those Title I schools most likely to benefit from a significant program of improvement. Focus Schools are Title I schools that would benefit from an improvement program targeted to specific needs. Title I schools receive federal anti-poverty funds to improve student performance. Federal school improvement funds have been made available to Priority and Focus Schools.

The department assists 1-star and 2-star schools under the Alaska School Performance Index on required School Improvement Planning.

SSOS coaches serve selected low-performing schools with monthly five-day visits and distance coaching between visits. The coaches average more than two decades of experience in education. All have some experience in rural Alaska. Some coaches have been principals. The local school's leader and the coach create a plan of service with specific measurable goals, specific actions, and designated responsibilities.

SSOS operates under its Effective Schools Framework, which deals with leadership, curriculum, instruction, professional development, assessment, and supportive learning environment. These topics are central to the Alaska STEPP (Steps Toward Educational Progress and Partnership) online planning tool, which schools use to plan and implement school improvement.

Career and technical education

The Department of Labor and Workforce Development received state funding for fiscal year 2015 to help implement the Alaska Career and Technical Education Plan. The departments of education, labor, and the University of Alaska are partners in the plan.

Grant awardees are: Hiland Mountain Correctional Facility to train to install solar photoelectronics; AVTEC to buy a refrigeration simulator; Bering Strait School District and Northwestern Alaska Career and Technical Education Center to develop airframe and power plant mechanics; Galena City School District to develop construction and automotive technology programs; Iditarod Area School District to prepare for a shared use of its residential facility.

Also: Juneau School District to train students in health sciences and fisheries; Kenai Peninsula Borough School District to develop a middle school computer-drafting course; Kodiak Island Borough School District to develop a STEM Academy; Kuskokwim School District to pilot a mining career pathway; North Slope Borough School District to develop an engineering and technology pathway.

Also: Pribilof School District to use the Young Alaskan Fisherman Training Academy; UAA Mat-Su to buy Cisco computer equipment for training programs that lead to certification;
Wrangell School District to improve its maritime program; Yukon-Koyukuk School District to develop a natural resources pathway; and Yuut Eltnaurviat to develop a mining trades camp.

Alaska’s Learning Network (AKLN)

Now in its fourth school year, Alaska’s Learning Network offers online courses taught by highly qualified Alaska teachers, as well as professional development for teachers who create and teach online courses. The University of Alaska Southeast’s School of Education operates AKLN. This school year’s fall enrollment is 376.

AKLN helps provide an equitable education for rural students and helps students throughout Alaska graduate on time. AKLN’s courses meet all curricular eligibility requirements for the Alaska Performance Scholarship and for college entry in general. Some courses offer dual credit with a postsecondary institution. Course options include Advanced Placement and honors, as well as credit recovery.

AKLN is not a school in itself. The network partners with all 54 Alaska school districts, and has an advisory board of school district superintendents and community members. Alaska’s school districts oversee their students’ use of AKLN’s courses and grant credit. Courses often blend face-to-face learning from local teachers with online learning. The online portion of courses is taught by Alaska teachers.

AKLN is funded by $850,000 in state general funds and by course fees, which are paid by the districts. See http://www.aklearn.net/

Alaska Digital Teaching Initiative

The Alaska Digital Teaching Initiative is a three-year, $15 million demonstration project to give students better access to high-quality teachers in college-preparatory courses such as science, technology, engineering, and math. The initiative supports students, especially in rural areas, who are striving to be eligible for the Alaska Performance Scholarship. The initiative promotes educational choice at the course level.

The Kenai Peninsula Borough School District received an $819,915 grant and is partnering with the Bristol Bay Borough School District and the Cordova City School District. The grant will increase distance-delivered math, science, and Advanced Placement courses; train and evaluate teachers for best practices in online and blended instruction; create support services; codify best practices; and conduct replication studies in the Bristol Bay and Cordova school districts. Blended instruction refers to courses that are partly in-person and partly online.

The Copper River School District received a $652,053 grant and will partner with small, remote districts. The grant will expand access to high-quality, Alaska Performance Scholarship-eligible courses, including dual-credit high school/university coursework and innovative college-
career-focused elective courses through True North Academy Online, an online high school that dovetails with a planned variable-length residential educational program.

The Kodiak Island Borough School District received an $890,260 grant and is partnering with the Pribilof, Lower Kuskokwim, Lower Yukon, Northwest Arctic, Lake and Peninsula, Nome, St. Mary's, and Annette Island school districts. The grant will increase student engagement and academic performance in core content areas with an emphasis in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM); increase life-literacy skills; enhance and expand online delivery models; and create a network of well-trained online educators.

The Ketchikan Borough School District received an $837,744 grant and is partnering with the Craig, Annette Island, Klawock, Hydaburg, and Southeast Island school districts to create Alaska Digital Academies. The grant will provide an online enrollment portal to high-quality interactive courses for middle and high school students taught by highly qualified teachers who are proficient in distance technology and who understand alternative forms of education.

School safety and suicide prevention

The department’s newly created Suicide Awareness, Prevention and Intervention eLearning course became available at no cost to districts in August. The course helps districts comply with state law, which mandates annual training for educators who serve public school students in grades 7-12. See http://education.alaska.gov/ELEarning/. Also see http://education.alaska.gov/tls/suicide/.

The department received a $9.1 million federal grant to improve school safety by addressing mental health issues in school-aged youth through Alaska’s Project AWARE. The five-year award will provide $1.8 million annually for districtwide Youth Mental Health First Aid training in Anchorage, Mat-Su, and Kenai, and targeted mental health resources to the following alternative schools in those districts: Burchell High School, Valley Pathways, Mat-Su Central School, Avail School, Crossroads School, Benson Secondary/S.E.A.R.C.H., S.A.V.E. High School, Kenai Alternative High School, and Homer Flex School.

Teacher mentoring

The Alaska Statewide Mentor Project, a partnership of the department and the University of Alaska, has been serving school districts since the 2004-2005 school year. One of its main goals is to improve teacher retention, particularly in rural districts, so that students can benefit from experienced teachers.

Teacher retention is defined as a teacher remaining in the Alaska public K-12 school system from one year to the next, although not necessarily at the same school. Retention has fluctuated
between 72% and 85% for rural teachers served by mentoring. This is an improvement over the retention rates of new teachers in rural districts before mentoring, which was 67% on average.

Since the project began, mentors have served in 52 of Alaska’s 54 districts and 49% of Alaska’s approximately 500 public schools. The state funds mentors in rural districts. A federal grant funds mentors in Anchorage, Kenai Peninsula, Fairbanks, Mat-Su, and Sitka. This school year 36.5 mentors are serving 508 teachers in 246 schools within 40 school districts.

OTHER DEPARTMENT FUNCTIONS

Mt. Edgecumbe High School

Mt. Edgecumbe is the state-operated residential school in Sitka. The State Board serves as the Mt. Edgecumbe board. Parents and others participate on an advisory board.

In fall 2014, 427 students from 107 villages throughout Alaska attended Mt. Edgecumbe. Sixty-two percent of the student body is female. Alaska Native students compose 84% of the student population; 10% are Caucasian; and 6% are mixed ethnicity. Fifty-five percent of students meet federal guidelines for free and reduced-price lunches.

Mt. Edgecumbe freshmen and sophomores take the state’s standards-based assessments in reading, writing, and math. In reading, 80.77% of freshmen and sophomores were proficient; in writing, 84.53% were proficient; and in math 74.73% were proficient.

The school’s Alaska School Performance Index score for this school year is 92.80 of 100 possible points, giving it four stars. The school’s four-year graduation rate last school year was 91.30%; the five-year rate was 98.57%. (This does not include students who transferred out of MEHS and attended another school.) MEHS’s attendance rate was 96.05%.

Alaska State Council on the Arts

The council supports educators, artists, community-based organizations and statewide partners in delivery of arts education in school and community settings. The council awards funding to Alaskan schools, districts, educators and arts/community-based organizations in several categories. Other grants to communities also serve students through school outreach and education programs provided by Alaskan arts and culture organizations.

In August 2014, the council published Venture for Alaska’s Youth, a report on the state of arts education in Alaska’s public schools. The report included a survey of 40 districts serving 92% of Alaska’s students in the topics of arts curriculum and instruction, qualified teachers, professional development, budget and resource allocation, and leadership and policy. Over the past five years, more districts have adopted a written arts curriculum and employ more highly qualified arts

In fiscal year 2014, the Artists in Schools program funded 13 individual school residencies and 9 multi-site district residency programs. The program awarded $122,830 to these projects, serving approximately 25,702 Alaskans, including 17,201 students. In fiscal year 2014, more than 5,895 students were served by Rasmuson Foundation Cultural Collaborations grants, working with more than 117 artists in communities.

The Division of Libraries, Archives and Museums (LAM)

The State Libraries, Archives & Museums Building, now under construction, will place the Alaska State Museums, the Alaska State Archives, and the Alaska State Libraries in one facility at the site of the current State Museum. The new building is scheduled to open in April 2016. See http://lam.alaska.gov/slam.

LAM benefits lifelong and K-12 education. Examples are:

- Live Homework Help monitors live tutoring for students in grades 4 to early college, seven days a week, from noon to 2 a.m. Use has grown exponentially in the past six years. See http://sled.alaska.edu/homework.
- An early literacy project sent public library materials for children age 2 to 4.
- OWL provided non-Internet computers for early learning and digital literacy to Alaska’s 100 public libraries. See http://www.awelarning.com.
- Alaska’s Digital Archives shares historical Alaskan videos, photographs and documents for students and researchers. See www.vilda.education.edu.
- In Alaska’s Digital Pipeline are hundreds of full-text online books, magazines, newspapers and other research resources specifically targeted to elementary, middle school, high school, and college student academic needs. See http://sled.alaska.edu/databases/
- Many school districts’ Alaska Native language materials are scanned and available online.

Alaska Professional Teaching Practices Commission

The Professional Teaching Practices Commission governs educators’ ethical and professional standards and educators’ compliance with state law and contractual obligations. The commission reports by fiscal year, not calendar year. In fiscal year 2014, the commission reviewed 69 cases and levied 12 sanctions, compared with 56 cases and 14 sanctions the year before. The sanctions were: two for sexual misconduct with students; two for criminal misconduct not involving drugs; three for contract violations; and five for professional misconduct. See http://education.alaska.gov/ptpc/pdf/2014_annual_report.pdf
STUDENT DATA

Graduation and dropout rates

The federal government requires all states to use the same method to calculate graduation rates. The Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate was first implemented in Alaska with the 2010-2011 school year.

A cohort graduation year is assigned to each 9th-grade student in the fall of his or her initial entry. For example, a student who entered 9th grade in the 2010-2011 school year would be considered part of the 2014 graduation cohort group. A student may be added to the cohort as a transfer into the public school system or removed from the cohort upon transfer to an education program with a secondary school diploma track. A deceased student would be removed from the cohort group.

A graduate is defined as a student who has received a regular diploma from a state- or district-approved education program, as evidenced by receipt of a secondary school diploma from school authorities.

The Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate is reported as a fraction. The numerator is the sum of the number of graduates within the cohort who receive a regular diploma on or before June 30. The denominator is the sum of all students assigned to the cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Graduate Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>6,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>7,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>7,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>7,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>8,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>8,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>8,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>7,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>7,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>7,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Prior to the 2011 school year, the denominator was the sum of the number of graduates, plus the number of unduplicated dropouts in the current year and the previous three years, plus the number of grade 12 continuing students.
Graduate count represents any student who graduated with a regular diploma during the school year (July 1-June 30).

Alaska also calculates the graduation rate for a five-year cohort of students, which includes students who graduated in four years and five years. In 2014 the five-year graduation rate was 76.4%.

Dropout rates are calculated by dividing the total number of students dropping out of public school, in grades 7-12, by the October 1 enrollment count for all students in grades 7-12. Preliminary information for the 2013-2014 school year shows a grade 7-12 dropout rate of 4.0%, which is stable from 4.0% in 2012-2013. The dropout rate has generally declined from 6.0% in 2004-2005.

**State assessment results**

Alaska students have been taking the state’s Standards Based Assessments in reading, writing and mathematics in grades 3 through 10, and in science in grades 4, 8 and 10. School year 2013-2014 was the final administration of the Standards Based Assessments. This school year, students will start taking the Alaska Measures of Progress, which are assessments in English language arts and math in grades 3 through 10. Students will continue to take science assessments in grades 4, 8 and 10.

For all assessed students statewide in the 2013-2014 Standards Based Assessments, 80.0% scored proficient or advanced in reading; 74.7% proficient or advanced in writing; and 68.3% proficient or advanced in math. Those numbers are similar to the previous five years.

In the science assessment, the percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced ranged from a high of 65.2% in grade 10 to a low of 50.8% in grade 4.

The final administration of the repealed Alaska High School Graduation Qualifying Examination also was in the 2013-2014 school year. Of 10th-graders (who were taking the test for the first time) 84.4% passed the reading portion, 75.8% passed the writing portion, and 76.8% passed the math portion. Nearly 66% passed all three portions in 10th grade.

The department publicized students’ opportunity to receive retroactive diplomas. School districts contacted eligible students at the last-known address.


**National Assessment of Educational Progress**
Every two years the U.S. Department of Education, through the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), tests large samples of 4th-graders and 8th-graders in each state in reading and mathematics, including about half of Alaska’s students in those grades.

A science test is given to a much smaller sample of 8th-graders, including about a fifth of Alaska’s 8th-graders. No science test was given in 2013.

Alaska has participated in the reading and math tests since 2003 and in the science test since 2011. The most recent NAEP assessments were in 2013.

NAEP’s state and nationwide results are presented as average scores on a scale of 000 to 500. The “scale scores” fall into four categories of achievement as defined by NAEP: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. Thus, NAEP also reports the percentage of students who fall within those categories of achievement.

In general, NAEP’s definition of proficiency is more rigorous than that of many states. In NAEP, “basic” refers to partial mastery of the subject. “Proficient” refers to competency in challenging material, including knowledge, application, and analytical skills. “Advanced” is superior performance.

In the highest-scoring state overall in 2013, 48% and 49% of students scored proficient or above on the 4th-grade and 8th-grade NAEP reading tests, respectively. 59% and 54% scored proficient or above on the 4th-grade and 8th-grade math tests, respectively. Researchers estimate that in the highest-scoring nations on international assessments, 46% to 58% of their students would score proficient or above on the NAEP.

The following data, comparing Alaska results to the national average, are from the 2013 tests.

**Math**
- Alaska 4th grade: 76% basic or above; 36% proficient or above; 6% advanced.
- Nation 4th grade: 83% basic or above; 42% proficient or above; 8% advanced.
- Alaska’s average scale score is 236, which is lower than 40 states.
- The national average is 241.

- Alaska 8th grade: 72% basic or above; 33% proficient or above; 7% advanced.
- Nation 8th grade: 73% basic or above; 34% proficient or above; 8% advanced.
- Alaska’s average scale score is 282 which is lower than 29 states.
- The national average is 284.

**Reading**
- Alaska 4th grade: 58% basic or above; 28% proficient or above; 6% advanced.
- Nation 4th grade: 67% basic or above; 34% proficient or above; 8% advanced.
- Alaska’s average scale score is 209, which is lower than 46 states.
- The national average is 221.
Alaska 8th grade: 76% basic or above; 36% proficient or above; 6% advanced.
Nation 8th grade: 83% basic or above; 42% proficient or above; 8% advanced.
Alaska’s average scale score is 261, which is lower than 37 states.
The national average is 266.

In addition to the reading and math assessments, a NAEP science test is given to a smaller sample of 8th-graders from each state, including about a fifth of Alaska’s 8th-graders. Alaska has participated in the science test since 2011, which is the latest administration.

Science 2011
Alaska 8th grade: 68% basic or above; 34% proficient or above; 1% advanced.
Nation 8th grade: 65% basic or above; 32% proficient or above; 2% advanced.
Alaska’s average scale score is 153, which is lower than 25 states.
The national average is 151.

See http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/naep/NAEPNewsletterFall2013.pdf

**WorkKeys assessments**

School year 2013-2014 marks the final year in which the state required 11th-graders to take WorkKeys assessments in reading for information, applied mathematics, and locating information (in visual formats). The assessments were developed by ACT with assistance from employers.

In accordance with the Alaska Education Opportunity Act, the State Board no longer requires students to take WorkKeys assessments. Instead, 11th-graders will choose an assessment among the SAT, ACT, and WorkKeys, administered once at state expense.

Students who earn a combined score of at least 13, with no score lower than 4, on WorkKeys have met the assessment requirement for an Alaska Performance Scholarship for a postsecondary certificate program, such as in the trades. In addition, students who score well receive a nationally recognized career-readiness certificate in one of four categories: bronze, silver, gold, and platinum.

Of the 9,432 students who took WorkKeys between August 2013 and December 2014, 7,600 (80.6%) earned a certificate.

- Winning a bronze certificate were 2,046 students (21.7% of all test-takers)
- Silver 4,511 students (47.8% of all test-takers)
- Gold 1,031 students (10.9% of all test-takers)
- Platinum 12 students (.001% of all test-takers)
RECOMMENDATIONS
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner  

December 4, 2014

Agenda Item: 8A

♦ ISSUE
- The Board is being asked to approve the application of the Birchtree Charter School for a period of ten years, terminating on March 28, 2025. The initial charter was approved in 2010 for five years.

♦ BACKGROUND
- On September 17, 2014, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough School Board approved Birchtree Charter School’s reapplication for a period of ten years.

- The attached Overview and Charter School Rating Template provide the standard information provided to the State Board during charter school reapplication requests.

- Additional information of relevance is related to communication between Birchtree and the department related to the early literacy screening assessment requirements of state statute and regulation
  o Over the past 6 months, the department has responded to multiple requests from Birchtree to be exempted from administering the early literacy screening assessments required by AS 14.03.244(c) and 4 AAC 06.713.
  o Birchtree cited a waiver provided in their original charter exempting them from the local district requirement to conduct early literacy screening assessments.
  o The department explained that a waiver written in a charter or a contract between the charter school and a school district may not supersede a state statute, and neither a local school board nor the department has the authority to waive state law.
  o State statute 14.03.255(c) prescribes that “a charter school is subject to tests required by the department.”
  o State regulation 06.713 requires a district to administer an approved early literacy screening assessment to all students in kindergarten, first, and second grade, and to third-grade students identified as experiencing delays during second grade.
  o Birchtree administered the required early literacy screening assessment. However, upon receiving the screening data from Birchtree, no data was provided for 11 of its 49 kindergarten students who were exempted by parent request from the literacy screening assessment.
  o The department notified Birchtree and the Mat-Su Borough School District that there is no language in 4 AAC 06.713 that allows for a waiver from early literacy screening for students enrolled in the
applicable grades. Birchtree was informed that compliance with 4 AAC 06.713 required that all students be assessed.
  o Birchtree submitted all of the required data on November 5, 2014.

- Behind this cover memo are the Birchtree Overview Document and the Birchtree Rating Template.

- Les Morse, Deputy Commissioner, will brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is an information item. Action will take place under 23E.
## Birchtree Charter School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>History</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opened in 2010 with an initial 5-year charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeking a 10- year renewal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently: 363 students for the 2014-15 school year, and a future goal of 422 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grades K-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher/student ratio: 1:18 in kindergarten, 1:24 in grades 1-6, and 1:20 in grades 7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Location: 7107 E. Palmer-Wasilla Hwy, Palmer, Alaska, 99645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two portable classrooms have been added for FY 15, and two additional portables will be added for FY 16 to accommodate student growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible development of a long-term plan for a new facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 23 full-time teachers (includes German teacher, handwork teacher, orchestra teacher, movement teacher, 2 special education teachers), half-time counselor, half-time instructional coach, and half-time special education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 administrators, 2 secretaries, 7 classroom assistants, 1 parent coordinator, 3 special education aides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program budget is $3,857,687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rent is $438,660.71.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides a holistic standards-based Waldorf program, enhancing student growth through the arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academics are introduced in Grade 1 and formalized in Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implements the “loop” model – one teacher stays with class through Grade 5, possibly through Grade 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alaska School Performance Index (ASPI) rating: 4 stars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited transportation; no lunch program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parents volunteer 36 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Rating Template for Application

This Rating Template is a guideline of criteria to be addressed in an application for a charter. Please see the directions included in the application for more information.

Upon receipt of an application to operate a charter school, the Department’s Charter School Technical Review Team will evaluate the application using this Rating Template. The team will identify any deficiencies in the application and determine if any modifications or additional information are necessary. Once the Technical Review Team deems that the application is acceptable, it will be sent to the State Board of Education for approval.

The rating template is in a scoring guide format and will be used by the EED Charter School Technical Review Team to evaluate applications received. Each item on the rating template corresponds to one of the fifteen criteria in the application.

The charter school will need to properly address the question(s) under each criterion. For instance, number “1.” concerns the “Academic Policy Committee”. There are two questions in this section that need to be addressed.

Under the question in each section are guidelines regarding “what the reviewers will look for,” followed by “suggested sources of evidence”. These two review guidelines should assist the charter school in properly submitting what the technical review team and State Board want in the review process. If a question in one of the criteria is not applicable, please write that in your application. For example, if this is a first application (a new charter school), the shaded NA check boxes indicate the question may not apply, but must be addressed with comments for future plans to deal with the specific issue.

The application should not leave to the reader any responsibility for deciphering the explanation or interpreting the evidence presented. Successful applicants will also identify weaknesses, as well as strengths, and will explain why the weaknesses do not outweigh the school’s strengths.

The application and rating template is a response to questions about the school’s performance and to questions about the school’s future. In conclusion, the charter school’s application should be looked upon favorably by the State Board of Education and Early Development if the fifteen criteria are adequately addressed.
Requirements

Timeline:
(a) An initial charter application (after local school board approval) for a new or conversion school may not be submitted to the Department of Education & Early Development sooner than twelve (12) months prior to the start-up of the school.
(b) An existing charter school cannot apply for reapplication to the state sooner than twelve (12) months before the expiration date of their charter.
(c) The completed application materials shall be presented to the local school board, which will then forward the application to the Alaska Department of Education & Early Development's charter school program manager as required by AS 14.03.250(c).
(d) Mail to:
   Alaska Department of Education & Early Development
   Attn: Charter School Program Manager
   801 W. 10th Street, Suite 200
   PO Box 110500
   Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500
(e) 4 AAC 33.110(g) states: “No later than 20 working days after a local school board's decision to approve or deny an application for a charter school, the local school board shall mail to the Department of Education & Early Development the application and the decision, including the supporting documents required by (a) of this section, and the minutes of the local school board meeting at which the charter school was approved or denied....”
(f) The completed application must be in the hands of the charter school program manager no later than 90 days before the next regular scheduled meeting of the State Board of Education & Early Development. See schedule at: www.eed.state.ak.us/State_Board/

Required Format:
1. Not more than 200 pages single-sided, unbound, in 12 point font.
2. ALL pages numbered in consecutive order (i.e. 1, 2, 3, ...200).
3. A table of contents.
4. Follow in numerical order the numbered headings of the application.
5. ALL numbered headings and subheadings must be addressed.

Application will not be read if any of the above five requirements are not met.
## Charter Schools Rating Template

**A= Adequate**  
**IA= Inadequate**  
**NA= Not Applicable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Charter School:</th>
<th>Birchtree Charter School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Application and Rating Template:</td>
<td>10/3/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District:</td>
<td>Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Has the school’s independent academic policy committee operated at an acceptable level?</td>
<td>☑️ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The Academic Policy Committee (APC) is comprised of 7 parents/guardians, 2 teachers, and the principal (non-voting member). Monthly meetings are conducted with special sessions as needed. An annual retreat is held to work on the strategic plan. Board training is provided for all APC members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is there an independent academic policy on file?</td>
<td>☑️ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The academic policy is included in the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school is meeting the objectives as stated in the independent academic policy.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** The number of academic policy sessions and the minutes from those committee meetings.
## 2. LAW PROVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a. To be valid, the application must include a separate, signed, charter school contract with the district, addressing the fourteen provisions as listed under AS 14.03.255(c)(1 – 14). | ☑ | ☐ | ☐ | Yes. A signed contract containing all required provisions is in place. |
| b. Have the responsibilities of the academic policy committee regarding provisions of the law been fully addressed? | ☑ | ☐ | ☐ | Yes. The by-laws document this requirement. |
| c. Is the charter school within the bounds of the most current applicable statutory and regulatory requirements? | ☑ | ☐ | ☐ | Yes. The by-laws document this requirement. |

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school complies with applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations in regards to the academic policy.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Charter contract, charter school bylaws, and minutes of meetings where committee has adopted bylaws, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. EDUCATION PROGRAMS</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Has the school made reasonable progress in meeting its academic goals?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Birchtree Charter's goals are based on the Waldorf model with the academic focus beginning in Grade 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Has the school demonstrated progress, where applicable, on the statewide assessment?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Progress is evident at the upper grade (middle school) levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Has the school demonstrated progress, where applicable, on other assessments?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Progress is evident by MAP scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Does the school use its assessment data to drive decision-making in curriculum and instruction?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Assessment results are reviewed at monthly grade level meetings. Staff includes an instructional coach hired for additional support to teachers and students in meeting goals. Reading and math curriculum is available to support remedial and mainstream reading and math instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Where performance-based assessments are used, does the school have clear criteria?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Criteria has been set by the district and the school continues to work on improving standardized test scores. The school continues to work on curriculum development to merge the Waldorf Curriculum with the Alaska State Standards. Rubrics are developed for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school is providing an instructional program that meets or exceeds the academic standards, including assessments set by the state.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Promotion & graduation requirements & results of assessments that determine whether students are achieving standards.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Is the school implementing a well-conceived plan to ensure equal and bias-free access for all students, for all facilities, courses, programs, activities, and services?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Students with varying backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles may benefit from the program. Information regarding the school is targeted to reach all parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> Is the school systematically addressing the needs of students who do not perform at acceptable levels of proficiency in the statewide assessment program?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Creative scheduling, differentiated instruction, modified groupings, and teaching assistants are some of the ways the school works with struggling students. There is also an intervention team to work on targeted goals for students using a 3-tier Response to Intervention (RTI) plan of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> Is the school systematically informing parents of their child’s performance and progress?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. This is documented by twice-yearly parent-teacher conferences, standards-based report cards for the first two semesters, and comprehensive assessments at the end of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong> Did the charter school provide student assessment participation rates?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. In 2013-14, the school achieved 100% participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong> Has the charter school made a comparison between their assessment scores and the district’s assessment data?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The school’s assessment scores are in line with district data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong> Has the charter school made a comparison between their assessment scores and the state’s assessment data?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The school’s assessment scores are in line with state data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g.</strong> Has the charter school shown disaggregated scores across all categories?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**h.** Does the school provide professional development that is goal-based and driven, in large part, by the student assessment data?

Yes. Waldorf presenters assist staff with professional development, as well as the ability of staff to travel to other Waldorf schools to make observations. Additionally, training specific to purchased curriculum materials, conferences, and weekly early release days for staff planning occur.

**i.** Is the school implementing a well-conceived plan to demonstrate progress over time?

Yes. The plan is to continue to implement a whole child curriculum using the Waldorf model.

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school is meeting the objectives agreed to for program achievement, particularly assessment data comparisons, student assessment participation rates, and disaggregated scores across all categories.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Implementation of approved plans for special education, relevant data regarding enrollment & services provided to special needs & bilingual students, school schedule & calendar, and student records of statewide assessment performance. Also, student report card/progress report & description of staff development activities.

### 5. ADMISSION PROCEDURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a.** Does the school have admission procedure criteria?

Yes. Admission is open to all eligible students; the expectations are outlined in the registration information given to parents.

**b.** Are eligible students specifically defined?

Yes. All students living within the district boundaries are eligible.

**c.** What are the provisions for accommodating additional students, if necessary?

Yes. Procedures for a lottery and waitlists are in place.

**d.** Is there a lottery or other type of provision for random drawing for enrollment when applicants exceed the school’s capacity?

Yes. A waitlist is created for each grade level and used to fill open seats as they occur.

**e.** Is there a provision for accommodating vacancies that may occur mid-year?

Yes. Families on the waiting list will be contacted for mid-year vacancies.

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school is viable in terms, of student admissions, and has adequate provisions for accommodating additional students and a plan for random drawing for enrollment when applicants exceed capacity.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Enrollment data, turnover data, waiting list data, exit interviews or surveys, and written admissions/enrollment procedures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. ALTERNATIVE OPTION</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is there a provision in place for students who do not wish to attend the charter school, even though it's the only option?</td>
<td>☑ ☐ ☒</td>
<td>The Mat-Su Borough School District has neighborhood schools and other options available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence through a local written provision that there are alternative choices for students who choose not to attend the local charter school, even though it is the only local school available.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Check local provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is there an administrative policy that follows charter school law?</td>
<td>☑ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District Charter School policy and Birchtree Charter School Bylaws adhere to local and state laws and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Does the school present evidence that there is a full and abiding understanding of the obligations of the administration in providing for the control and supervision of the charter school?</td>
<td>☑ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The duties and responsibilities of the administration are clearly stated in the bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is there compelling evidence that the school’s leadership is strong?</td>
<td>☑ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The student population continues to increase which has required an additional administrator. Principal turnover has been low since the school opened. Strong leadership is also provided by the Academic Policy Committee and the Birchtree Parent Guild.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Is there compelling evidence that the school has handled organizational challenges effectively and competently?</td>
<td>☑ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The two challenges of hiring a new principal and working through a high turnover on the APC Board, which required building a working relationship with a new principal, document the ability to resolve challenges successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Are the mechanisms in place; (e.g. an advisory grievance committee) to respond to, and, where indicated, resolve complaints?</td>
<td>☑ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Birchtree Charter School Conflict Resolution Procedures are in place. Grievance procedures for employees can be found in the negotiated agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school is administered in an efficient and effective manner. Evidence that there is clear governance and administrative structures and problems are addressed adequately when they arise.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Written evaluations, formal complaints, leadership changes, board turnover, and examples of governance issues & how they are addressed, and the administrative policy manual.
### 8. FUNDING ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Is a charter school budget summary in place that designates the funding allocation from the local school board in addition to a summary of the charter school budget?</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is the school district going to implement indirect costs? If so, what services are provided to the charter school for this indirect fee?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Will the charter school be eligible for the additional local revenue over the 2.65-mills required in the foundation program?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Has the charter school met the requirement to achieve a positive or zero ending fund balance?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence of an understanding of the financial management and reporting requirements associated with operating a school per the charter school budget summary.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** A clear concise narrative statement providing sufficient evidence that the school has competently & effectively managed its finances. Evidence of an approved budget procedure for amending the budget, and procedures for amending budget minutes of meetings where the budget is adopted or amended.

### 9. FISCAL SOLVENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Has the charter school, over the course of the initial charter, implemented a well-conceived financial plan to ensure the fiscal solvency of the charter school?</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do the audit reports to date indicate that the school has met its obligation to ensure the fiscal integrity of the school’s financial operation?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Has the school achieved efficiencies in its operation?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence of sound fiscal management and fiscal viability of the charter school as confirmed by a balanced budget.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Financial audits & financial statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FACILITY PLANS</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A  IA  NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Does the school present a clear and detailed plan for maintaining the present site or, if indicated, acquiring a suitable and adequate education facility?</td>
<td>☒  ☐  ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The school is in the process of adding portable classrooms to their facilities to accommodate student growth. The APC will be discussing the possibility of a long-term plan that results in a new facility to better meet school needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence of how the charter school is in compliance with and is meeting their detailed facility plan.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** A drawn schematic of the physical plant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TEACHER TO STUDENT RATIO</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A  IA  NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is there a plan which adequately addresses teacher to student ratio?</td>
<td>☒  ☐  ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The teacher-student ratio is lower in grades 7-8 to ensure that students who have not been enrolled since early grades receive an understanding of the skills and philosophy of the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Is the plan reasonably based on projected enrollment figures?</td>
<td>☒  ☐  ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The school has shown consistent growth and maintains a waitlist. Enrollment is projected to increase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school has a workable plan that addresses teacher to student ratio including projected enrollment figures.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** Minutes of board meeting where staffing ratio was approved and evidence of deployment for determining enrollment projections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A  IA  NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has the student enrollment been stable?</td>
<td>☒  ☐  ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The school opened in 2010 with 160 students and continues to grow each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Has the school’s enrollment been at a maximum?</td>
<td>☒  ☐  ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Most grade levels have been at the maximum each year since opening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Reviewers Will Look For:** Evidence that the school is viable in terms of student enrollment, has an adequate student recruitment process to attract students, and is successful enough to retain the number of students it projected in the charter application.

**Suggested Sources of Evidence:** A written statement that is a reflective self-appraisal of strengths & weaknesses of the school’s charter with credible & compelling plans for building on success, maintaining or increasing student enrollment & momentum, & making necessary changes for improvement of the school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. TEACHING METHOD/CURRICULUM</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong> Does the school have a plan that addresses explicit teaching methods that will benefit an age group, grade level, or specific type of student?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Examples of the holistic approach the school employs are looping (students stay together with same teacher through grades 1-5 and 6-8), blocks of study (thematic units), collaborative learning, narrative/lecture format, multisensory approach, and an integrated social curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong> Does the school have a systematic plan in place to monitor curriculum implementation and curriculum quality?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Curriculum is monitored by the principal and pedagogical council. The principal monitors through evaluations and observations. The council meets bi-monthly to review and make recommendations on curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong> Has the school undertaken curriculum review and revision?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. In addition to the work the pedagogical council does, a pedagogical dean has been hired for this current school year to align curriculum to the Waldorf philosophy, and align curriculum both across and within all grade levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong> Is there evidence to support effective intervention with students who are “at risk?”</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Student progress is monitored monthly using the Response to Intervention (RTI) process. An RTI team meets twice monthly. Specialists are brought in as needed. Behavioral interventions are available as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong> Is the school addressing the needs of students with educational disabilities?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. Staff has 2.5 special education teachers and three special education assistants. Transition meetings are held for students entering with IEPs. Both “push-in” and “pull-out” models provide services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong> Where applicable, does the school address the needs of students with limited English proficiency?</td>
<td>☒ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>Yes. The district ELL teacher provides support to students as needed. The language-rich, contextually-based program, along with the teacher/student “looping” model, help ELL students succeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Reviewers Will Look For: Evidence that the school utilizes various teaching methods that would benefit specific age groups, grade levels, or explicit types of students. Evidence that the charter school has a written systematic plan to monitor curriculum implementation and quality, including curriculum review and revision. Evidence that the school is attracting and accommodating at-risk students and special education students and meeting their needs. Evidence that the school is complying with federal and state laws and regulations regarding these populations.

Suggested Sources of Evidence: Check written plans on monitoring curriculum implementation, check that laws regarding special needs students are being adhered to. Evidence of an adopted curriculum/course of study, regular monitoring and updating of curriculum/course of study.

14. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Where applicable, does a collective bargaining contract exist that alludes to contract exemptions that are agreed to by both the school district and bargaining unit? □ □ □ There are no contract exemptions.

b. If no contract exemptions are agreed to, are the employees of the charter school subject to all provisions of the collective bargaining agreements enforced in the school district? □ □ □ Yes. Employees are subject to all provisions of the district’s collective bargaining agreements.

What Reviewers Will Look For: Evidence that a written collective bargaining contract exists, if applicable, regarding contract exemptions. In the event of no contract exemptions, evidence that the employees of the charter school are subject to all provisions of the school district’s collective bargaining agreements.

Suggested Sources of Evidence: Written collective bargaining unit contract, and board approval of exemptions from the collective bargaining agreement.

15. CONTRACT TERMINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Is there a charter school contract termination clause currently in effect? □ □ □ Yes. A termination clause is contained within the contract.

What Reviewers Will Look For: Evidence that a written charter school contract termination clause is present.

Suggested Sources of Evidence: Check for written charter school termination clause.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 4, 2014

Agenda Item: 9A

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on multiple regulations regarding updates to the Alaska Performance Scholarship (APS) program. Proposed amendments include the elimination of a grace period for curriculum requirements, a deadline change for non-public school students and an extension of eligibility time period for students having enrollment delays that are outside of the student’s control.

♦ BACKGROUND
- The APS provides an opportunity for Alaska high school students to earn a scholarship to help cover the cost of an Alaska postsecondary education. Alaska high school students who take a more rigorous curriculum, get good grades, and score well on college placement or work ready exams can earn a scholarship to qualified Alaska colleges, universities, or vocational/technical programs.

- In the initial two years of the APS the Commissioner could grant a grace period of one extra year of eligibility for a student following high school graduation to meet curriculum requirements. This was due to the tiered structure of the APS requirements as increases in rigor were established for two consecutive years until reaching the current levels.

- The current regulations require public school graduates to have eligibility information submitted by July 15 of each year. The current regulations require non-public school graduates to have eligibility information submitted by July 1 of each year.

- The current Alaska Statute 14.43.825 (b) states that a student's eligibility for a scholarship terminates six years after the date the student graduates from high school unless the student qualifies for an extension of time allowed by the department by regulation.

- Behind this cover memo is: 1) Proposed amended regulations.
- Erik McCormick, Director of Assessment, Accountability & Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 13A.
4 AAC 43.035 is repealed:

4 AAC 43.035. Grace period for curriculum requirements. Repealed. (Eff. 2/25/2011, Register 197; am 6/25/2011, Register 198; repealed __/__/____, Register ___)

4 AAC 43.040(a) is amended to read:

(a) To establish eligibility for an Alaska performance scholarship, a student who is not enrolled in a public school program and who completes a home-based education program in the state, or who graduates from a religious or other private school accredited under 4 AAC 04.300(c) that does not elect to comply with AS 14.45.100 - 14.45.130, shall apply to the department no later than July 15 of the year the student intends to enroll at an eligible postsecondary institution. The application must be in writing, on a form provided by the department, and must include documentation demonstrating

(1) proof of results achieved on a standardized examination that meet the requirements of 4 AAC 43.020(a), (b), or (c); and

(2) completion of the curriculum requirements in 4 AAC 43.030. (Eff. 11/4/2010, Register 196; am __/__/____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.07.060 AS 12.43.810
4 AAC 43 is amended by adding a new section to read:

**4 AAC 43.045. Extensions of eligibility period.** A student may remain eligible for longer than 6 years after the date of the student’s graduation from high school if the student submits to the commissioner a written request for a scholarship eligibility extension. The request must be accompanied by a signed statement from the institution of higher learning in which the student is admitted or enrolled attesting that the student has experienced or is experiencing an enrollment delay due to the availability of coursework required by the degree program the student is pursuing, and that the enrollment delay is beyond the student’s control. The eligibility extension request must be postmarked no later than 30 days before the student’s period of scholarship eligibility under AS 14.43.825(b) is set to expire. Nothing in this section permits a student to receive a scholarship for more semester hours than is permitted under AS 14.43.825. (Eff. __/__/____, Register ___)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.060    AS 12.43.825
ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on multiple regulations regarding updates to the state assessment system. Proposed amendments include clarifying language regarding substitute courses under alternative completion requirements and definitions for certificates of achievement and certificates of completion.

BACKGROUND
• 4 AAC 06.078 allows alternative course completion opportunities for a student with a disability when the disability precludes the taking of regular curricular offerings.

• A substitute course in the same subject area may be designed and provided as determined by the team that develops the individualized education program (IEP).

• A proposed regulation amendment defines that substitute courses are available only to students who take the standards based assessment.

• A proposed regulation amendment specifies the Alaska Alternate Assessment as the assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are eligible to receive a certificate of completion.

• A proposed regulation amendment defines that a certificate of achievement is a certificate earned by a student meeting all local graduation requirements but has not taken the College and Career Ready Assessment and is therefore ineligible for a diploma.

• Behind this cover memo is: 1) Proposed amended regulations.

• Erik McCormick, Director of Assessment, Accountability & Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 13B.
4 AAC 06.078 is amended to read:

(a) If the disability of a student precludes the taking of regular curricular offerings, a substitute course in the same subject area may be designed and provided as determined by the team that develops the individualized education program (IEP) set out in 4 AAC 52.140. A substitute course may be noted on the student transcript by a number code known only to the IEP team and institution offering the course. **Substitute courses are available only to students taking the standards based assessment described in 4 AAC 06.737.**

(b) If the disability of a student is so severe that substitute course offerings cannot be designed and provided, the student may be awarded a certificate of [ATTENDANCE OR] completion[, ] based upon [COMPLETION OF THE IEP OR] attendance at school until age 22.

(c) In this section, "disability" means a condition described in the definition of "children with disabilities" at 4 AAC 52.990.

(d) In this section “substitute course” means a course that is aligned to the grade level content standards in 4 AAC 04.140(a) and meets the state and district graduation requirements as specified in 4 AAC 06.075. (Eff. 12/13/87, Register 104; am 3/30/95, Register 133; am __/__/____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 06.717(f) is repealed and readopted to read:

(f) The IEP team for a student with a significant cognitive disability may determine whether the student will take the assessment based on the IEP team's determination of whether
the assessment supports the transitional plan in the student’s IEP. If the student with significant cognitive disabilities takes the Alternate Assessment instead of the general standards based assessment described in 4 AAC 06.737, the student will not be eligible for a diploma as defined in the Participation Guidelines, adopted by reference in 4 AAC 06.775(a). The student’s college and career ready assessment will be paid for under 4 AAC 06.717(c)(1). In this subsection,

(1) "IEP" means the individualized education program described in 4 AAC 52.140;

(2) "IEP team" means the team described in 4 AAC 52.140(b) (3);

(3) "student with a significant cognitive disability" means a student described in 4 AAC 06.775(b) . (Eff. 2/23/2008, Register 185; am 7/19/2009, Register 191; am 6/8/2011, Register 198; am /__/____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.03.123 AS 14.07.020

4 AAC 06.775(b) is amended to read:

(b) The commissioner shall select an alternate assessment for use in this state, to be known as the Alaska Alternate Assessment, for assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are eligible [ON A TRACK] to receive a certificate of completion [ACHIEVEMENT UNDER AS 14.03.075,] instead of a diploma. A student's eligibility for the Alaska Alternate Assessment shall be established in the student's IEP in accordance with the criteria in the Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, adopted by
reference in (a) of this section. Each district shall administer the Alaska Alternate Assessment to eligible students whenever it administers the state assessments described in 4 AAC 06.710. To obtain a proficiency level of advanced, proficient, below proficient, or far below proficient in (1) reading, writing, and mathematics on the Alaska Alternate Assessment, a student must obtain a score as set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Grades 3 and 4</th>
<th>Grades 5 and 6</th>
<th>Grades 7 and 8</th>
<th>Grades 9 and 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Advanced</td>
<td>63 or above</td>
<td>77 or above</td>
<td>52 or above</td>
<td>57 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Proficient</td>
<td>32-62</td>
<td>46-76</td>
<td>33-51</td>
<td>43-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Below Proficient</td>
<td>8-31</td>
<td>11-45</td>
<td>12-32</td>
<td>22-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: Far Below Proficient</td>
<td>7 or below</td>
<td>10 or below</td>
<td>11 or below</td>
<td>21 or below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: Advanced</td>
<td>76 or above</td>
<td>67 or above</td>
<td>76 or above</td>
<td>82 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: Proficient</td>
<td>38-75</td>
<td>33-66</td>
<td>41-75</td>
<td>47-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: Below Proficient</td>
<td>7-37</td>
<td>10-32</td>
<td>16-40</td>
<td>24-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing: Far Below Proficient</td>
<td>6 or below</td>
<td>9 or below</td>
<td>15 or below</td>
<td>23 or below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Advanced</td>
<td>62 or above</td>
<td>61 or above</td>
<td>74 or above</td>
<td>81 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Proficient</td>
<td>33-61</td>
<td>25-60</td>
<td>52-73</td>
<td>63-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Below Proficient</td>
<td>6-32</td>
<td>8-24</td>
<td>22-51</td>
<td>24-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Far Below Proficient</td>
<td>5 or below</td>
<td>7 or below</td>
<td>21 or below</td>
<td>23 or below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) science on the Alaska Alternate Assessment, a student must obtain a score as set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science: Advanced</td>
<td>44 or above</td>
<td>44 or above</td>
<td>44 or above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science: Proficient</td>
<td>24-43</td>
<td>29-43</td>
<td>26-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science: Below Proficient</td>
<td>12-23</td>
<td>16-28</td>
<td>18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science: Far Below Proficient</td>
<td>11 or below</td>
<td>15 or below</td>
<td>17 or below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Authority:** AS 14.03.075   AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 06.790 is amended by adding new paragraphs to read:

(16) “certificate of completion” means a certificate earned by students who takes the alternate assessment;
(17) “certificate of achievement” means a certificate earned by a student who has met all local graduation requirements but does not take the College and Career Ready Assessment and are therefore ineligible for a diploma. (Eff. 12/16/94, Register 132; am 3/3/2000, Register 153; am 12/19/2002, Register 164; am 9/17/2004, Register 171; am 8/15/2008, Register 187; am 6/30/2013, Register 206; am __/__/____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 124.03.075 AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.060
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 4, 2014  

Agenda Item: 9C  

♦ ISSUE  
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on regulations regarding a Type B Limited certification.  

♦ BACKGROUND  
- During the work session of the December 6, 2013, meeting of the State Board of Education & Early Development, board members discussed possible avenues for amending regulations to permit an alternate route for obtaining a Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement.  
- The intent of the board was to encourage a larger pool of applicants for school superintendent positions.  
- At the request of the board, proposed regulations establishing an alternate route to obtaining a Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement were developed and put out for public comment at the board meeting on March 14, 2014.  
- Currently, in order to qualify for a Type B certificate with superintendent or other administrative endorsement, an applicant must meet the following requirements:  
  - Have completed a master’s or higher degree;  
  - Be recommended by the preparing institution; and  
  - Have completed at least five years of employment as a teacher or administrator with a minimum of three years employment as a teacher.  
- The proposed amendment permitted five years of employment in a leadership position on an Alaska school district’s management team to substitute for the five years of employment as a teacher and administrator.  
- Public comment included both support and lack of support for the proposed amendments to regulation. Comments supportive of the proposed amendment focused on increasing the applicant pool for superintendent vacancies. Comments in opposition to the proposed amendment centered on the importance of teaching experience for individuals who are permitted to conduct evaluations of teachers.  
- At its meeting on June 5, 2014, the board voted against approval of the proposed regulations and requested that the department reconsider alternate paths for obtaining a Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement, including broadening the definition of teaching experience.  
- At its meeting on September 18, 2014, the board was briefed regarding the following information:
At this meeting, the board discussed a limited Type B certificate similar to regulation currently providing for a route to certification for individuals with expertise in military science, career and technical education, and Native language or culture (Type M).

The proposed regulations provide for the issuing of a limited Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement to an individual who is sponsored by an Alaska school district. The individual would need to meet the following requirements:
- Have at least five years of full-time work experience in an administrative position;
- Possess a master’s degree or higher; and
- Provide two letters of recommendation verifying expertise in key areas.

During the first three years of the limited Type B certificate, the applicant would need to complete the following requirements:
- Three semester hours of educator evaluation coursework;
- District’s certificated evaluation system training;
- Three semester hours Alaska studies;
- Three semester hours multicultural education/cross-cultural communications; and
- An approved superintendent endorsement program.

Prior to conducting certified employee evaluations, the individual holding the limited Type B must complete the educator evaluation coursework and the district’s certificated evaluation system training. Additionally, during the first two years of the applicant’s employment, the sponsoring school district is required to provide the applicant with a mentor who is an experienced Alaska superintendent.

The limited Type B certificate would only be valid in the sponsoring district.

The proposed regulations can be found behind this cover memo.

Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Sondra Meredith, Administrator of Teacher Certification, will be present to brief the board.

**OPTIONS**
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 13C.
4 AAC 12 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 12.346. Administrative certificate (Type B Limited). (a) The department may issue a limited administrator certificate (Type B Limited) with a superintendent endorsement, valid for one year if

(1) the applicant has demonstrated administrative expertise and has the educational background, as described in (b) of this section;

(2) the school board for the district in which the applicant will be employed, through its school board president, has requested issuance of a limited administrator certificate for the applicant under this section;

(3) the school board for the district in which the applicant will be employed has provided a mentor who is an experienced Alaska superintendent for at least the first two years of the applicant’s employment with the school district as the superintendent; and

(4) the applicant has successfully passed the criminal history background check in the same manner as a teacher certified under AS 14.20.020 and 4 AAC 12.300; the applicant must submit to the department:

(A) one completed fingerprint card, with fingerprinting performed by a law enforcement agency or a person who has been trained in recording fingerprints, for separate submittal to the Department of Public Safety and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the department will accept a name-based criminal history background check on an applicant from the agency performing the background check if the requirements of AS 14.20.020(j) are met; and

(B) the fee for the criminal history background check in the amount charged by the Department of Public Safety as set out in 13 AAC 68.900; and
(C) the fee for the issuance of a teacher certificate as established in 4 AAC 12.300 (g).

(b) To demonstrate the competency required under (a) of this section, the applicant must

(1) submit two letters of recommendation verifying the applicant's length of experience and expertise in the following areas: organizational leadership; creation of effective work environments; oversight of program or project implementation; communication with diverse stakeholder groups; compliance with established laws, policies, procedures and good business practices; and the selection, appointment, oversight, review, and evaluation of employees; and

(2) possess a master's degree or higher; and

(3) have completed five or more years of full-time work experience in an administrative position.

(c) The department may extend the initial one-year limited administrative certificate issued under (a) of this section for an additional year, if the applicant demonstrates that the applicant has enrolled in or completed an approved superintendent endorsement program at a regionally accredited institution and completed three semester hours of educator evaluation coursework approved by the department.

(d) The department may approve an additional one-year extension of the extend certificate issued under (c) of this section, if the applicant has completed three semester hours of Alaska studies and three semester hours in multicultural education or cross-cultural communications as described in AS 14.20.020(h) and shows substantial progress towards completion of the superintendent endorsement program.
(e) The department may approve an additional two-year extension of the extend certificate issued under (d) of this section if the applicant has completed a superintendent endorsement program within three years of the initial application under (a) of this section.

(f) A limited administrative certificate issued under (e) of this section may be renewed any number of times for five years upon submission to the department of

1. evidence of satisfactory completion credit requirements as described in 4 AAC 12.405; and

2. evidence of satisfactory administrative performance under the limited certificate; and

3. a request for renewal from the school board of the district in which the certificate holder is employed.

(f) A limited administrative certificate is valid only in the school district or regional educational attendance area whose school board requested the certificate.

(g) Prior to conducting certified educator evaluations per AS 14.20.149, the individual holding an administrative certificate authorized under this section must satisfactorily complete the educator evaluation coursework requirement describe in (c) of this section and the school district’s certificated employee evaluation system training.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 4, 2014

Agenda Item: 9D

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on regulations regarding teacher certification fees.

♦ BACKGROUND
  ● Currently, the Professional Teaching Practice Commission (PTPC) is entirely funded through a general fund appropriation of approximately $300,000.
  
  ● The FY 2015 Operating Budget included legislative intent language “that no later than FY 2016, the PTPC be entirely funded by receipts collected from teacher certification fees under AS 14.20.020(c).”
  
  ● Currently, the fee structure for certification is only sufficient to support the certification of Alaska educators. In order to have sufficient funds to also support the educational and disciplinary activities of the PTPC, the department will need to increase the certification and renewal fees by $75.
  
  ● The increase would impact the fees collected for all certificates and renewals with the exception of the Advanced Type C and the Student Teaching Authorization.
  
  ● The proposed increase was calculated by dividing $300,000 by the number of certificates (excluding the Advanced Type C and the Student Teaching Authorization) issued by the department in FY2013, which was 3,926.
  
  ● For a regular certificate, the fee increase would be from $125 to $200 every five years. Considering educator certification cost on a yearly basis, the fee increase for a regular certificate would be from $25 per year to $40 per year. For a lifetime or retired certificate, the fee increase would be from $165 to $240.
  
  ● The proposed regulations can be found behind this cover memo.
  
  ● Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Sondra Meredith, Administrator of Teacher Certification, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 13D.
4 AAC 12.300(g) is amended to read:

(g) Unless otherwise provided in this section, fees must be paid at the time of application and are nonrefundable. The fee for

(1) initial issuance of a teacher certificate, including all endorsements, is $200 [125], plus the cost of a criminal history background check required under (b)(4) of this section;

(2) renewal of a teacher certificate, including all endorsements, is $200 [125], plus the cost of a criminal history background check required under 4 AAC 12.405(b);

(3) addition or deletion of an endorsement, other than at the time of initial issuance of the certificate is $200 [125];

(4) a certified copy of a teacher certificate is $25; and

(5) each nonacademic credit is $50 payable at the time supporting documentation required by 4 AAC 12.410(a) is submitted to the department. (Eff. 9/29/2005, Register 175; am 9/30/2005, Register 175; am 12/20/2005, Register 176; am 9/20/2006, Register 179, am __/__/____, Register ___)

AS 14.20.010
4 AAC 12.380(e) is amended to read:

(e) The fee for a lifetime retired teacher certificate is $240 [165], plus the cost of any criminal history background check required under (b)(2) of this section. (Eff. 9/29/2005, Register 175; am __/__/____, Register ___)

To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 10

ISSUE
The board requested the Overview of the Center for Alaska Education Policy Research (CAEPR) Salary & Benefits Schedule and Teacher Tenure Study.

BACKGROUND
- There will be two reports presented, the Cost of Teacher Turnover, and Salary and Benefits and Teacher Tenure Study.
- Behind this cover memo is the Association of Alaska School Boards (AASB) 2014 HB 278 PowerPoint Presentation.
- Dr. Diane Hirshberg, Director for the Center for Alaska Education Policy Research; Liz Brooks, Research Analyst from the Alaska Department of Administration; Lexi Hill, Senior Research Associate; and Dr. Dayna DeFeo, Research Associate, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
Salary & Benefits Schedule – teachers and principals

- What are the different ways a salary schedule can be structured?
- What benefits do districts offer, and how are these appropriately built into a compensation model?
- What salaries and benefits do different school districts need to offer to hire and retain personnel of comparable quality?
- What sorts of differentials are necessary for the salary scale to account for community, district, or job characteristics?
- What are the pros and cons of a statewide salary schedule?
Salary and Benefits issues—other positions

- What other positions do school districts employ?
- What is the appropriate definition of the labor market (geographic scale) for different positions?
  - E.g., are teacher aides – non-certificated personnel working in the classroom – different from other positions?
- How well does the labor market for classified personnel serve districts?
- What are the different ways districts meet their needs for related services?
- How do superintendent duties differ across districts?
- How is superintendent pay determined?
Teacher Tenure

• What is the purpose and value of tenure?
• What is the current teacher tenure structure in Alaska?
• How well is the current teacher tenure structure working?
• What are alternatives to the current structure, and what are their benefits and drawbacks?
• What is tenure worth to teachers, and how does this effect the teacher labor market (compensation, turnover)?
Methods

• Literature review on salary issues and tenure – what have researchers learned elsewhere?
• Gather quantitative & qualitative data from districts: salary and benefits, staffing categories, teacher evaluation policies and district performance standards for tenure, etc.
• Analysis of existing data (CAEPR teacher turnover information, statewide survey of teachers on working conditions)
Methods, cont’d.

- Review ISER’s geographic cost differential model, revise and improve, adding benefits and more differentials
  - The differentials for instruction were based on a statewide labor market for teachers and administrators
- Explore the basis for teacher advancement and provide alternatives:
  - Consider alternatives to (or additional criteria besides) years of experience and education levels
- Interviews/surveys – outside experts and key stakeholders
Stakeholders

- School district employees
- School board members
- Parent organizations
- Alaska Dep’t of Education
- State Board of Education
- Teacher unions
- Not-for-profit education organizations
- Education advocacy organizations
- Alaska Native education organizations
- Education-related professional organizations
- School business officers
- Post-Secondary Education Programs
- Legislators
- Others???
Timeline for Study

• November 2014 – work plan and instrument development, Institutional Review Board approval
• December – February 2015 – data collection
• March – April 2015 – data analysis
• April - May 2015 – produce draft report, comment period for stakeholders
• June 2015 – final draft and presentation to legislature
Deliverables

• Profile of benefits currently offered
• Proposed Salary & Benefits Schedule
• Geographic (district or community) and (potentially) job pay differentials
• Review of teacher tenure (current and alternatives)
• Recommendations for teacher tenure
For more information

Diane Hirshberg
Dbhirshberg@alaska.edu
907-786-5413

Alexandra Hill
arhill@uaa.alaska.edu
907-786-5436

www.iser.uaa.alaska.edu/CAEPR/
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

December 4, 2014

From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 11

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to convene in executive session for the purpose of interviewing and selecting a student advisor-elect to the board for the remainder of the 2014-2015 school year.

♦ BACKGROUND
- 4 AAC 03.025 governs the appointment of the board’s student advisor members. A copy of the current regulation follows this cover memo.
- The term of the student advisor-elect begins immediately upon the board’s action to appoint the student advisor-elect. The 2014-2015 student advisor-elect automatically rotates into the position of student advisor on July 1, 2015.
- Four students are under consideration in accordance with the selection process inviting nominations from the Alaska Association of Student Government. Application materials for the nominees will be distributed to board members at the board meeting.
- The candidates are:
  - Aleah Busbey from Palmer High School
  - Dunya Hermann from Thunder Mountain High School
  - Alec Burris from Mat-Su Career and Technical High School
  - Erik Handeland from Mt. Edgecumbe High School

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION
Convene an executive session to interview candidates for student advisor-elect. An executive session is in accordance with the state’s open meetings act, AS 44.62.310(c)(2), specifically the provision related to “subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of any person, provided the person may request a public discussion.”

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development convene in executive session to interview candidates for student advisor-elect for the remainder of the 2014-2015 school year. An executive session is necessary so as to not prejudice the reputation and character of any person being interviewed.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION TO RECONVENE
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development reconvene into regular session.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION FOR FINAL SELECTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development select __________________________ as its Student Advisor-Elect for the remainder of the school year 2014-2015. On July 1, 2015, __________________________’s one-year term will begin as the Student Advisor to the board and continue through June 30, 2016.
4 AAC 03.025. Advisory members of state board. (a) In addition to the board members appointed under AS 14.07.085, the board will appoint, as advisory members of the board, 
  (1) one military representative; 
  (2) before September 1, 2002, two students, one as an advisory member and one as an advisory member elect, who are enrolled in a state public secondary education program; and 
  (3) on or after September 1, 2002, one student as an advisory member elect who is enrolled in a state public secondary education program.

(b) The senior military commander in the state may designate the advisory member of the board representing the military. The designation must include a written statement of qualifications and a resume of the designee.

(c) The Alaska Association of School Governments may nominate candidates for the appointment of a student advisory member and a student advisory member elect under (a) of this section and subject to the rotation of members under (e) of this section as follows:
  (1) the association may nominate not less than three and not more than five individuals who will not have reached the 11th grade at the time of appointment for consideration as the student advisory member elect;
  (2) the association may submit the names of nominees to the board; the department will provide the association with not less than 30 days advance notice of the date that the nominations must be submitted to the board;
  (3) if the association submits the names of nominees to the board, the association shall provide a written statement of qualifications or resume for each nominee and a letter written by each nominee stating the contributions that the nominee would make as the student advisory member to the board.

(d) Before September 1, 2002, the board will, at a regular meeting, select a student advisory member and a student advisory member elect from among the individuals nominated under (c) of this section. The term of the student advisory member is one year, commencing with the first board meeting of each school year and, after September 1, 2002, commencing with the second school year after that individual's appointment as advisory member elect. The term of the student advisory member elect is one year commencing with the first board meeting of each school year subject to the rotation to student advisory member under subsection (e).

(e) Beginning September 1, 2002, the board will rotate its appointment of the student advisory member elect to the position of student advisory member commencing with the second school year after that individual's appointment as advisory member elect. At the same meeting, a new appointment of advisory member elect shall be made from the list of nominees submitted under (c) of this section for that year.

(f) Advisory members and advisory members elect appointed under this section are entitled to expenses, travel, and per diem allowances provided by law for members of state boards and commissions.

(g) Advisory members appointed under this section may participate in the work of the board, and may deliberate and debate matters brought to the attention of the board. An advisory member, except an advisory member elect, may cast an advisory vote, but an advisory vote is not counted in determining the disposition of board matters.
(h) Advisory members elect shall attend meetings but may not cast a vote.
History: Eff. 2/11/89, Register 109; am 5/28/92, Register 122; am 4/14/95, Register 134; am 7/25/2001, Register 159
Authority: AS 14.07.020   AS 14.07.060
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 1

ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations related to charter schools.

BACKGROUND


- The proposed regulations reflect the new requirements of these amended statutes for the following charter school topics:
  - Application procedures;
  - Application appeal procedures;
  - A one-time grant program for new charter schools; and
  - Pupil transportation for students attending charter schools.

- Behind this cover memo are the proposed regulations, as well as the relevant amended statutes regarding charter schools including AS 14.03.250, AS 14.03.253, AS 14.03.264, and AS 14.09.010.

- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Elizabeth Nudelman, Director of School Finance & Facilities, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14A.
4 AAC 27 is amended by adding a new section to read:

**4 AAC 27.057. Charter school transportation policy.** (a) A local school board shall adopt a charter school transportation policy that describes the transportation services that will be provided by the district to students attending a charter school operated by the district if

(1) a district provides transportation services under AS 14.09.010; and

(2) the district operates a charter school or an application for the establishment of a charter school in the district is pending with the district under AS 14.03.250.

(b) A district must submit to the department an application for approval of its charter school transportation policy on a form provided by the department

(1) not later than April 15, 2015, if a charter school is in operation in the district on July 1, 2014; or

(2) not later than 30 days after approval of a charter school by a local school board, if a charter school is approved by a local school board after July 1, 2014, and a charter school transportation policy approved by the department is not in effect in the district.

(c) The application to the department must include

(1) evidence that the charter school transportation policy was developed in compliance with AS 14.09.010(e)(1); and

(2) the charter school transportation policy adopted by the local school board that provides transportation service for charter school students in compliance with AS 14.09.010(e)(2); and

(3) other documents or information the department needs to evaluate a charter school transportation policy adopted by a local school board.
(d) Not later than 60 days after receipt by the department of an application for approval of a charter school transportation policy, the department will grant approval for a charter school transportation policy if the charter school transportation meets the requirements of AS 14.09.010 and this section.

(e) If a district seeks to amend an approved charter school transportation policy, it must submit an application for approval of an amendment of the charter school transportation policy on a form provided by the department not later than April 15 of the fiscal year prior to the fiscal year when the proposed amendment will take effect. An application for approval of an amendment of a charter school transportation policy must meet the requirements of (c) of this section.

(f) Not later than 60 days after receipt by the department of an application for approval of an amendment of a charter school transportation policy, the department will grant approval for the amendment of a charter school transportation policy if the amendment meets the requirements of AS 14.09.010 and this section. (Eff. ____/____/_____. Register ____)


4 AAC 33.110 is repealed and readopted to read:

4 AAC 33.110. Charter school application and review procedure. (a) The application procedure required by AS 14.03.250(a) for the establishment of an initial or renewed charter for a charter school must be in writing and must be available upon request at the school district's central office. The local school board must require an applicant to submit sufficient information so that the local school board may conduct a thorough review of the proposed charter school. An application must conform to the content areas and formatting standards set out at the
department's website at http://education.alaska.gov/Alaskan_Schools/Charter. An application, upon final approval by the state Board of Education and Early Development, will operate as the charter for the school. In addition to the requirements of AS 14.03.250(a), an application must include, at a minimum,

1. a list of the members of the academic policy committee and their qualifications;

3. the length of the term of the contract required under AS 14.03.255(c);

4. the charter school's bylaws;

5. a description of the education program to be offered at the charter school and mechanisms for student assessment to be utilized in addition to those required by state law;

6. a written instructional program that addresses state content standards under 4 AAC 04 and that aligns with the content on the statewide student assessment system under 4 AAC 06.710 – 4 AAC 06.790;

7. written objectives for program achievement;

8. a description of and schedule for staff development activities;

9. a school schedule and calendar;

10. plans for serving special education, vocational education, gifted, and bilingual students;

11. written admissions policies and procedures;

12. if the charter school is the only school in the community, an alternative option for students not wishing to attend the charter school;

13. a written administrative policy manual;

14. a written budget summary and financial plan, including
(A) a statement of the charter school’s funding allocation from the local school board and costs assignable to the charter school program budget; and

(B) the method by which the charter school will account for receipts and expenditures;

(15) a written plan for the charter school's facility;

(16) a written plan that addresses the teacher-to-student ratio, including projected enrollment figures;

(17) a written student recruitment process, including a lottery or random drawing mechanism for enrollment if applicants exceed the school's capacity;

(18) a requested or existing exemption for the charter school from a written collective bargaining contract;

(19) a plan for pupil transportation and the district charter school transportation policy, if proposed or adopted;

(20) the written termination clause that must appear in the contract between the charter school and the local school board;

(21) proof of compliance with applicable law; and

(22) other documents or information the district needs to evaluate the proposed charter school.

(b) Not later than 30 days after a local school board's decision to approve an initial application or a renewal application for a charter school, the local school board must forward the application to the state Board of Education and Early Development for review and approval under AS 14.03.250(c) by mailing to the department
(1) the complete application filed with the local school board, including all supporting documents required by (a) of this section;

(2) the written decision of the local school board;

(3) all other materials considered by the local school board in support or in opposition to the application; and

(4) the minutes of the local school board meeting at which the charter school was approved.

(c) An initial application for a charter school approved by a local school board may not be submitted to the department under subsection (b) more than 12 months before the planned start-up date for the new school. A renewal application for a charter school approved by a local school board may not be submitted to the department under (b) of this section more than 12 months before the expiration of the existing contract.

(d) An initial application and a renewal application approved by a local school board and submitted to the department under (b) of this section must be received by the department at least 90 days before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the state Board of Education and Early Development.

(e) The state Board of Education and Early Development will review an initial application or a renewal application approved by the local school board and submitted to the department under (b) of this section. The state Board of Education and Early Development will consider an initial application or a renewal application in the order in which it is received.

(f) Not later than 60 days after a local school board issues a decision to deny an initial application or a renewal application for a charter school, an applicant may file a notice of appeal to the commissioner under AS 14.03.250(d). In the notice of appeal, the applicant must specify
the grounds for its appeal, stating which, if any, finding of fact or conclusion of law in the local school board's decision is alleged to be in error. If the applicant alleges that a finding of fact is in error, the applicant shall specify in the notice of appeal the evidence in the record before the local school board that supports a contrary finding of fact. With the notice of appeal, the applicant must file with the commissioner

(1) the complete application submitted to the local school board, including all supporting documents required by (a) of this section;

(2) the written decision of the local school board;

(3) any other materials considered by the local school board in support or in opposition to the application;

(4) the minutes of the local school board meeting at which the charter school was approved or denied, or if the minutes are not yet available, the date on which the minutes will be available for review by the department; and

(5) within ten working days of receipt of the commissioner's written request for a hearing transcript, a transcript of any recorded testimony presented to the local school board regarding the charter school application.

(g) The commissioner will review an appeal of a local school board decision denying an initial or renewal application for a charter school under AS 14.03.250(d).

(h) If the commissioner upholds the denial of an application, the applicant may file an appeal of the commissioner's decision to the state Board of Education and Early Development within 30 days of the issuance of the commissioner's decision. The commissioner will forward the appeal to the state Board of Education and Early Development immediately for consideration at its next meeting. The state Board of Education and Early Development will issue a decision
within 90 days after the filing of an appeal of a commissioner's decision upholding a denial of an application.

(i) If the commissioner approves an initial or renewal application by overturning a denial by the local school board, the commissioner will forward the application and record to the state Board of Education and Early Development not later than thirty days after the commissioner issues a written decision of approval. The state Board of Education and Early Development will consider the application at its next meeting.

(j) The state Board of Education and Early Development will not approve an application that contains insufficient information to determine compliance with applicable law.

(k) A decision of the state Board of Education and Early Development granting or denying approval for a charter school application is a final agency action for purposes of an appeal to the superior court. (Eff. 4/27/96, Register 138; am 3/31/2002, Register 161; am 7/26/2002, Register 163; am 8/6/2004, Register 171; am ___/___/___, Register ___)

Authority:   AS 14.03.250   AS 14.03.280   AS 14.07.060

**AS 14.03.253**   AS 14.07.020

4 AAC 33 is amended by adding a new section to read:

**4 AAC 33.113. Amendment of charter.** A charter school may apply to a local school board for an amendment to its charter during the term of its contract with the local school board. If a local school board approves an amendment to the charter, an amended contract must be executed to conform to the amended charter. The local school board must forward an amended charter and amended contract to the department. A charter school may make district-approved changes to its program that do not require an amendment to its charter without review by the
state Board of Education and Early Development, except that a change of program that involves 
the addition of an elementary or secondary program must be approved by the local school board 
and the state Board of Education and Early Development. (Eff. ___/___/___, Register ___)

Authority:  AS 14.03.250  AS 14.07.020  AS 14.07.060

AS 14.03.280

4 AAC 33 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 33.115. Operation of charter schools. (a) The department may audit the 
charter school’s program during the term of the contract under AS 14.03.255(c) and may take any 
action necessary to ensure compliance with federal and state law, including the withholding of 
money under AS 14.07.070. Notwithstanding any provision of a charter or contract, a charter 
school must comply with state and federal law. A change in state or federal law taking effect 
during the term of an existing contract or charter will override an inconsistent provision of a 
contract or charter. (Eff. ___/___/___, Register ___)

Authority:  AS 14.03.250  AS 14.03.280  AS 14.07.060

AS 14.03.255  AS 14.07.020

4 AAC 33 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 33.117. Charter school grant program. (a) A charter school that is established 
on or after July 1, 2014, may apply to the department for one-time grant funding under 
AS 14.03.264. An applicant charter school must 

(1) apply on a form prescribed by the department;
(2) provide evidence in its application that demonstrates that grant funding will
be used to provide educational services as defined under AS 14.03.264(a); and

(3) file its application with the department not later than September 15 to receive
funding based on student enrollment on October 1 of the same fiscal year.

(b) A charter school that received reduced grant funding in a prior fiscal year as
permitted under AS 14.03.264(c) may apply for the balance of the grant amount using the
procedures described in (a) of this section.

(c) The department will notify a newly approved charter school of its eligibility for grant
funding under AS 14.03.264 promptly after approval of the charter by the state Board of
Education and Early Development. (Eff. ____/____/_____. Register ____)

Authority: AS 14.03.264 AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 33 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 33.119. Definitions. In 4 AAC 33.110 – 4 AAC 33.119,

(1) "charter school" has the meaning given in AS 14.03.290;

(2) "commissioner" means the commissioner of education and early
development;

(3) "department" means the Department of Education and Early Development;

(4) "local school board" has the meaning given in AS 14.03.290.

(Eff. 4/27/96, Register 138; am 3/31/2002, Register 161; am 7/26/2002, Register 163; am
8/6/2004, Register 171; am ____/____/____, Register ____)

Authority: AS 14.03.250 AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.060

AS 14.03.280
Amended Charter School Statutes- AS 14.03.250, AS 14.02.253, AS 14.03.264, and AS 14.09.010

AS 14.03.250 is repealed and reenacted to read:

(a) A local school board shall prescribe an application procedure for the establishment of a charter school in that school district. The application procedure must include provisions for an academic policy committee consisting of parents of students attending the school, teachers, and school employees and a proposed form for a contract between a charter school and the local school board, setting out the contract elements required under AS 14.03.255(c).

(b) A decision of a local school board approving or denying an application for a charter school must be in writing, must be issued within 60 days after the application, and must include all relevant findings of fact and conclusions of law.

(c) If a local school board approves an application for a charter school, the local school board shall forward the application to the state Board of Education and Early Development for review and approval.

(d) If a local school board denies an application for a charter school, the applicant may appeal the denial to the commissioner. The appeal to the commissioner shall be filed not later than 60 days after the local school board issues its written decision of denial. The commissioner shall review the local school board's decision to determine whether the findings of fact are supported by substantial evidence and whether the decision is contrary to law. A decision of the commissioner upholding the denial by the local school board may be appealed within 30 days to the state Board of Education and Early Development.

(e) If the commissioner approves a charter school application, the commissioner shall forward the application to the state Board of Education and Early Development for review and approval. The application shall be forwarded not later than 30 days after the commissioner issues a written decision. The state Board of Education and Early Development shall exercise independent judgment in evaluating the application.

(f) A local school board that denied an application for a charter school approved by the state board on appeal shall operate the charter school as provided in AS 14.03.255 - 14.03.290.

AS 14.03 is amended by adding a new section 14.03.253 to read:

(a) In an appeal to the commissioner under AS 14.03.250, the commissioner shall review the record before the local school board. The commissioner may request written supplementation of the record from the applicant or the local school board. The commissioner may

(1) remand the appeal to the local school board for further review;
(2) approve the charter school application and forward the application to the state Board of Education and Early Development with or without added conditions; or
(3) uphold the decision denying the charter school application; if the commissioner upholds a local school board's decision to deny a charter school application and the applicant appeals to the State Board of Education and Early Development, the commissioner shall
immediately forward the application and record to the state Board of Education and Early Development.

(b) In an appeal to the state Board of Education and Early Development of a denial of a charter school application under (a)(3) of this section, the state board shall determine, based on the record, whether the commissioner's findings are supported by substantial evidence and whether the decision is contrary to law. The state board shall issue a written decision within 90 days after an appeal.

AS 14.03 is amended by adding a new section 14.03.264 to read:

(a) A charter school that is established on or after the effective date of this section may receive a one-time grant from the department equal to the amount of $500 for each student enrolled in the school on October 1 of the first year in which the school applies for the grant. The charter school shall use a grant received under this section to provide educational services. In this subsection, "educational services" includes curriculum development, program development, and special education services.

(b) The department shall establish by regulation procedures for the application for and expenditure of grant funds under (a) of this section.

(c) If the amount appropriated in a fiscal year for the charter school grant program is insufficient to meet the amounts authorized under (a) of this section, the department shall reduce pro rata the per pupil grant amount by the necessary percentage as determined by the department. If a charter school grant is reduced under this subsection, the charter school may apply to the department in a subsequent fiscal year for the balance of the grant amount.

AS 14.09.010 is amended by adding new subsections to read:

(e) A school district that provides transportation services under this section shall provide transportation services to students attending a charter school operated by the district under a policy adopted by the district. The policy must

(1) be developed with input solicited from individuals involved with the charter school, including staff, students, and parents;
(2) at a minimum, provide transportation services for students enrolled in the charter school on a space available basis along the regular routes that the students attending schools in an attendance area in the district are transported; and
(3) be approved by the department.

(f) If a school district fails to adopt a policy under (e) of this section, the school district shall allocate the amount received for each student under (a) of this section to each charter school operated by the district based on the number of students enrolled in the charter school.

(g) Nothing in (e) of this section requires a school district to establish dedicated transportation
Amended Charter School Statutes- AS 14.03.250, AS 14.02.253, AS 14.03.264, and AS 14.09.010

routes for the exclusive use of students enrolled in a charter school or authorizes a charter school to opt out of a policy adopted by a school district for the purpose of acquiring transportation funding.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 5, 2014  

Agenda Item: 12B

ISSUE

The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations related to correspondence study programs.

BACKGROUND

- House Bill 278, The Education Opportunity Act, amended AS 14.03 to add Article 3 Correspondence Study Programs.
- This new statute addresses the requirements for students’ individual learning plans and the use of and accounting for student allotments.
- The new statute includes language contained in current regulations, as well as language that requires amendments to current regulation.
- Therefore, the proposed regulations eliminate redundancy between the new statute and current regulation, as well as provide new language to further define or clarify requirements of the new statute.
- In response to public comment, several revisions to the draft regulations are being recommended as follows:
  - 4 AAC 33.421(a)(1): Eliminate the requirement for monthly monitoring by the certificated teacher for students who are proficient;
  - 4 AAC 33.421(a)(4)(B): Utilize a student’s Individual Learning Plan (ILP) as the mechanism for determining the appropriateness of textbooks and other curriculum materials; and
  - 4 AAC 33.421(c): Eliminate reference to statewide goals and standards since this is redundant with language already in statute.

Behind this cover memo are the proposed regulations, as well as the new statutes for correspondence study programs including AS 14.03.300 and AS 14.03.320 and public comments.

Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching and Learning Support will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS

This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14B.
4 AAC 09.160 is amended to read:

4 AAC 09.160. Fund balance. (a) All money in the year-end fund balance of a district's school operating fund are subject to the 10 percent limit described in AS 14.17.505(a), except for money in the following six categories:

(1) encumbrances;
(2) inventory;
(3) prepaid expenses, which may include fuel;
(4) self-insurance;
(5) federal impact aid received

(A) in response to the application for impact aid submitted in the fiscal year that immediately preceded the current fiscal year; and

(B) on or after March 1 of the current fiscal year that was awarded as a result of applications that were submitted before the application for impact aid for the current fiscal year.

(6) unexpended annual student allotment funds as provided under AS 14.03.320(c).

(b) A district shall include in the report required under 4 AAC 06.121(5)(A) a schedule that identifies the amount of money in the categories listed in (a) of this section.

(c) For purposes of AS 14.17.505(a), "unreserved portion of the year-end fund balance of a school operating fund" means the portion of the fund balance remaining after the deduction of the items listed in (a) of this section. (Eff. 12/13/87, Register 104; am 8/5/90, Register 115; am 6/19/2011, Register 198; am __/__/____, Register ___)
4 AAC 33.421 is repealed and reenacted to read:

**4 AAC 33.421. Correspondence study program requirements.** (a) Each correspondence student's individual learning plan must provide for

- (1) monitoring of each student by the assigned certificated teacher; the monitoring must include at least monthly teacher-student or teacher-parent contact for students who have obtained a proficiency level of below proficient or far below proficient on the most recent administration of Alaska's statewide standards-based assessments and quarterly reviews of all students’ work or progress in the individual learning plan; the district must maintain a record of the contact required under this paragraph;

- (2) a grade, or other determination that the student has met the standards for a course, determined and assigned by the certificated, highly-qualified teacher who is responsible for the course; the plan may provide for review and consideration of any recommendations submitted by the student or the student's parents;

- (3) a transcript that includes the source of any course taken by the student that was not offered or approved by the governing body of the district, or, in the case of a program that is a charter school, by the charter school, and for which no public money was provided; the transcript must note whether the student's mastery of the content of the course was approved by the district as meeting a requirement for graduation; and

- (4) a signed agreement between the certificated teacher assigned by the correspondence study program and at least one parent of each student that verifies that

  (A) the student and parent have the same right to access the district appeal process as students and parents in the district's other programs;
(B) the textbooks or other curriculum materials and the course of study are appropriate for the student as outlined in the individual learning plan.

(b) In addition to the requirements set out in AS 14.03.300 and this section, the individual learning plans for students who have obtained a proficiency level of below proficient or far below proficient on the most recent administration of Alaska's statewide standards-based assessments must identify strategies to move the student toward proficiency in the related subject.

(c) For each course offered for credit by the program, the program must assign a certificated teacher who has the primary responsibility for the course.

(d) In accordance with AS 14.07.050, AS 14.08.111(9), and AS 14.14.090(7), a program that is not a charter school must use curriculum materials, including textbooks and other instructional aids, that have been reviewed and selected by the governing body of the district, are of the same quality as those materials that the district offers in the district's other programs, and are in compliance with AS 14.03.090 and AS 14.18.060. A program that is a charter school must review and approve all curriculum materials for compliance with AS 14.03.090 and AS 14.18.060.

(e) An employee of the district, including a certificated staff member, may not advocate religious, partisan, sectarian, or denominational doctrine as part of the employee's instructional or other duties. Nothing in this subsection prevents a parent from providing supplemental instruction to the parent's own child using materials of the parent's choice, if the materials were not purchased with money provided by the department or district.
(f) The district must require students to participate in the statewide student assessment program as required by 4 AAC 06.710 - 4 AAC 06.790. The correspondence study program must

(1) provide, and require parents to sign, a written statement that they understand, and will abide by, the requirements of the assessment program; and

(2) follow the requirements of 4 AAC 06.790 for test security, by

(A) providing a secure testing facility to administer all testing requirements of the assessment program; or

(B) entering into agreements with districts and schools where the testing is administered that allow correspondence program students to participate in testing at that location.

(g) A district that offers a correspondence program must have an open enrollment policy for the program for the entire school year. However, a program that is a charter school may limit its enrollment in accordance with AS 14.03.265.

(h) A correspondence study program may not pay for or provide money for services or materials that do not reasonably relate to the delivery of the students’ instructional needs. Textbooks, curriculum materials, school supplies, tutoring services, athletic equipment, and technology expenses may be approved by the certificated teacher who has primary responsibility for the course. Funding for other materials or services requires the approval of the correspondence program director or the director’s trained designee and the valid instructional purpose served by the expenditure must be noted in the student’s individual learning plan. Business managers or other administrative personnel who are not certificated under 4 AAC 12.305 or 4 AAC 12.345 may process receipts, reimbursement requests, or other paperwork
related to expenditures or fund account activity, but may not fulfill the responsibilities of
certificated teachers, program directors, or trained designees as outlined in this subsection.

(i) A correspondence study program, or a parent through a fund account under
4 AAC 33.422, may contract with a private individual to provide tutoring to a student in a
subject described in 4 AAC 04.140, fine arts, music, or physical education, if

(1) the instruction is part of the student's individual learning plan under (d) of this
section; and

(2) the tutor is not vested with the primary responsibility to plan, instruct, or
evaluate the learning of the student in the subject. (Eff. 12/25/2002, Register 164; am 8/6/2004,
Register 171; am 2/20/2005, Register 173; am 9/19/2008, Register 187; am __/__/____. Register ___)


AS 14.03.300 AS 14.07.050 AS 14.17.430

AS 14.03.320 AS 14.07.060 AS 14.30.010

AS 14.07.020 AS 14.08.111

4 AAC 33.422 is amended to read:

4 AAC 33.422. Fund accounts. (a) A correspondence study program may provide a
fund account to the student's parents for the purpose of meeting instructional expenses for the
student enrolled in the program. Expenditures from a fund account must be for the student's
instructional needs as described on the individual learning plan under 4 AAC 33.421(d).

(b) Textbooks, equipment, and other curriculum materials purchased with state money,
including money provided to the parent through a fund account, are property of the district.
Materials that are not consumables must be returned to the district when the student leaves the program for any reason.

(c) A fund account may not be used to pay for any item or service excluded under 4 AAC 33.421(h)(g).

(d) The fund account may not be used by the district or the parent to supplant district funds or obligations for IEP services.

(e) If a correspondence study program provides for a fund account, the governing body of the district, or, in the case of a program that is a charter school, the charter school, must establish written standards, consistent with 4 AAC 33.405 - 4 AAC 33.490, on what constitutes appropriate and allowable expenditures of a fund account.

(f) The district or charter school must approve all expenditures from the fund account under the written standards established by the district under (e) of this section. The district's or charter school's approval process may include pre-authorization for items identified by the district in its written standards.

(g) The district or charter school may not permit the transfer of funds between student fund accounts. (Eff. 8/6/2004, Register 171; am 9/19/2008, Register 187; am __/__/____.

Register ___)

Authority:  **AS 14.03.320**  AS 14.07.060  AS 14.17.430

AS 14.07.020  AS 14.08.101  AS 14.30.010

AS 14.07.030

4 AAC 33.426 is amended to read:
**4 AAC 33.426. Core course requirements.** (a) A student enrolled in a correspondence study program, whether full-time or part-time, must take at least 50 percent of the student’s coursework that the student takes through the correspondence study program in core courses. A student enrolled in more than two correspondence classes must take core courses in at least two different subject areas.

(b) A district may waive the requirement of (a) of this section if the district determines that the student is a senior and needs less than 50 percent of the student's curriculum in core courses to qualify for high school graduation from the correspondence study program in which the student is enrolled.

(c) A district shall waive the requirement of (a) of this section if the student obtained a proficiency level of advanced or proficient in English/language arts and mathematics as outlined in 4 AAC 06.739(b) during the previous academic year.

(d) Core course work performed outside the student's correspondence study program may not count towards the requirements set out under (a) of this section.

(e) In this section, "core course" means

1. a course of study in
   1. English;
   2. mathematics;
   3. social studies;
   4. science;
   5. technology;
   6. world languages; or
(2) a course required by a student's IEP if the student is receiving special
education and related services under 4 AAC 52. (Eff. 8/6/2004, Register 171; am 9/19/2008,
Register 187; am 2/16/2013, Register 205; am ___/___/____, Register ___)

**Authority:**

- AS 14.03.300
- AS 14.07.060
- AS 14.17.430
- AS 14.07.020
- AS 14.08.101
- AS 14.30.010
- AS 14.07.030
AS 14.03 is amended by adding new section 14.03.300 to read:

(a) A district or the department that provides a correspondence study program shall annually provide an individual learning plan for each student enrolled in the program developed in collaboration with the student, the parent or guardian of the student, a certificated teacher assigned to the student, and other individuals involved in the student's learning plan. An individual learning plan must

(1) be developed with the assistance and approval of the certificated teacher assigned to the student by the district;
(2) provide for a course of study for the appropriate grade level consistent with state and district standards;
(3) provide for an ongoing assessment plan that includes statewide assessments required for public schools under AS 14.03.123(f);
(4) include a provision for modification of the individual learning plan if the student is below proficient on a standardized assessment in a core subject;
(5) provide for a signed agreement between the certificated teacher assigned to the student and at least one parent or the guardian of each student that verifies compliance with an individual learning plan;
(6) provide for monitoring of each student's work and progress by the certificated teacher assigned to the student.

(b) Notwithstanding another provision of law, the department may not impose additional requirements, other than the requirements specified under (a) of this section and under AS 14.03.320, on a student who is proficient or advanced on statewide assessments required under AS 14.03.123(f).

AS 14.03 is amended by adding new section 14.03.320 to read:

(a) Except as provided in (e) of this section, the department or a district that provides a correspondence study program may provide an annual student allotment to a parent or guardian of a student enrolled in the correspondence study program for the purpose of meeting instructional expenses for the student enrolled in the program as provided in this section.

(b) A parent or guardian may purchase nonsectarian services and materials from a public, private, or religious organization with a student allotment provided under (a) of this section if

(1) the services and materials are required for the course of study in the individual learning plan developed for the student under AS 14.03.300;
(2) textbooks, services, and other curriculum materials and the course of study
   (A) are approved by the school district;
   (B) are appropriate for the student;
   (C) are aligned to state standards; and
   (D) comply with AS 14.03.090 and AS 14.18.060; and
(3) the services and materials otherwise support a public purpose.
(c) Except as provided in (d) of this section, an annual student allotment provided under this section is reserved and excluded from the unreserved portion of a district's year-end fund balance in the school operating fund under AS 14.17.505.

(d) The department or a district that provides for an annual student allotment under (a) of this section shall

(1) account for the balance of an unexpended annual student allotment during the period in which a student continues to be enrolled in the correspondence program for which the annual allotment was provided;

(2) return the unexpended balance of a student allotment to the budget of the department or district for a student who is no longer enrolled in the correspondence program for which the allotment was provided;

(3) maintain a record of expenditures and allotments; and

(4) implement a routine monitoring of audits and expenditures.

(e) A student allotment provided under (a) of this section may not be used to pay for services provided to a student by a family member. In this subsection, "family member" means the student's spouse, guardian, parent, stepparent, sibling, stepsibling, grandparent, stepgrandparent, child, uncle, or aunt.
PUBLIC COMMENT
PLEASE REFER TO THE DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF THE LEGISLATURE’S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (UNDER AGENDA ITEM 12I) FOR COMMENTS APPLICABLE TO THIS AGENDA ITEM.
November 3, 2014

Mike Hanley, Commissioner  
Attn: Regulations Review  
Department of Education and Early Development  
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 200  
PO Box 110500  
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

While public education has touted its inclusiveness, history has demonstrated that attempts at inclusiveness often occur only through legislative or court action. From education for African Americans and Native Americans, to inclusion of special needs students, to equal access to programs and extra-curricular activities for female students, public education’s first reaction to calls for more openness is one of circling the wagons as opposed to opening up its arms.

Recent history in Alaska demonstrates this reaction to recent calls for change. One needs to look no further than the regional high school, charter school, and public homeschool options that have come about as a result of families wanting more choices. When first proposed, these public education alternatives were often met with resistance from those protecting the status quo. Through persistence and help from legislators such initiatives were able to gain a toehold and hang on.

As a public educator, who is a product of public education, and whose children receive a public education, I have witnessed firsthand attempts made by my fellow public school officials to thwart new approaches that might encroach upon their turf or threaten the status quo. The system appears, at times, to be more focused on protecting itself rather than evolving to include more programs to engage all of Alaska’s children. Now, while it is true that our public school system allows any and all of Alaska’s children to attend its schools, it often makes little effort to embrace new approaches and programs that might be more engaging, and thus encourage more students to enroll in public education. The lack of true engagement has stratified the system into
public schools, private schools, unregulated homeschooled, and probably a number of "unschooled" children as well. It doesn't have to be this way.

Working with Commissioner Hanley and his staff, I and other legislators crafted legislation to enhance district correspondence study homeschool programs. I believed, at the time, that through House Bill 278, we reached out to thousands of Alaskan families and their children in private schools and unregulated homeschools to encourage them to enroll in public education. Now, I am not so sure.

Don't get me wrong, there is no question that Commissioner Hanley and his staff were sincere in their efforts to craft regulations in the spirit of the law that was passed, however, there needs to be some tweaking. With adjustments, the State Board of Education can achieve the minimal controls necessary to ensure compliance with state laws, with the maximum flexibility for families and teachers.

Student performance can be maximized by focusing on proficiency outcomes and minimizing control over the inputs. In other words, if a child is proficient (performance output), let's not get wrapped around the axel as to how (inputs) the proficiency was achieved. Let's give the families and the teachers the flexibility through the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) to determine the "how" (inputs).

If modifications to the proposed regulation are accepted by the State Board of Education, we as a state will have made monumental progress in making our public education system an inviting and inclusive system. Students currently in private schools and unregulated homeschools are enrolling in the Mat-Su Borough School District as a result of the passage of the education bill. By minimizing the restrictive nature of the proposed regulations, student performance and involvement will be maximized.

In hopes of a continued dialogue, I respectfully submit the following comments on the correspondence study program proposed regulations:

**Proposed 4 AAC 33.421 (a)(1)**

*Each correspondence student's individual learning plan must provide for monitoring of each student by the assigned certificated teacher . . . (and) must include at least monthly teacher-student or teacher-parent contact and quarterly reviews of the student's work . . .*

House Bill 278 stipulates that a student's individual learning plan must "provide for the monitoring of each student's work and progress by the certificated teacher assigned to the student" (page 11, lines 10-11), but the timing of this monitoring is left at the local level.

The proposed regulation imposes additional restrictions that are unnecessary. In the past, the monthly monitoring requirement has been shown to be a record keeping practice that has not been proven to enhance or support what a student needs. The district assigned certificated teacher is in the best position to determine when a teacher-student or teacher-parent contact is warranted and when the contact is not necessary.
Recommendation: Eliminate any reference to monthly monitoring and allow local school districts to determine how best to monitor each student’s work and progress.

Proposed 4 AAC 33.421 (a)(4)(B)
Each correspondence student’s individual learning plan must provide for a signed agreement between the certificated teacher assigned by the correspondence study program and at least one parent of each student that verifies that . . . the textbooks or other curriculum materials and the course of study are appropriate for the student, aligned to state standards, and comply with AS 14.03.090 and AS 14.18.060 and a certificated teacher has reviewed all textbooks and other curriculum materials for each student.

The proposed regulation imposes additional restrictions that are unnecessary. A certificated teacher, along with the student and parent, collaborate together and determine textbooks and other curriculum materials that are appropriate for the student. It is not necessary to add further restrictions, other than what is outlined in the individual learning plan. The output of the student’s learning is what is important and not the input.

Recommendation: Revise 4 AAC 33.421 (4)(B) to read as “the textbooks or other curriculum materials and the course of study are appropriate for the student, as outlined in the individual learning plan” (added). The remaining language is eliminated.

Proposed 4 AAC 33.421 (c)
A correspondence study program must conform with statewide goals and standards, as set out in 4 AAC 04.

House Bill 278 stipulates that an individual learning plan must “provide for a course of study for the appropriate grade level and consistent with state and district standards” (page 11, lines 1-2).

The proposed regulation imposes additional restrictions that are unnecessary. It is my understanding that school districts are not compelled to adopt and implement the Alaska State Standards. However, they are required to participate in the statewide assessment program.

State law as written in House Bill 278 provides the necessary guidance to school districts relating to state and district standards.

Recommendation: Eliminate 4 AAC 33.421 (c) and allow state law to provide guidance.

Proposed 4 AAC 33.421 (f)(1)
The correspondence study program must . . . provide, and require parents to sign, a written statement that they understand, and will abide by, the requirements of the assessment program.”
House Bill 278 stipulates that an individual learning plan must “provide for an ongoing assessment plan that includes statewide assessments required for public schools under AS 14.03.123 (f)” (page 11, lines 3-4).

The proposed regulation imposes additional requirements that are not necessary. Under state law, a parent must verify compliance to the student’s individual learning plan and the learning plan must include statewide assessments (House Bill 278, page 11, lines 7-9). It is unnecessary to require an additional signature.

In addition, it is my understanding that parents of the “brick and mortar” public school students are not required to sign a written statement that they understand and will abide by the requirements of the statewide student assessment program. Why should correspondence study parents be required to sign another agreement?

**Recommendation:** Eliminate the requirement that the correspondence study program must “provide, and require parents to sign a written statement that they understand and will abide by, the requirement of the assessment program.”

**4 AAC 33.421 (i) (2)**

*A correspondence study program, or a parent through a fund account under 4 AAC 33.422, may contract with a private individual to provide tutoring to a student in a subject described in 4 AAC 04.104, fine arts, music, or physical education if the tutor is not vested with the primary responsibility to plan, instruct, or evaluate the learning of the student in the subject.*

Why does this matter? If the individualize learning plan is constructed by a certificated teacher assigned to the student determines that tutor services result in proficiency or progress to proficiency, why does it matter who plans, instructs or evaluates.

The goal should not be one of inputs, but outputs.

**Recommendation:** Eliminate the restriction that “the tutor is not vested with the primary responsibility to plan, instruct, or evaluate the learning of the student in the subject.”

**4 AAC 33.422 (g)**

*The district or charter school may not permit the transfer of funds between student accounts.*

The proposed regulation imposes an additional restriction that is unnecessary. Currently correspondence study programs that provide for a student allotment allow families to form “family allotments” by combining the individual student allotments for the children within their family. A “family allotment” provides the flexibility to manage allotment dollars to best serve the needs of the students within a family.

**Recommendation:** Eliminate 4 AAC 33.422 (g) and allow the formation of a “family allotment” in regulation.
A student enrolled in a correspondence study program, whether full-time or part-time, must take at least 50 percent of the student’s coursework that the student takes through the correspondence study program in core courses. A student enrolled in more than two correspondence classes must take core courses in at least two different subject areas.

This regulation was adopted several years ago and imposes restrictions that may prevent students from taking correspondence study courses. If a student is on an accelerated academic plan and elects to take courses year-round, the student may be junior with only one required subject to take for graduation, for example health. The student enjoys learning and wants to continue learning through correspondence study. It appears that this current regulation prevents this learning to take place.

Does this requirement apply to all public school programs, including the “brick and mortar” programs or is it only for the correspondence study program?

Recommendation: Revisit this regulation and allow flexibility in the type of courses available to students.

I appreciate the time the Department of Education and Early Development and the State Board of Education has taken to listen to the concerns of others regarding the proposed correspondence study regulations. I look forward to our continued dialogue on ways to strengthen our correspondence study programs. Thank you for thoughtful consideration of my suggestions.

Sincerely,

Mike Dunleavy
Alaska State Senator
District D
Name: Ruth Poglitsh
E-Mail: rpoglitsh@yahoo.com
Telephone: 407 505-4385
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 33.422 g
My Comments: Dear Legislators,

I moved to Alaska last year. I had been homeschooling my children before we came to Alaska. It has been a real blessing to work with Mat Su Central and use Alaska’s homeschool support system.

This year is the first year that we have been eligible for allotments. It has enabled us to broaden and deepen what we can provide educationally for our children. I am grateful for the support the state provides for this.

One thing I have appreciated is that this is a family allotment. So many things are purchased and then reused within our family (we have five children). It would be very hard to have to keep separate balances for each child and put shared resources into just one child’s account—hoping that you didn’t judge wrong for the year and that later expenses for that child will exceed that individual’s allotment.

One of the reasons that we homeschool and a key factor in choosing curriculum is to find things that we can do together as a family. Individual allotments rather than family allotments make this difficult.

The result I am afraid would be a lot more administration and time spent by both school staff and parents and no real benefit to the state.
Name: Jay Webber  
E-Mail: jay.webber@matsuk12.us  
Telephone: 907 352-7473  

I am commenting on: 4 AAC 33.422, section g  

My Comments:  To whom it may concern,  

The following is an e-mail I sent to Senator Dunleavy regarding a possible change in how a homescooling parent can use his/her students’ allotments. I am an advisor at Mat Su Central School and I work with these families to support their homeschooling efforts all the time. Please consider the changes to (4 AAC 33.422, section g) I’ve outlined below. I also included comments from a long time homeschooling parent.  

Please contact me if you have any questions,  

Jay Webber  
High School Advisor  
1-907-352-7473  

Hello Senator Dunleavy,  

I know you’re busy, but I wanted to know your thoughts on part of the proposed new regulations. By the way, I called your Wasilla office contact # (376-3370) and left a message. I also dialed a cell # I have for you (841-0399) but your voice mail was full. I can only imagine how busy you are with the election coming up.  

While I would rather this was about moose hunting, I am trying to find out how hard it would be to tweak the new regs (specifically 4 AAC 33.422, section g) to continue to allow home schooling families to use their individual student accounts as family accounts when necessary. Section g is the one that spells out that “the district or charter school may not permit the transfer of funds between student fund accounts.”  

Previous to this time, it was common for parents to use leftover funds from one student’s account who was already taken care of for the year (previously used curriculum from older siblings, or less expensive curriculum) on the curriculum needs for another sibling with more expensive new curriculum or a major one-time expense. We commonly referred to this as using the funds as a “family account”. I’m pretty sure you, as a homeschooling parent yourself, are familiar with this.  

As we are interpreting the new proposed regs this would not be allowed. I know the Department of Education is soliciting input about the new regs now. While I applaud the change that allows student allotments to “roll over” rather than be lost annually, I hope it is possible to add wording now that would allow home schooling parents, under the supervision of school district advisors, to use one of their student’s allotment for another of their student’s needs when:  

The first student’s annual academic needs have been met.  
The second student’s allotment has been used up.  
Said use is seen as academically sound by the school district’s representatives involved for both students.
Essentially, we would be allowing home schooling parents to decide whether to use individual excess allotments for other siblings for that year or let the individual excess balances roll over into the individual student’s accounts.

Mike, if you have time before the public comment period is up to speak with me about this I would greatly appreciate it. If not, I hope I have accurately laid this out. Please find below the comments made by Ella Embree, one of my tried and true homeschooling parents, about this matter. I intend to send this commentary to the DEED as well for their consideration.

I appreciate all the work you’ve managed to do in the short time you have been in the legislature. I hope you continue to have the opportunity to do good things for education in these rapidly changing times.

You have my support,
Jay Webber

Comments from Ella Embree (long time home schooling parent) on possible inclusion of “family use of accounts”:

Thanks for taking my feedback on the current legislation proposed. I am a very active homeschool mom of three wonderful children for the past ten years. I also run a homeschool co-op that meets on Friday in Palmer. I love the accountability and the opportunities that we can delve into as educators of our children with the partnership of Mat-Su Central School. However, practically, section “g” is a hinderance for the following three reasons:
1) shared resources
2) different costs for targeted learning
3) group learning

Shared Resources: Reuse!
If I purchase a book for our home library, more than one child will benefit and utilize that same book. It would be a financial nightmare to try to divide up a book into three different allotments. Another example is the case of internet expenses, it makes sense to have a “family” allotment because all students in the home will be using the online resources. Thankfully, I can use the same teachers addition of Math curriculum once my younger students get to the same level as the older one. In reality, I purchase more specific new stuff for my older student and only need to purchase consumables for the younger ones. A FAMILY allotment makes sense because I can keep the item until all my students are done with the curriculum purchased.

Different Cost
I have an active son that benefits from team sports that are minimal cost per activity ($60) for almost three months of workouts. However, my daughter is in Point Class at a ballet studio costing $340 for 4 months. Both are getting a workout, both are learning needed skills. As an educator, it would be sad to say, wow- your activity is over the allotment, so you must stay home. Nevertheless, the family allotment would allow each kid to get the desired “physical education and workout”.

Group Learning
Many activities have a family cost for membership. If you keep the no shared resources between family members, it would be another paperwork hassle to keep original receipts for each student...It is best understand that we live and learn as a family, so we also can have the allocated funds administered as a family.

*I am in agreement that this needs to still be under the supervision of the Individual learning plans and the contact teacher. But, please allow the funds to be administered as a family instead of per student.
From: eric.fry@alaska.gov
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 6:08 PM
To: Fry, Eric V (EED)
Subject: Comments on Regs

Name: Rachelle Seiber
E-Mail: wdseiber@ideafamilies.org
Telephone: 907 841-1341

I am commenting on: 4AAC 33.426
My Comments: There are several changes to the regulations regarding correspondence study programs that I find very concerning. The wonderful opportunity the correspondence study programs offer to families is the ability to cater the educational experience to each student's needs. Our curriculum has always been chosen very carefully, and have enabled us to share our learning experiences. The new regulations are not extremely clear, but this section implies that our curriculum choices may be limited to those aligned to the state standards -
(B) the textbooks or other curriculum materials and the course of study are appropriate for the student, aligned to state standards, and comply with AS 14.03.090 This is our seventh year homeschooling through IDEA and we have enjoyed the wide variety of curriculum options. It would be a shame to limit the curriculum options for home educators.
Specifically, the regulations seem to imply that curriculum options will be determined based on proficiency levels determined by the state-mandated assessments. In the past, we have had the ability to determine our own educational standards and have used the assessments merely as a reference tool. If the state-mandated assessments will be used to determine our curriculum choices, our family will definitely be rethinking our participation in the correspondence study program.
Comments on Regs

Name: ella embree
E-Mail: ellaembree@gmail.com
Telephone: 907 707-3505
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 33.422 g
My Comments: Thanks for taking my feedback on the current legislation proposed. I am a very active homeschool mom of three wonderful children for the past ten years. I also run a homeschool co-op that meets on Friday in Palmer. I love the accountability and the opportunities that we can delve into as educators of our children with the partnership of Mat-Su Central School. However, practically, section "g" is a hinderance for the following three reasons:
1) shared resources
2) different costs for targeted learning
3) group learning

Shared Resources: Reuse!
If I purchase a book for our home library, more than one child will benefit and utilize that same book. It would be a financial nightmare to try to divide up a book into three different allotments. Another example is the case of internet expenses, it makes sense to have a "family" allotment because all students in the home will be using the online resources. Thankfully, I can use the same teachers addition of Math curriculum once my younger students get to the same level as the older one. In reality, I purchase more specific new stuff for my older student and only need to purchase consumables for the younger ones. A FAMILY allotment makes sense because I can keep the item until all my students are done with the curriculum purchased.

Different Cost
I have an active son that benefits from team sports that are minimal cost per activity ($60) for almost three months of workouts. However, my daughter is in Point Class at a ballet studio costing $340 for 4 months. Both are getting a workout, both are learning needed skills. As an educator, it would be sad to say, wow- your activity is over the allotment, so you must stay home. Nevertheless, the family allotment would allow each kid to get the desired "physical education and workout".

Group Learning
Many activities have a family cost for membership. If you keep the no shared resources between family members, it would be another paperwork hassle to keep original receipts for each student. It is best understand that we live and learn as a family, so we also can have the allocated funds administered as a family.

*I am in agreement that this needs to still be under the supervision of the individual learning plans and the contact teacher. But, please allow the funds to be administered as a family instead of per student.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 1

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations related to math credits.

♦ BACKGROUND
- At the March State Board of Education meeting, board members reviewed the number of credits currently being required by 4 AAC 06.075 for high school graduation, as well as how this compares to other states’ requirements and to what is required by school districts in Alaska.
- Currently, 4 AAC 06.075 requires students to complete a total of 21 units of credits to graduate from high school including the following number of subject-specific units:
  - Language arts – four units of credit;
  - Social studies – three units of credit;
  - Mathematics – two units of credit;
  - Science – two units of credit; and
  - Health/physical education – one unit of credit.
- Forty-two states require students to complete more than Alaska’s currently required two units of credit in mathematics.
- Forty-seven school districts in Alaska require students to complete more than the minimally required two credits in mathematics in order to earn a diploma in that district.
- The proposed regulation increases the units of credits required for high school graduation from two to three units of credit.
- This increase brings consistency between what is already being required by the vast majority of both other states and school districts in Alaska.
- Behind this cover memo are the proposed regulations and public comments.
- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14C.
4 AAC 06.075 is amended to read:

4 AAC 06.075. **High school graduation requirements.** (a) Each chief school administrator shall develop and submit to the district board for approval a plan consisting of district high school graduation requirements. The plan must require that, before graduation, a student must have earned at least 21 units of credit.

(b) Specific subject area units-of-credit requirements must be set out in each district plan and must require that, before graduation, a student must have completed at least the following:

1. language arts - four units of credit;
2. social studies - three units of credit;
3. mathematics - two units of credit for students graduating from high school on or before June 30, 2017, and three units of credit for students graduating from high school on or after July 1, 2017;
4. science - two units of credit; and
5. health/physical education - one unit of credit.

(c) Transfer students who have earned 13 units of credit while in attendance outside the district may, at the discretion of the district, be excused from the district subject area units-of-credit requirements.

(d) Beginning January 1, 2009, the three units of credit in social studies required under (b)(2) of this section must include one-half unit of credit in Alaska history or demonstration that the student meets the Alaska history performance standards. The provisions of this subsection do not apply to a student who
(1) transfers into an Alaska public school after the student's second year of high school; or

(2) has already successfully completed a high school state history course from another state.

(e) In this section, "unit of credit" means the credit that a student is awarded for achieving a passing grade in a course of study by meeting the content standards for a course of study as prescribed by a local school board. (Eff. 3/1/78, Register 65; am 6/16/84, Register 90; am 3/24/85, Register 93; am 2/11/89, Register 109; am 4/4/96, Register 138; am 8/21/2005, Register 175; am 10/16/2012, Register 204; am __/__/____. Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.060
PUBLIC COMMENT
November 3, 2014

Commissioner Mike Hanley
Department of Education and Early Development
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 2002
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

In response to the request for review and public comment to the proposed changes in Title 4 of the Alaska Administrative Code to amend 4 AAC 06.075 to revise the units of credit required for high school graduation, the Anchorage School District forwards the attached comment.

My staff and I are available to answer any questions regarding our responses and will forward any additional remarks to the proposed regulation changes, as you deem necessary.

Sincerely,

Ed Graff
Superintendent

Cc: Anchorage School Board
    Mike Graham, Chief Academic Officer
    Diane Hoffbauer, Assistant Superintendent, Instruction
    Mike Henry, Executive Director, Secondary Education
    Bobbi Jo Eshb, Executive Director, STEM
4 AAC 06.075 Increasing Math Credits Required for Graduation

The Anchorage School District is supportive of the change in graduation requirements to three credits of math.

The proposal to increase credits required for graduation to three full credits would only be an additional half credit requirement for the Anchorage School District, as the ASD currently requires 2.5 credits.

From 2012-2014, 85.55% of ASD graduates finished with at least 3 credits of mathematics. The proposed regulation change would therefore only impact 14.45% of our graduates. In 2014, with 86.05% of graduates finishing with at least 3 credits, approximately 390 ASD students would have needed an additional 0.5 credits of math.

Because the vast majority of students already graduate with 3 or more credits in math, the change would not have a major impact their individual schedules. It may take some students in alternative programs a bit longer to complete their credits, but it would not have a major impact.

One challenge that school districts that could face as a result of the increase in the math credit requirement is the impact on elective class offerings. In the Anchorage School District, for example, the 390 students who last year stopped after 2.5 credits of math enrolled in other semester long elective courses. With the requirement change to three credits, those students would no longer have that space in their schedule. Districts could face the possibility of fewer elective offerings as a result of having fewer students available to take other courses.

November 3, 2014
Name: Louise Kern
E-Mail: louise.kern@k21schools.org
Telephone: 907 225-6398

I am commenting on: 4AAC 06.075 Units of credit required for high school graduation

My Comments: I am concerned that adding additional math credit requirements will affect graduation rates.

Students planning to go to more advanced academic studies will take credits required by the schools that they hope to attend no matter how many credits that might be in a particular academic area.

Students who have plans for future work which does not include academic degrees could be put off by the additional requirement and leave their academic studies behind even with no diploma.

Not every school will have math credits available which are oriented to daily life (banking, investment etc.) and not every student wants or needs to do trig and calculus.

What is the expected benefit to the student to have another math credit?

Why not a language credit, or arts credit or business credit?
October 28, 2014

Esther J. Cox, Chair  
State Board of Education & Early Development  
PO Box 110500  
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

dear Ms. Cox:

The University of Alaska supports the State Board of Education & Early Development’s proposed regulation to require students to have three high school credits of math to receive a diploma.

Alaska’s largest college readiness issue is inadequate mathematics preparation. In fall 2014 about 47% of recent high school graduates entering the UA system required developmental mathematics coursework to prepare for collegiate level courses.

The proposed increase in high school mathematics credits, in conjunction with the new Alaska Standards and the rigorous curriculum required for Alaska Performance Scholarship eligibility, will positively impact college readiness.

Sincerely,

Patrick Gamble
Fry, Eric V (EED)

From: eric.fry@alaska.gov
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2014 3:19 PM
To: Fry, Eric V (EED)
Subject: Comments on Regs

Name: Shawn Aspelund
E-Mail: saaspelund@gmail.com
Telephone: 907 570-8244
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.075
My Comments: It is good to increase the units of credit in mathematics for future high school graduates.

However, this may only work if the elementary and middle-school curriculum is also strengthened to provide the necessary foundation for success at the high school level.
Name: Mike Shiffer  
E-Mail: mike.shiffer@alaska.gov  
Telephone: 907 538-2118  
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.075  
My Comments: I do not support the increase in math credits. Evidence from post-secondary education institutions and the University of Alaska in particular reveals that as many as 60 percent of incoming freshmen who recently graduated high school are deficient in basic math skills and must take remediation before taking degree conferring math classes. Additional math classes do not solve the problem. The issue is better application of basic math skills. Students who attend Career and Technical Education courses with an emphasis in applied math skills demonstrate acquisition of math skill sufficient to advance in post-secondary education.

Instead of more math, require that students demonstrate a high level of applied competency by applying math skills in a required CTE credit course. The state does not have any standards for the number of required credits in CTE and is a disservice to our graduates, many of whom do not plan to attend a four-year program but do plan on additional post-secondary training. This is more likely to prepare students for the workforce and increase proficiency than simply requiring more theoretical math courses.
From: eric.fry@alaska.gov
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2014 12:55 PM
To: Fry, Eric V (EED)
Subject: Comments on Regs

Name: Deborah Lo
E-Mail: delo@uas.alaska.edu
Telephone: 907 796-6551
I am commenting on: 4AAC 06.075
My Comments: I support requiring 3 credits of math for high school graduation. It is absolutely imperative to producing College and Career Ready graduates for Alaska. Please pass this regulation.
Name: Pamela Verfaillie
E-Mail: PBV@valdezak.net
Telephone: 907 835-8678

I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.075, UNITS OF CREDIT REQUIRED FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

My Comments: I strongly support the increase of math credits required for graduation. I would also suggest that these 3 credits, and all other high school required classes, be required to be taken WHILE IN HIGH SCHOOL (so 8th grade algebra would count as a middle school math class even if it shows on a high school transcript).
Name: Amber Cunningham  
E-Mail: acunningham@bssd.org  
Telephone: 907 625-1309  
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.075  
My Comments: Good afternoon,

I was told that I could leave a public comment on your webpage regarding raising high school graduation requirements. I am saddened that the requirements were ever dropped in the first place. I remember having to have at least 3 math credits and 3 science credits to graduate back in 2004. I think it is important to set high standards for our students because they are our future. I have two sons who are in elementary school and I am strongly persuaded to send them off to Mt. Edgecumbe so they may get a QUALITY education. Rural education has been very poor for far too long. We keep dropping our standards for our students just so we can get more and more kids to pass them for funding. This needs to stop.

When we lower standards, we are basically slapping a "Stupid" sticker on our student's forehead. We are saying that they are incapable to rise to higher standards. When we lower standards and lower the high school graduation requirements, our students are not prepared to go on to college. Those that choose to go to college end up having to spend extra money on preparatory Math and English classes (Math 055 and English 105 or even lower).

It is my strong belief that those high school requirements be brought back up so that we can provide our future leaders with proper education and preparation for college or whatever else they choose to pursue after high school.

I attended Mt. Edgecumbe High School from 10th-12th grade and found a passion for learning. The curriculum was excellent and the teachers were all highly qualified. I think that we should take note from M.E.H.S. and apply their principles to public and private education: rural and urban throughout Alaska. Before attending M.E.H.S. I had absolutely no plans on going to college after graduating. I wanted to be done with school and never look back. However, after three years of wonderful teachers, my outlook on life changed. I graduated in May 2004 and have been attending UAA ever since. I received my Bachelor's in Elementary Education with a minor in Psychology in 2012. Currently I am working on my Master's in Teaching and Learning. I will be graduating with that degree in December. Afterwards, I plan on finding another degree to begin. Learning has become a passion and I hope to pass that on to my sons.

Let's not forget how valuable our children are. We need to think of them when making decisions regarding their education. They are our future leaders and if they aren't getting the education they are entitled to, how can they pass on the passion of learning to their kids and their kids' kids and so on?

Think about what is really important to our children. We use math every day. Health is also becoming more important as more kids are becoming overweight and obese earlier and earlier in life. So many kids from villages don't pursue careers in science because they are only required to take 2 credits of science in high school. Let's bring that back up. Our children may want to be doctors, architects, scientists, etc.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Hope you all have a great weekend. If you have any comments or questions feel free to email me or call me.
Amber Cunningham
BSSD Registrar & "Professional Student"
Fry, Eric V (EED)

From: eric.fry@alaska.gov
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2014 1:41 PM
To: Fry, Eric V (EED)
Subject: Comments on Regs

Name: Gerald Scarzella
E-Mail: gerald.scarzella@k21schools.org
Telephone: 907 821-8800

I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.075 Units of credit required for high school graduation My Comments: As a high school math teacher, it is great to see the State of Alaska implement high expectations in the content area of math by requiring 3 credits for graduation.

The current Math Standards (June 2012) for 9-12 grade are very specific and comprehensive. I do not agree with the premise that districts can choose how to cover the standards through traditional course offerings sequence (Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2, etc.) or with an integrated approach. I believe that in order to cover the standards appropriately, there needs to be curricular materials that has been researched that will be able to do this task, and have the State list specific learning materials to implement.

I believe the day to day interactions at school and the duties that teachers perform do not allow a teacher to keep track of what standards have been covered throughout the year, let alone the four years a student has been in school, with up to 4 different math teachers. If there was a suggested list of materials to use, and sequence to implement, it would be easier to insure students will meet the new math standards. No matter where they live or go to school.

Although I applaud the higher expectations, the implementation needs to be addressed and researched. We shouldn't expect 54 districts to perform 54 different curricular materials reviews and implement 54 different programs to cover math standards. Let’s be efficient and have the State perform this task to alleviate the burden of teachers to do this.
Name: Fred Villa
E-Mail: villa9987@hotmail.com
Telephone: 907 490-2476
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.075
My Comments: Requiring a greater proficiency and even mastery of mathematics is critical for students to be successful in after-secondary education careers and higher education. This should be encouraged. Requiring additional credits without relevancy of it’s purpose becomes an exercise in rote memory and distracts from critical learning improving problem solving skills applicable to future careers and possibly continuing education.

Solution: Expanding the required number of math credits in regulation should be accompanied by language that supports applied math concepts in career and technical education courses to meet the math credit requirement rather than increasing additional math credits by simply adding advanced math classes. The availability of upper division math teachers will challenge many school districts. Students may become discouraged when failure to learn difficult math concepts reflects personal success in the classroom.

Applied math reasoning aligned with the educational and work opportunities for students should be the goal, not advanced math, but mastery at an appropriate and applicable level.
To:  Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From:  Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 12D

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations pertaining to House Bill 210, an act regarding crisis intervention training for school personnel, and restraint and seclusion of students in public schools.

♦ BACKGROUND
● House Bill 210 amended statute to require the following of school districts:
  o Establishing policies and procedures for the use of restraint and seclusion of students;
  o Reporting to parents of affected students incidences involving the use of restraint or seclusion;
  o Complying with limitations regarding the use of restraint and seclusion of a student; and
  o Reporting annually to the department data regarding incidents involving the use of restraint or seclusion of a student.

● As part of HB 210, two amended statutes have implication for regulation.
  o AS 14.33.125 requires the department to collect from school districts data related to incidents involving the use of restraint or seclusion of a student.
  o AS 14.33.127 requires the department to approve crisis intervention training programs for schools.

● The proposed regulations prescribe the timeline for submission by school districts of the required data and outline the department’s process for approving crisis intervention training programs.

● Behind this cover memo are the proposed regulations, the relevant authorizing statutes AS 14.33.125 and AS 14.133.127 regarding crisis intervention training and restraint and seclusion of students in public schools, and public comments.

● Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14D.
4 AAC 06. is amended by adding a new section to read:

**4 AAC 06.175. Reporting restraint and seclusion incidents.** On or before June 30, each governing body shall provide a report to the department that includes all data required under AS 14.33.125(f). Each governing body must file the required report electronically in a format prescribed by the department, unless the governing body determines that the district does not have the capability of filing the report electronically in that format. (Eff. ____/____/_____. Register ____)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.020   AS 14.07.060   AS 14.33.125

4 AAC 06 is amended by adding a new section to read:

**4 AAC 06.177. Crisis intervention training programs.** (a) The department will maintain a list of approved crisis intervention training programs. An approved program must

(1) include training in all areas required under AS 14.33.127(a);

(2) have a clear record of success in the prevention and safe use of physical restraint and seclusion;

(3) have undergone a peer-review process or have otherwise been the subject of scholarly research; and

(4) adequately address AS 14.33.127(a)(1)-(3).

(b) In determining whether a training program meets the requirement under (a)(4) of this section, the department will consider whether the program

(1) cautions against the use of mechanical or chemical restraint except as authorized by licensed and qualified medical personnel;
(2) limits the use of restraint and seclusion to situations where the child’s behavior poses imminent danger of serious physical harm to self or others and requires discontinuation as soon as the risk of serious harm dissipates;

(3) includes policies restricting the use of restraint and seclusion for all students, whether or not they have a disability;

(4) emphasizes students’ rights to be treated with dignity and be free from abuse;

(5) forbids the use of restraint or seclusion as a punishment or disciplinary technique;

(6) forbids the use of restraint or seclusion that restricts a student’s breathing or otherwise harms the student;

(7) requires that the repeated use of restraint and seclusion by one individual or in a particular classroom will trigger an automatic review;

(8) requires the use of behavioral strategies that address the underlying cause or purpose of dangerous behavior;

(9) requires that instances of restraint and seclusion be visually monitored to ensure the appropriateness of the intervention and the safety of the student and school staff;

(10) requires parental notification regarding the governing body’s restraint and seclusion policy and applicable federal, state, and local laws, and also requires that parents be notified as soon as possible following each instance in which restraint or seclusion was used with their child; and

(11) provides for the regular review of the governing body’s restraint and seclusion policies and requires written documentation.
(b) The department will, on an annual basis, review the list of crisis intervention training programs approved under (a) of this section. The department will review whether currently approved programs continue to meet the requirements under (a) of this section and the availability of other training programs that warrant approval by the department. (Eff. ____/___/_____, Register ____)

**Authority:**  AS 14.07.020    AS 14.33.125    AS 14.33.127

AS 14.07.060
AS 14.33 is amended by adding new section 14.33.125 to read:

(a) A public school disciplinary and safety program must

   (1) prohibit restraint or seclusion of a student except as provided in (b) of this section;
   (2) be annually reviewed with school personnel;
   (3) include a written report of each incident that is maintained in the student's record as described in (d) of this section; and
   (4) include a review of each incident in which restraint or seclusion is used as provided in (e) of this section.

(b) A teacher, teacher's assistant, or other person responsible for students may physically restrain or seclude a student only if

   (1) the student's behavior poses an imminent danger of physical injury to the student or another person;
   (2) less restrictive interventions would be ineffective to stop the imminent danger to the student or another person;
   (3) the person continuously monitors the student in face-to-face contact or, if face-to-face contact is unsafe, by continuous direct visual contact with the student;
   (4) the person has received training in crisis intervention and de-escalation and restraint techniques that has been approved by the department under AS 14.33.127, unless a trained person is not immediately available and the circumstances are rare and present an unavoidable and unforeseen emergency; and
   (5) the restraint or seclusion is discontinued immediately when the student no longer poses an imminent danger of physical injury to the student or another person or when a less restrictive intervention is effective to stop the danger of physical injury.

(c) A teacher, teacher's assistant, or other person responsible for students may not

   (1) use chemical restraint;
   (2) use mechanical restraint; or
   (3) physically restrain a student by placing the student on the student's back or stomach or in a manner that restricts the student's breathing.

(d) School personnel who restrain or seclude a student shall provide a written report of the incident to the school administrator. A school shall provide a copy of the report to the student's parents or legal guardians. The report must include

   (1) the date and time of the incident;
   (2) the names and job titles of school personnel who participated in or supervised the incident;
   (3) a description of the activity that preceded the incident, including efforts and strategies used with the student before the incident;
   (4) a description of the incident, including the type and duration of the intervention used;
   (5) a description of how the incident ended, including any further action taken.
(e) A school district shall ensure that a review process is established and conducted for each incident that involves restraint or seclusion of a student. The review must be conducted as soon as practicable after the event and include

(1) staff review of the incident;
(2) follow-up communication with the student and the student's parent or legal guardian;
(3) review of and recommendations for adjusting or amending procedures, strategies, accommodations, individualized education plans, or other student behavior plans, or for additional staff training.

(f) Each school district shall annually report to the department, on a form acceptable to the department, the total number of incidents involving the restraint or seclusion of a student. The report must specify

(1) the number of incidents that resulted in injury or death of students or personnel;
(2) the number of incidents in which school personnel involved in the restraint or seclusion were not trained in an approved crisis intervention training program as described in AS 14.33.127(b); and
(3) the number of incidents involving the restraint or seclusion of a child with a disability under AS 14.30.350; the report must also include the category of the disability of the child involved in each incident.

(g) In this section,

(1) "chemical restraint" means a psychopharmacologic drug that is used on a student for discipline or convenience and that is not required to treat a medical symptom;
(2) "mechanical restraint" means the use of a device that is not a medical device or protective equipment prescribed by a qualified health care professional to restrict a student's freedom of movement;
(3) "physically restrain" or "physical restraint" means a personal restriction that immobilizes or reduces the ability of a student to move the student's arms, legs, or head freely;
(4) "restraint" means physical restraint, chemical restraint, mechanical restraint, or other aversive behavioral interventions that compromise health and safety;
(5) "seclusion" means the involuntary confinement of a student alone in a room or area that the student is physically prevented from leaving; "seclusion" does not include a classroom time-out, supervised detention, or suspension from school under AS 14.30.045.

AS 14.33 is amended by adding new section 14.33.127 to read:

(a) The department shall approve crisis intervention training programs for schools, which shall include training in

(1) evidenced-based techniques that have been shown to be effective in the prevention of restraint and seclusion of students;
(2) evidence-based techniques shown to be effective in keeping school personnel and students safe when imposing physical restraint or seclusion of students;
(3) evidence-based skills related to positive behavior supports, conflict
(4) prevention, understanding antecedents, de-escalation, and conflict management;
(5) first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation; and
(6) applicable policies and procedures.

(b) The governing body of a school shall ensure that a sufficient number of school employees receives periodic training in an approved crisis intervention program to meet the needs of the school population.

(c) In this section,

(1) "restraint" has the meaning given in AS 14.33.125;
(2) "seclusion"
PUBLIC COMMENT
PLEASE REFER TO THE DRAFT TRANSCRIPT OF THE LEGISLATURE’S
ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION REVIEW COMMITTEE (UNDER AGENDA ITEM 121)
FOR COMMENTS APPLICABLE TO THIS AGENDA ITEM.
November 3, 2014

Commissioner Mike Hanley
Department of Education and Early Development
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 2002
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

In response to the request for review and public comment to the proposed changes in Title 4 of the Alaska Administrative Code to amend 4 AAC 06.175, .177, procedures for reporting incidents involving the restraint or seclusion of a student and criteria for approval of crisis intervention training programs, the Anchorage School District provides the attached comments.

My staff and I are available to answer any questions regarding our responses and will forward any additional remarks to the proposed regulation changes, as you deem necessary.

Sincerely,

[signature]

Ed Graff
Superintendent

Cc: Anchorage School Board
    Mike Graham, Chief Academic Officer
    Linda Carlson, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Support

Educating All Students for Success in Life
4 AAC 06.175, .177 Restraint and Seclusion

The Anchorage School District is supportive of these regulation changes.

1) Procedures for school districts to follow in reporting incidents involving the restraint or seclusion of a student:

The Anchorage School District has identified a means to document any incidents involving the restraint or seclusion of a student and already put that practice into place. While still being developed, we believe the documentation will allow for a final report that can be submitted to the state.

2) Criteria for department approval of crisis intervention training programs for use by school districts:

The Anchorage School district believes criteria should be broad enough to encompass a number of evidence-based models so that districts can comply with this regulation. The Anchorage School District currently uses CPI and Nonviolent Crisis Intervention that includes the following:

- Preventive techniques: non-verbal and verbal to de-escalate behavior. Demonstrates principals of personal safety and provides for the care, welfare, safety and security of all those involved in the situation.

- Nonviolent physical crisis intervention and team intervention: develops team intervention strategies and techniques, recognizes the importance of staff attitudes and professionalism, and demonstrates physical control and restraint positions as a last resort.

- Post-intervention strategies: uses a model for action after an incident for closure, debriefing, and re-establishment of a therapeutic relationship with the individuals involved and continues to provide for the care, welfare, safety and security of all those involved in the crisis situation.

Furthermore, if an LEA currently uses a crisis intervention training program that is not on the approved list, we believe it would be advantageous to allow the LEA to demonstrate evidence of the aforementioned components within the training program for approval.
Name: Christie Reinhardt  
E-Mail: christie.reinhardt@alaska.gov  
Telephone: 907 947-2542  

I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.175, .177 Restraint and Seclusion of Students  
My Comments:  
Department of Health & Social Services  

GOVERNOR’S COUNCIL ON DISABILITIES  
& SPECIAL EDUCATION  
Patrick Reinhart, Executive Director  
3601 C Street, Suite 740  
Anchorage, Alaska 99503-5924  
Main: 907.269.8990  
Toll Free: 1.888.269.8990  
Fax: 907.269.8995  

The Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education (the Council) is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for Alaska as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Council members are former special education students, parents of students with disabilities, special education teachers, school administrators, staff from the Department of Education & Early Development (EED) and others involved in the education of students with disabilities. The Council works on issues and activities of concern to make changes in the education system that improves the lives of students with disabilities. The Council generally supports the changes to the proposed regulation changes to 4 AAC06 to address the department requirements necessitated by the passage of CSHB 210, an act relating to the restraint and seclusion of students in public schools.  

The Council worked with the Department, the legislature and a wide variety of stakeholders to facilitate the crafting and fine tuning of the bill. We are very excited to see the hard work of so many finally translated into these regulations required for implementation. One of the requirements of the act is that schools must report the incidents of restraint and seclusion to the Department annually. Section 4 AAC 06.175 explains how this will happen, the only comment that while the section does have a report date, it may be clearer to specify that this is an annual reporting requirement  

4 AAC 06.175. Reporting restraint and seclusion incidents.  
On or before June 30, each governing body shall provide an annual report to the department that includes all data required under AS 14.33.125(f).  

4 AAC 06.177 Crisis intervention training programs.  
This section addresses the criteria needed for the approval by the department of crisis intervention training programs required in the act. This regulation follows the requirements of the act as well as adding some requirements that clarify what an effective yet safe program should consist of. The Council is very pleased with much of this regulation, in
particular the respectful language in (b) (4) which “emphasizes students’ rights to be treated with dignity and be free from abuse;” We do see a couple of areas where there should be a little more clarification and recommend the following changes.

(b) {6} forbids the use of restraint or seclusion that places a student on their back or stomach or restricts a student’s breathing or otherwise harms the student;

(b) {8} requires the use of evidence based behavioral strategies including Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS) that address the underlying cause or purpose of dangerous behavior;

(b) {9} requires that instances of restraint and seclusion be continuously visually monitored, face to face whenever possible, to ensure the appropriateness of the intervention and the safety of the student and school staff;

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these regulations to keep everyone in Alaskan schools safe and respected.

Taylor Gregg
Chair of the Education Committee
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 12E

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt regulations regarding residential school programs.

♦ BACKGROUND
  ♦ State funding for districts operating residential schools is provided for at AS 14.16.200. The program provides eligible programs with a per-pupil monthly residential stipend for a nine-month year. The stipend rate is set in statute. The program also provides for one round-trip ticket per student, at the least expensive means, between the student’s community of residence and the school.

  ♦ House Bill 278, The Education Opportunity Act, amended AS 14.16.100 to provide an annual period of open applications for the residential program. The proposed regulation implements an annual period of applications for the residential program.

  ♦ Additionally, the proposed regulations are amended to provide an opportunity for districts to request an alternative count day for variable term programs. The alternative count day must be during the October count period at AS 14.17.600 and must reflect the number of students the district will continue to house throughout the entire school year.

  ♦ Behind this cover memo are: 1) proposed amended regulations for 4 AAC 33.090, 2) authorizing language, AS 14.16.100 and 3) public comment.

  ♦ Elizabeth Nudelman, Director of School Finance, will be present to brief the board and public comment.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under agenda item 14E.
4 AAC 33.090(c) is amended to read:

(c) The department will **open a period of application annually on May 1. The application period will close on June 30.** [ESTABLISH A PERIOD OF OPEN APPLICATIONS AND SOLICIT PROPOSALS FROM DISTRICTS TO ESTABLISH ADDITIONAL STATEWIDE OR DISTRICT-WIDE RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS WHEN THE DEPARTMENT DETERMINES THAT ESTABLISHMENT OF ADDITIONAL SCHOOLS IS WARRANTED.] The department may require that applications be targeted to provide a particular program to meet specific needs of students in the state. A period of open application and solicitation does not imply that the department will approve the establishment of any new schools. [IN DETERMINING WHETHER TO ESTABLISH A PERIOD OF OPEN APPLICATIONS, THE DEPARTMENT WILL CONSIDER THE]

1. DEMAND FOR RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS, INCLUDING THE DEMAND AND NEEDS IN DIFFERENT REGIONS OF THE STATE;
2. CAPACITY OF EXISTING SCHOOLS; AND
3. PUBLIC INTEREST.]

(Eff. 10/22/2006, Register 180; am 6/8/2013, Register 206; am 10/16/2013, Register 208; am 2/21/2014, Register 209; am __/__/____, Register ____)

**Authority:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 14.07.060</td>
<td>AS 14.16.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 AAC 33.090(h) is amended to read:

(h) A district may apply during a period of open application under (c) of this section for approval to operate a variable-term statewide or district-wide residential school that will house
students for the entire school calendar. The minimum term for each student must be at least two weeks. A variable-term school is eligible for reimbursement for a monthly stipend for up to nine months of the school year under (f) of this section for the number of students that it housed on the last day of the student count period under AS 14.17.600 if the district will continue to house at least the same number of students throughout the entire school term. **Upon the written request of a school district, the commissioner may permit a district to report the number of students it housed on a date other than the last day of the student count period if the date is within the count period set out in AS 14.17.600 and the date more accurately reflects the numbers of students the district will house throughout the school term.** A variable-term school is eligible for a one-time air fare reimbursement under AS 14.16.200(b)(1) for the number of students housed by the school on the last day of the student count period, based on the average cost of round-trip air fare for all statewide or district-wide residential schools. A district may not include students housed by a variable-term school in the school's student count submitted to the department for foundation funding under AS 14.17; a student being housed by a variable-term school during the student count period may be included in the count of the student's district of residence. In this subsection, "variable-term statewide or district-wide residential school" means a statewide or district-wide residential school that rotates students in and out of the school during the school year for the entire school term as defined under AS14.03.030. (Eff. 10/22/2006, Register 180; am 6/8/2013, Register 206; am 10/16/2013, Register 208; am 2/21/2014, Register 209; am __/__/____, Register ____)

**Authority:**

AS 14.07.020  
AS 14.07.165  
AS 14.16.200  
AS 14.07.060  
AS 14.16.100
Sec. 22. AS 14.16 is amended by adding a new section to article 2 to read:

Sec. 14.16.100. Application for residential school. A school district shall apply to the department for approval to establish and operate a statewide or district-wide residential school. The department shall accept applications during an open application period conducted annually. A period of open application in itself does not indicate that the department will approve the establishment of a new residential school.
PUBLIC COMMENT
Mike Hanley, Commissioner  
Alaska Department of Education & Early Development  
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 200  
P.O. Box 110500  
Juneau, AK 99811-0500

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on proposed changes to 4 AAC 33.090.

Northwest Arctic Borough School District supports the proposed changes to the above referenced regulation. The proposed timeframe for the open application period affords districts ample time to prepare and submit an application.

Additionally, the flexible count date for variable-term education programs is a practical approach that fits nicely with the delivery schedule of variable-term programs.

As a recently approved residential program that will offer both full-year and variable-term programs, our school district is very appreciative of your leadership and support in shepherding the statute changes through the legislative process and proposing these adjustments to the regulation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Annmarie O'Brien,  
Superintendent
Deadline for Comment – November 4

4 AAC 33.090(C) RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS
The Department of Education & Early Development proposes to adopt regulation changes in Title 4 of the Alaska Administrative Code to amend 4 AAC 33.090. The proposed regulation implements AS 14.16.100, which was enacted by the 2014 legislature and requires the department to provide an annual open application period for approval to operate a residential school. The regulation also addresses the student count date for a variable-term statewide residential educational program. The regulation may

- Describe the annual open application period required by AS 14.16.100;
- Allow a variable-term statewide residential educational program flexibility in determining the day of the student count period for which they provide enrollment figures for state funding purposes.
Name: Susan Hope  
E-Mail: susan.hope@nsbsd.org  
Telephone: 907 852-9530  
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 33.090, Presidential Schools  
My Comments: October 28, 2014

Commissioner Hanley  
Department of Education & Early Development PO Box 110500 Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Dear Commissioner,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to public comment for the proposed regulation 4 AAC 33.090, Residential Schools.

The North Slope Borough School District acknowledges the department’s need to set a specific application date for registering a residential school. The proposed dates from May 1 to June 30 seem adequate and fair for submitting the required application. However, what is vague is the lag time between submission of the application, the approval of funding and when a residential program would receive funding after approval.

The second change that we support is that of permitting upon written request a student count date other than the last day of the student count period. We are considering a variable term program and this change may better reflect our student population count.

Sincerely,

Debby Edwardson  
Board of Education President  
North Slope Borough School District

cc: Linda Saito, Assistant Superintendent  
Mark Roseberry, Coordinator of Residential Learning Center
Name: Laural Jackson  
E-Mail: l.jackson@dgds.us 
Telephone: 907 895-4657

I am commenting on: 4 AAC 33.090(c) Residential Schools  
My Comments: Affording the residential schools a more flexible count period is an idea worthy of consideration: however, if it is allowed for these schools then it should also be available for all other schools in the State. We all have varying times in a year when our counts may be up or down.

The change in the language seems to have confused the idea that we take an average daily membership during a count period rather than count on a single day. That needs to be addressed.

Finally, why not fund them based on their count during the application period. This would allow for forward funding which would be nice for all schools!! Knowing your budget the spring before would be so very helpful.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 12F

December 5, 2014

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt regulations related to the powers of the Alaska State Museum to name other Alaskan museums or cultural centers to be repositories of natural history and cultural materials, per HB 154, which was passed by the recent state legislature.

♦ BACKGROUND
  • HB 154 amended AS14.56 to authorize the Alaska State Museum as a designated repository of natural and cultural history collections and enabled the department to designate other such Alaskan repositories.
  
  • Some museums in the state have expressed a strong interest in applying for this designation under the authorization.

  • These proposed regulations outline the steps for a review of applications related to applicant’s collections preservation, curatorial practices, scope of collections, knowledge dissemination and compliance with NAGPRA requirements.

  • Behind this cover memo are
    o The proposed regulations,
    o Enrolled HB 154, and
    o Public comment.

  • Linda Thibodeau, Director of the Division of Libraries, Archives and Museums, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14F.
4 AAC 58 is amended by adding new sections to read:

Article 4. Designation of Natural and Cultural History Repositories.

Section

300. Application

305. Alternative accreditation requirements

310. Statement of assurances and affirmative obligation to report material change in conditions

315. Review of designated repositories

320. Revocation of designation

4 AAC 58.300. Application. (a) A museum, cultural center, or an affiliated research component of a museum or cultural center may apply to the department for designation as a natural and cultural history repository under AS 14.57.012.

(b) An application for designation as a natural and cultural history repository must be made on a form prescribed by the department. The application must be signed by the applicant institution’s director or chief curator.

(c) Institutions seeking designation as a natural and cultural history repository must submit an application to the department during an annual application period beginning March 1 and closing April 30.

(d) Applications must describe in writing or otherwise substantiate that the institution seeking designation as a natural and cultural history repository

(1) meets all the requirements set forth in AS 14.57.012; and
(2) holds a current accreditation from the American Alliance of Museums or alternatively meets the standards set forth in 4 AAC 58.305. (Eff.__/__/____, Register ___)

**Authority:** AS 14.07.060 AS 14.57.012 AS 14.57.050

AS 14.57.010

**4 AAC 58.305. Alternative accreditation requirements.** Applications submitted by institutions that are not currently accredited by the American Alliance of Museums must demonstrate that the applicant institution

(1) currently maintains a certification or accreditation issued by a nationally recognized entity other than the American Alliance of Museums;

(2) operates under a curatorial and collections management plan that includes procedures for accessioning, cataloging, and deaccessioning museum property and for handling incoming and outgoing loans;

(3) has a written plan for the care of all collections and materials in case of institution closure;

(4) has a designated curator of record and staff trained in the curation and basic conservation of the collections contained in the holdings;

(5) has a written scope of collections statement that details the nature of present and future collections at the repository;

(6) has a written access plan that provides access to collections for scientific research, educational, administrative, or exhibition purposes;

(7) has procedures in place to protect confidential or sensitive information including site-specific locality information, nature of certain ethnographic collections, and
objects addressed by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act ("NAGPRA");

   (8) has implemented an ethics policy regarding the behavior of curatorial staff that addresses the acquisition of personal collections, outside employment, and engagement in commercial collecting activities;

   (9) stores specimens with appropriate environmental controls, including temperature and humidity, in order to prevent deterioration and minimize the need for conservation treatment;

   (10) has a pest management plan and keeps the facility free of insects, vermin, mold, and mildew;

   (11) forbids the consumption or storage of food and drink in the same rooms where collections are stored;

   (12) protects all collection areas with both locks and alarm systems. A system must be in place that tracks all keys and security codes and identifies who is authorized to be in collections storage areas;

   (13) has a fire prevention/suppression plan and equipment in place;

   (14) maintains a visitor log or sign-in sheet in order to track the use of collections by non-museum staff;

   (15) has a disaster preparedness plan in place which identifies known and potential hazards;

   (16) separates collections storage areas from offices, employee gathering areas, preparation and conservation laboratories, and has as few doors and windows as possible;
(17) stores collections away from utility service panels and water/sewer pipes. These should be located outside of collections storage areas and procedures should be in place to minimize the necessity to access conduits and utility corridors from collections storage areas. Or, if the construction of the building necessitates the presence of water or sewer pipes in collections areas, the museum has demonstrated how the collections are protected from potential disasters resulting from catastrophic failures of these pipes;

(18) has taken steps to minimize ultraviolet light in collections areas. Windows should be shuttered or covered with UV filters. Lighting should be designed to minimize UV radiation;

(19) stores collections in stable and secure cabinetry with smooth moving drawers and adequate clearance above each specimen. Oversized specimens may be stored on open shelving, but dust and UV covering should be considered in order to supplement protection;

(20) stores each object properly. Archives should be in archival (acid-free) boxes and folders. Objects and artifacts should be in ethafoam-lined boxes, non-gassing polyethylene reclosable bags, glass vials, or other state of the art containers. Each object or artifact should be cradled, supported, or positioned, so that damage will not occur by its own weight over time or by the opening and closing of sliding drawers;

(21) has a custodial plan that addresses daily waste collection, periodic cleaning, and sanitation procedures;

(22) safely stores flammable liquids away from all archival materials;

(23) maintains accession files that contain the following information:
(A) transmittal documentation that certifies that the specific collection, object, or archive was acquired and transferred by legitimate means. This may include copy of federal collecting permit, deed of gift, will-and-testament, or sales receipt;

(B) receiving report that ensures that the specific collection falls within the repository’s scope of collections statement and is approved by a designated receiving official (usually a curator or museum director);

(C) pertinent contextual information including field notes, maps, photographs, conservation or preparation records, related archives; and

(D) administrative documentation that relates to the past, present, and future status of the collection;

(24) maintains conservation and preparation documentation that records techniques, chemicals, and treatments that have been applied to the objects, artifacts, or archives over time;

(25) has a system in place to monitor the status and location of objects while they are checked out of collections storage. This may include outgoing loans or removal for study, conservation, preparation, or exhibit;

(26) ensures that all objects and archives display a unique catalog identification that includes the repository acronym and unique catalog number and identifies ownership;

(27) has a system in place to conduct a periodic inventory of its holdings. While complete inventories are ideal, random sample inventories are sufficient. (Eff. __/__/____.

Register ___. _____ 2015  EDUCATION AND EARLY DEV.

            AS 14.57.010
4 AAC 58.310. Statement of assurances and affirmative obligation to report material change in conditions. On or before April 30 each institution that has received a designation as a natural and cultural repository from the department shall annually provide the department with a statement of assurance that it continues to operate under the same physical conditions, management policies, and safety procedures outlined in its initial application. Additionally, designated repositories must promptly report significant changes to the policies and conditions described in its application to the department. (Eff. __/__/____, Register ___)


AS 14.57.010

4 AAC 58.315. Review of designated repositories. (a) The department may monitor designated natural and cultural repositories to ensure compliance with the requirements of 4 AAC 58.300 - 4 AAC 58.305.

(b) Upon request by the department, the designated repository shall permit department personnel physical assess to the repository and shall promptly comply with department requests to inspect any document referenced by the repository in its initial application or annual statement of assurances. (Eff. __/__/____, Register ___)


AS 14.57.010

4 AAC 58.320. Revocation of designation. The department may place a designated repository on a plan of correction for a violation of 4 AAC 58.300 - 4 AAC 58.305. The
department may withdraw an institution’s designation as a natural and cultural repository if the department determines that it is unable or unwilling to properly address a violation of 4 AAC 58.300 - 4 AAC 58.305 identified in a plan of correction. (Eff. __/__/____., Register ___)

**Authority:**

AS 14.07.060  
AS 14.57.012  
AS 14.57.050

AS 14.57.010
AN ACT

Relating to natural and cultural history repositories.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

THE ACT Follows ON PAGE 1
AN ACT

Relating to natural and cultural history repositories.

____________________

* Section 1. AS 14.57.010(a) is amended to read:

(a) The department shall manage and have complete charge of all of the
property contained in the institution known as the state museum. The museum is
designated as a repository of natural and cultural history collections and shall be
operated and maintained as a designated repository in the state capital. Branch
museums may be established and maintained in other localities in the state.

* Sec. 2. AS 14.57 is amended by adding a new section to read:

Sec. 14.57.012. Designated natural and cultural history repositories. (a)
The department may designate natural and cultural history repositories in addition to
the state museum as provided under this section.

(b) An institution located in the state that seeks designation as a natural and
cultural history repository may apply on a form and under procedures established by
the department in regulation. The procedures must include submission of evidence
acceptable to the department that the institution

(1) adheres to currently established criteria of collection preservation and storage, including employment of long-term, professional, and systematic curatorial services;

(2) ensures public access commensurate with the nature of the objects of the collection in the repository;

(3) has a statewide scope of collection;

(4) has a statewide scope of knowledge dissemination;

(5) maintains a museum certification issued by a nationally recognized entity;

(6) complies with 25 U.S.C. 3001 - 3013 (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act); and

(7) meets other standards established in regulation by the department.

c) The department shall maintain a list of designated repositories.

d) A repository may accept and expend funds from any available source, including federal and state grants and donations, for the purpose of acquiring, cataloging, curating, and preserving state natural and cultural history collections.

e) A designation of a repository confers no acquisition, management, or other rights to the department over the collections held by a designated repository.

f) In this section, "institution" means a museum, a cultural center, or an affiliated research component of a museum or cultural center.
PUBLIC COMMENT
Name: Kevin Winker
E-Mail: kevin.winker@alaska.edu
Telephone: 907 474-7027
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 58.300 Designation of Natural and Cultural History Repositories My Comments: I am submitting comments as Chief Curator of the University of Alaska Museum of the North on behalf of the Director, the Curators, and the Collections Managers of our institution.

Overall, we applaud the Department on the quality and comprehensiveness of these draft regulations. We have just two suggestions for modifications of the text:

1) The four occurrences of "natural and cultural history repository" should be changed to "natural and/or cultural history repository" so that repository designation does not automatically and inadvertently expand the mission of institutions focusing on one and not the other type of repository activity. This occurs four times under "4 AAC 58.300. Application." in each clause a-d.

2) Under "4 AAC 58.305. Alternative accreditation requirements," clause 16, we suggest adding the following text at the end to enable mitigation should the first part prove impossible due to existing facilities: "If the construction of the building necessitates the presence of water/sewer pipes in collections areas, the museum should be able to demonstrate how the collections are protected from potential disasters resulting from catastrophic failures of those pipes;"

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these important regulations.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 12G

December 5, 2014

ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations regarding accountability updates related to House Bill 278. Proposed changes include a modification to the ASPI accountability reporting system, allowance for teachers to be exempt from jury service while serving in low performing schools, and new reporting requirements that summarize the performance of students from families on active military duty.

BACKGROUND
• Governor Parnell signed HB 278, Alaska’s Education Opportunity Act, into law on May 13, 2014.

• The law repealed the HSGQE and replaced it with a student’s choice of participation in the SAT, ACT or WorkKeys assessments.

• A proposed regulation amendment reflects a slight adjustment in school accountability (ASPI) reporting related to the WorkKeys transition from a required assessment to an optional assessment.

• Prior to Alaska’s approval of the ESEA waiver teachers were eligible for jury service exemption if they were employed by a school that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). HB 278 allows a teacher employed by a low performing school to claim jury service exemption.

• A proposed regulation amendment reflects an update to allow teachers to be eligible for jury service exemption if they are employed by a school that is currently identified as a one- or two-star school in the ASPI system.

• A proposed regulation amendment reflects a new requirement to include counts and performance data for students from families that are on active military duty. The information will be included in the state Report Card system that is published online.

• Behind this cover memo is: 1) Proposed amended regulations.

• Erik McCormick, Director of Assessments, Accountability and Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14G.
4 AAC 06.812(b) is amended to read:

(b) Each factor included in the Alaska school performance index has a maximum of 100 points. The factors and the weighting of each factor in the index are as follows:

1. for a school with students in grades kindergarten through eight,
   (A) academic achievement, 35 percent;
   (B) school progress, 40 percent;
   (C) attendance rate, 25 percent;

2. for a school with students in grades 9 – 12 that is not an alternative school,
   (A) academic achievement, 20 percent;
   (B) school progress, 40 percent;
   (C) attendance rate, 10 percent;
   (D) graduation rate, 20 percent;
   (E) college and career readiness indicator, 10 percent;
   [(F) PARTICIPATION RATE FOR THE WORKKEYS ASSESSMENT, TWO PERCENT;]

3. for an alternative school with students in grades 9-12,
   (A) academic achievement, 10 percent;
   (B) school progress, 50 percent;
   (C) attendance rate, 10 percent;
   (D) graduation rate, 20 percent;
   (E) college and career readiness indicator, 10 percent;
[F] PARTICIPATION RATE FOR THE WORKKEYS ASSESSMENT,
TWO PERCENT;]

(4) for a school [SCHOOLS] with students in a combination of grades kindergarten through 12, the factors and weighting under (1) – (3) of the subsection, applied proportionally to the percentage of students enrolled in each grade span in the school as reported on the first day of testing under 4 AAC 06.737.

(Eff. 11/1/2007, Register 184; am 10/16/2013, Register 208; am ___/____/____, Register ____; am ___/____/____, Register)

Authority:  AS 14.03.123    AS 14.07.060    AS 14.50.080
            AS 14.07.020    AS 14.07.170

4 AAC 06.812(c)(7) is repealed:

(7) repealed /__/____.

(Eff. 11/1/2007, Register 184; am 10/16/2013, Register 208; am ___/____/____, Register ____;  
am ___/____/____, Register ___)

Authority:  AS 14.03.123    AS 14.07.060    AS 14.50.080
            AS 14.07.020    AS 14.07.170

4 AAC 06 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 06.883. Jury service exemption. A teacher employed by a school that is currently identified as a one- or two-star school under 4 AAC 06.835 is eligible for the jury service exemption described under AS 09.20.030(b). (Eff. ___/____, Register ___)

4 AAC 06.895(l) is amended to read:

(l) For purposes of this section, subgroups of students must include each subgroup described in 4 AAC 06.830 and, in addition, males, females, migrants, [AND] students other than migrants, and students from families on active military duty.

(Eff. 11/23/2003, Register 168; am 6/13/2004, Register 170; am 1/19/2006, Register 177; am 7/25/2007, Register 183; am 2/4/2011, Register 197; am 10/3/2011, Register 200; am 10/16/2013, Register 208; am __/__/, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.03.120 AS 14.07.020 AS 14.50.080
AS 14.03.123 AS 14.07.060

4 AAC 06.899 is amended by adding a new paragraph to read:

(24) "students from families on active military duty" means students whose parents or guardians are on active duty in the armed forces of the United States, the United States Coast Guard, the Alaska National Guard, the Alaska Naval Militia, or the Alaska State Defense Force.

(Eff. 11/23/2003, Register 168; am 6/13/2004, Register 170; am 1/19/2006, Register 177; am 7/25/2007, Register 183; am 2/4/2011, Register 197; am 10/3/2011, Register 200; am 10/16/2013, Register 208; am __/__/, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.03.120 AS 14.07.020 AS 14.50.080
AS 14.03.123 AS 14.07.060
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

Agenda Item: 12H

December 5, 2014

ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on multiple regulations regarding assessment updates related to House Bill 278 and changes to the state assessment system. Proposed changes include revisions to the Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments document and the establishment of a waiver system for the college and career ready assessments.

BACKGROUND
- Governor Parnell signed HB 278, Alaska’s Education Opportunity Act, into law on May 13, 2014.
- The law repealed the HSGQE and replaced it with a student’s choice of participation in the SAT, ACT or WorkKeys assessments.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects a need for a waiver system to support individuals that are unable to participate in the college and career ready assessments for reasons that are largely outside of their control.
- A high school student that enters the public school system after the completion of all scheduled administrations of the college and career ready assessments may be considered for a waiver from participating.
- A high school student may also be considered for a waiver from participating in the college and career ready assessments under a limited number of situations that are defined as rare and unusual circumstances.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects the need to revise the Participation Guidelines document based on major changes to the state assessment system and the state assessment delivery systems. The publication is adopted by reference in 4 AAC 06.775.
- Changes to the Participation Guidelines include combining the Alaska Supplement for WorkKeys Assessment publication to have a single document for all statewide assessments. The WorkKeys Supplement is also adopted by reference in 4 AAC 06.775.
- Behind this cover memo is: 1) Proposed amended regulations, 2) The Participation Guidelines, and 3) public comment.
- Erik McCormick, Director of Assessments, Accountability and Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14H.
4 AAC 06.775(a) is amended to read:

(a) When administering to students with disabilities the statewide assessments under 4 AAC 06.710 and 4 AAC 06.717, a district shall follow the requirements of this section and the department's Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments, dated December 2014 [JUNE 2011], adopted by reference. [HOWEVER, WHEN ADMINISTERING THE COLLEGE AND WORK PREPAREDNESS ASSESSMENT DESCRIBED IN 4 AAC 06.717, A DISTRICT SHALL FOLLOW THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS SECTION AND THE DEPARTMENT'S ALASKA SUPPLEMENT FOR WORKKEYS ASSESSMENT, DATED JANUARY 2012, ADOPTED BY REFERENCE.]


4 AAC 06 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 06.721. College and career readiness assessment waivers. (a) A governing body shall grant a waiver from participation in the college and career readiness assessments under 4 AAC 06.717 if a student

(1) submits to the governing body on a form prescribed by the department a complete waiver request;
(2) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the governing body that the student has met all other state and governing body requirements for graduation; and

(3) demonstrates to the satisfaction of the governing body that the student has

   (A) entered the public school system late as provided in 4 AAC 06.722; or

   (B) a rare or unusual circumstance as provided in 4 AAC 06.723.

(b) The governing body's decision approving or denying the request for a waiver must be in writing and be delivered by certified mail. The governing body may deliver courtesy copies to the student or the student's parents or legal guardian by other methods. The governing body shall also provide a copy of the decision to the department. The governing body shall state the reason for its decision in the written decision. A denial of a waiver request may be appealed to the department as provided in 4 AAC 06.724. The governing body's written decision and notice must include a statement that the decision may be appealed to the department as provided in 4 AAC 06.724. (Eff. __/__/____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.03.075 AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.030

AS 14.07.060 AS 14.07.165

4 AAC 06 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 06.722. Waiver for entering the public school system late. (a) For purposes of a waiver from participating in the college and career readiness assessments under 4 AAC 06.717, a student enters the public school system late if the student arrives in the state after the completion of all scheduled administrations in the student's year of intended graduation. A student who resides in the state but attends a private school or is home schooled as provided in
AS 14.30.010 and transfers to a public school after the completion of all scheduled administrations in the student’s year of intended graduation may also be eligible for a waiver under this section.

(b) In addition to the requirements of 4 AAC 06.721, a student's request for a waiver under this section must be supported by documentation

(1) of enrollment from the school in which the student is currently enrolled including the student's initial enrollment date;

(2) of previous enrollment from the Alaska private school or home school program or the out-of-state school district from which the student transferred; the documentation must include enrollment date and exit date from the Alaska private school or home school program or the out-of-state school district; and

(3) that verifies, for a student transferring from out-of-state, the date of the student's physical presence in this state before enrollment in any of the public schools in this state as provided in (a) of this section; documentation may include

(A) records or receipts of airlines, the Alaska Marine Highway system, or other carriers;

(B) hotel receipts; and

(C) affidavits or certifications by persons acquainted with or related to the student who have personal knowledge of the applicant's physical presence in the state. (Eff. __/__/____, Register ___)

Authority:  AS 14.03.075       AS 14.07.030       AS 14.07.165
            AS 14.07.020       AS 14.07.060
4 AAC 06 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC 06.723. Rare or unusual circumstances. (a) For purposes of a waiver from participating in the college and career readiness assessments and except as provided in (b) - (d) of this section, a student has a rare or unusual circumstance meriting a waiver if

(1) a recourse or remedy other than a waiver does not exist to address the circumstance before the student's expected graduation date; and

(2) the circumstance was beyond the control of the student, the student's parents, and the school; for purposes of this paragraph, a circumstance beyond the control of the student, the student's parents, and the school is limited to

(A) the death of the student's parent if the death occurs within the last semester of the student's year of intended graduation;

(B) a medical condition that is a serious and sudden illness or physical injury that occurs in the last semester of the student's year of intended graduation and that prevents the student from taking a college and career readiness assessment; the request for a waiver must include an affidavit or certification from the student's treating licensed medical professional that the diagnosed medical condition prevented the student from taking a college and career readiness assessment and was beyond the control of the student and the student's parents; the following conditions are not rare or unusual circumstances under this section:

(i) pregnancy or childbirth, unless the affidavit or certification verifies that an emergency occurred that meets the requirements of this subparagraph;
(ii) treatable depression, stress, or stress-related conditions, unless the affidavit or certification verifies that an emergency occurred that meets the requirements of this subparagraph;

(iii) a condition caused by illegal alcohol or substance use;

(C) a disability arising in the student's secondary school enrollment and the disability arising too late to apply for a meaningful accommodation from the testing vendor; a waiver under this subparagraph must be consistent with the recommendations of the student's IEP or section 504 team; a request for a waiver under this subparagraph may not be granted unless the student's principal and the district's superintendent concur with the waiver request;

(D) a significant and uncorrectable system error; a waiver may not be granted under this subparagraph unless the student's

(i) completed examination materials from the last administration of the student's year of intended graduation are lost in transit between the school district and the testing vendor after the test has been administered; a request for a waiver under this sub-subparagraph must be supported by documentation from the district that verifies that the district mailed the examination materials to the department, and by documentation from the United States Postal Service, or from the carrier used to transport the examination materials, verifying that the examination materials are lost; or

(ii) school or district failed to administer the assessment on a scheduled administration date while the student was in the 12th grade. (Eff. __/__/____. Register ___)
4 AAC 06 is amended by adding a new section to read:

**4 AAC 06.724. Procedures for appeal from a denial of a waiver from the college and career readiness assessments.** (a) A student or student's parent may appeal to the department the denial of a request for a waiver from participation in a college and career readiness assessment under 4 AAC 06.717. The appeal must be filed on a form provided by the governing body and prescribed by the department. The appeal form must be postmarked no later than 30 days after receipt of the notice of the denial.

(b) The person requesting the appeal must state the grounds for the appeal, including a brief summary of the nature of the original waiver request and a brief statement explaining how the governing body erred in its decision to deny the waiver.

(c) The appeal will be determined on the record and decided by a panel consisting of three members appointed by the commissioner. The commissioner may appoint to the panel a member of the board or an employee of the department. Depending on the number of appeals, the commissioner may designate more than one panel. A panel may deliberate in person, through correspondence, by telephone, audio, or video teleconference, or by other electronic means.

(d) Within 20 days after the filing of an appeal, the governing body shall forward to the department the entire record relating to the student's waiver request. The record must include

(1) the student's application for a waiver from participating in a college and career readiness assessment and any supporting documents supplied with the application;

(2) a copy of the governing body's graduation requirements; and
(3) a copy of the student's most current official transcript.

(e) The panel shall in a timely manner consider the appeal, including the record, and the appeal request and material that the person requesting the appeal submitted under (b) of this section.

(f) The panel shall submit a recommended decision to the commissioner after the panel has deliberated on the record presented. The recommended decision must be limited to whether the record supports the decision of the governing body and whether the governing body properly followed 4 AAC 06.721 - 4 AAC 06.723. In the recommended decision, the panel may only overturn the denial issued by the governing body if the record fails to support the denial by substantial evidence or the governing body erred in applying the requirements of 4 AAC 06.721 - 4 AAC 06.723. Failure of the governing body to comply with the requirements of this section is not by itself grounds for the panel in a recommended decision to overturn a denial issued by a governing body.

(g) The commissioner shall adopt all, part, or none of the panel's recommended decision, or remand the matter back to the panel, a different panel of the commissioner's designation, or the governing body with written instructions for further deliberations. The commissioner shall notify the student and the governing body by certified mail of the commissioner's decision on the appeal, or in the case of a remand, of the time schedule authorized for further deliberation and submission of a recommended decision if applicable.

(h) The commissioner's decision under (g) of this section is a final administrative decision of the department for purposes of appeal to the superior court under the Alaska Rules of Appellate Procedure. (Eff. ___/___/____. Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.03.075    AS 14.07.030    AS 14.07.165
Register ______, ______ 2015  EDUCATION AND EARLY DEV.

AS 14.07.020  AS 14.07.060
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The Purpose of the Participation Guidelines

Regulatory Guidance for Alaska Districts

The Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments is designed to help Alaska fulfill its commitment to include all students in state assessments. The United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education administers the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), reauthorized in 2001 as No Child Left Behind, requires assessment for all students, including regular education students, students with IEPs, students with Section 504 plans, and students with limited English proficiency. The Participation Guidelines explains the assessment options available to students and is subject to change based on revisions to the statewide assessment system.

ESEA requires accommodations (as appropriate) for students with disabilities. Policy also includes accommodations for students with limited English proficiency (LEP). Federal and state laws require accommodations be identified in students’ Individual Education Plans (IEPs), Section 504 plans, or LEP plans; test administrators must provide accommodations as documented. The Participation Guidelines, as adopted in 4 AAC 06.775, integrate and explain what is required, by law, of schools and districts with regard to providing instruction and assessment accommodations for these students.

Statewide Student Assessment System

Statewide student assessment is one component in an effective education system. The purposes of statewide student assessments, specifically, are to:

- Ascertain on a statewide basis the extent to which children of the state are attaining state standards;
- Produce statewide information to facilitate sound decision making by policy makers, parents, educators, and the public; and to
- Provide a basis for instructional improvement.

Accommodations for the following required state assessments are addressed in this booklet:

1. Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP)
2. Alaska Alternate Assessment (AK-AA)
3. Alaska Science Standards Based Assessment (SBA)
4. Early Literacy Screeners
5. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)
6. English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELP)
7. College and Career-Ready Assessments (CCRA)
   a. WorkKeys
   b. SAT
   c. American College Test (ACT)

Introduction to Participation in Assessments and to Student Supports

Participation

The Alaska Comprehensive System of Student Assessment includes assessments used for a variety of instructional and accountability purposes. Participation in these assessments is required for students who meet the criteria defined for each assessment. This document provides regulatory guidance for both the Comprehensive System of Assessment and each assessment within that system. Districts are required to assess students who meet the participation requirements for each assessment. It is essential to provide an experience for each student that results in a fair and accurate measurement of progress and achievement.

This document explains the accommodation options available for each assessment for a student with a disability and the decisions that must be made by the student’s IEP or section 504 team. These decisions include choosing which assessments the student is eligible to participate in and which accommodations are most appropriate to provide to the student in order to get an accurate measure of what the student knows and is able to do.

This document also explains the linguistic supports, or accommodations, available for each assessment for a student who is an English language learner.

Student Supports

The Alaska Comprehensive System of Student Assessment is built on a foundation of accessibility for all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners, but not limited to those groups. The validity of the assessment results depends upon all students having appropriate accessibility and/or accommodation supports when needed based on the constructs being measured in the assessment.

Universal Tools – Specific to the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Assessment

Universal Tools are supports or preferences that are available to all students taking the AMP computer-based assessment or the paper/pencil assessment. Universal Tools are available at all times and their use is based on student choice, need and preference. Universal Tools for computer-based assessments, such as a highlighter or screen magnification, are embedded in the test engine. There are also Universal Tools that are outside of the test engine, such as scratch paper. These tools do not alter the test construct (what the test is measuring) or change the reliability or validity of the assessment. Universal tools do not change score interpretation. Similarly, Universal Tools require no additional test security measures.

Accessibility Tools – Specific to the AMP and Alternate Assessments

Accessibility tools or features provide all students with a documented need the opportunity to access the content being measured in the assessment. The use of the tool does not change what is being measured. Accessibility tools are selected for the student based on the student’s needs and should generally be the same for classroom instruction and for assessments. Some accessibility tools are available at all times; others are only available when a teacher or team provides them for a student based on documented need. Accessibility tools are embedded in a computer-based assessment (e.g. masking tool). Refer to the Handbook for the Participation Guidelines: How to Select, Administer and Evaluate the Use of Student Supports for Assessment at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/accommodations.html.

Accommodations – Applies to all assessments

Accommodations must be made available to students with disabilities on an IEP or 504 Plan, students with transitory impairments, and LEP students as documented in student files. Accommodations are changes in practices and
procedures that provide equitable access to grade level content during instruction and assessment that do not alter the validity of the assessment, score interpretation, reliability or security of the assessment.

Accommodations are intended to reduce or even eliminate the effects of a student’s disability; they do not reduce learning expectations. The accommodations provided to a student should generally be the same for classroom instruction and for assessments. It is critical to note that although some accommodations may be appropriate for instructional use, they may not be appropriate for use on a standardized assessment. For example, providing spell-check for classroom assignments is appropriate; providing spell-check on an English/Language Arts subtest would change what the test items are measuring and is not allowed.

**Accommodations for Students with Disabilities on an IEP or 504 Plan**

It is important for educators to become familiar with state policies regarding accommodations during assessments. Because of the close link between assessment and instruction, the IEP or 504 plan must describe how the accommodations for assessment are provided routinely for classroom instruction. The IEP or 504 team should select appropriate accommodations based on the student’s needs, and must provide documentation and the rationale for the accommodations in the IEP or 504 plan.

Research shows that an unfamiliar test accommodation given to a student with a disability may negatively impact performance. Accordingly, an IEP or 504 team should be cautious about adding an accommodation shortly before an assessment. In general, a good practice is to make sure an accommodation has been used in the student’s regular or special education classes for instruction and classroom assessments for at least three months or 90 days before testing. This will ensure that the student has experience with the accommodation and that the accommodation is appropriate for the student.

When accommodations are provided as part of a computer-based assessment, the IEP team must take care to ensure that students have opportunities to become familiar with the technological aspects of the accommodations. In addition to using the accommodation in instruction, students should have the opportunity to use the computer-based practice tests to be familiar with how accommodations will be made available on computer-based assessments.

**Accommodations for English Language Learners (ELLs) for Content Assessments**

All students identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) must participate in statewide academic assessments. An LEP student is an individual whose first language is not English, or a student who is an American Indian, Alaska Native, or native resident who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual’s level of English language proficiency. See Regulation 4 AAC 34.090(a)(2) for a full definition of an LEP student. For details on the process for identification of LEP students refer to the *Guidance for Limited English Proficient Student Identification, Assessment and Data Reporting* on the department website at [http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/elp.html](http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/elp.html).

For the purpose of this guide, the term *English language learner (ELL)* refers to currently identified LEP students, not former LEP students.

ELL students must be provided reasonable accommodations on state academic assessments, to the extent practicable. Accommodations are allowed for students who are ELLs when testing for academic content knowledge and skills, but not when testing for English language proficiency.

The research-based ELL accommodations in Table 8 are ELL-responsive; they have been shown to support ELLs linguistically in order to more accurately assess their academic content knowledge. Careful selection of ELL-
responsive accommodations allows for meaningful participation in content assessments and ensures information obtained from the assessment is an accurate reflection of what the assessment is meant to measure, rather than a measure of the students’ English proficiency level. For detailed instructions on the use of ELL accommodations, refer to the Handbook for the Participation Guidelines: How to Select, Administer and Evaluate the Use of Student Supports for Assessment at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/accommodations.html.

Teams of people (teachers, administrators, etc.) who know the educational needs of the ELL student should make decisions concerning appropriate ELL accommodations to be used during statewide content assessments. Teams should include a teacher or administrator, when available, who has specialized training or experience with limited English speaking students and instruction. Because of the close link between assessment and instruction, the accommodations provided for the assessment should reflect those provided in classroom instruction and assessment. Research shows ELL students gain in language acquisition yearly; therefore, accommodations should be reviewed accordingly to reflect growth. Once a decision is made, it is essential to document the accommodations in the ELL student’s file.

Accommodations for Students with a Transitory Impairment

Students with a transitory impairment are not regarded as individuals with disabilities if the impairment is transitory and minor (Americans with Disabilities Act, Amendments Act of 2008, Section 3 (3)(B)). A transitory impairment is an impairment with an actual or expected duration of six months or less. A transitory impairment does not constitute a disability for purposes of Section 504 unless its severity is such that it results in a substantial limitation of one or more major life activities for an extended period of time. On a case-by-case basis, where appropriate documentation exists, students who are identified with a transitory impairment may receive testing accommodations. The need for accommodations must be made by a school committee and documented prior to testing. Copies of this documentation must be kept at the school or district.

Modifications

A modification is a change in the content, format, and/or administration of a test that alters what the test is designed to measure or the comparability of scores. Modifications may be used for instruction but not for assessment. A modification makes an assessment invalid. The following chart provides examples of accommodations and modifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Modification (Not Allowed for Assessments)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud writing, math or science subtest</td>
<td>Read aloud the reading test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of test directions</td>
<td>Clarification of test items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determining if an Adaptation is a Modification or Accommodation

An adaptation is any change from standardized administration provided to a student for testing. Examples might include additional breaks, preferential seating, or a special chair. Most adaptations are common and are listed in the accessibility tables, accommodation tables or in Appendix A of this document. However, sometimes a student needs an adaptation that is not found in the tables. Any list of accommodations will be incomplete because of the unique needs of each individual child. In addition, advances in the technology of adaptive and assistive devices will lead to new accommodations. Accordingly, the accommodations listed in the following tables and in the appendix are examples of some of the acceptable accommodations. When an adaptation for a content assessment is not listed in
either resource, the student’s IEP team should use the following guidance to determine if the accommodation is appropriate to use for content assessments.

When evaluating an adaptation that is not included in the accommodations table, an IEP team or 504 team should answer the following questions.

First, the two threshold questions:

1. Would the adaptation help the student demonstrate proficiency by reducing the effect of the disability on the student’s performance?
2. Would the student use the adaptation in the classroom, including during regular classroom assessments?

If the answer to either 1 or 2 is no, then the adaptation is probably not a reasonable or appropriate accommodation for the assessment.

If the answer to both is yes, then the next step is to determine whether the adaptation is an accommodation or a modification. To help make this distinction, the IEP or 504 team should answer the following questions:

3. Does the adaptation impede the measuring of the skill that is being tested? This question is often difficult to answer, and the following questions might help:
   a. Would the adaptation give the student an unfair advantage over a student who has the same proficiency level, but who is not eligible to use the adaptation?
   b. Does any research support the conclusion that this adaptation does not alter the ability of the test to measure the student’s skill level? (IEP or 504 teams may consult with the department at any time.)

Next, the team should consider questions that relate to whether the test could still be administered:

4. Would use of the adaptation cause a breach of test security? Before rejecting an adaptation for security reasons, an IEP or 504 team member or other school or district official should consult with the department. In special cases, security can be bolstered to accommodate special needs.
5. Would use of the adaptation make it impossible to score the test? Before rejecting an adaptation because it changes or alters the test answer sheet, an IEP or 504 team member or other school or district official should consult with the department. In many cases, the adaptation may still be allowed if a test proctor can transfer the student’s answers to another answer sheet after the student completes the test.

If the answer to questions 3, 4, or 5 is yes, then the adaptation is a modification, and is not allowed on state assessments. The use of a modification on the state assessments results in an invalid score.

If the answers to questions 3, 4, and 5 are no, then the adaptation is an allowable accommodation, and it may be used on regular academic assessments. This is particularly true if research supports the use of the accommodation.

IEP or 504 teams, schools, and districts may consult with the department at any time when considering new adaptations, particularly when the adaptation is requested by a parent. In general, most IEP or 504 teams will be able to resolve issues regarding the proper use of adaptations. Sometimes, however, a district might determine that the adaptation is a modification while the parent thinks it is an accommodation. If that happens, the parent may request that the district consult with the department first before reaching its decision. The department will issue a non-binding advisory opinion on whether the requested change is an accommodation or a modification.

If a parent requests an adaptation that is declined by the IEP or 504 team, the district should advise the parent of parental appeal/due process rights, including the right to administrative complaint or mediation. If possible, the
district should provide notice to the parent in a timely manner, enabling the parent to appeal the decision before the test.

If an IEP or 504 team requests a modification for an assessment, the district should allow the student to take the assessment with the modification if possible. The district must inform the IEP or 504 team that the modification will make the assessment results invalid and that the test will not be scored.
The relationship between Universal Tools, Accessibility Tools, & Accommodations

- **Universal Tools**
  - All students

- **Accessibility Tools**
  - Students with a documented need

- **Accommodations**
  - Students with disabilities
  - English language learners

Note: Modifications are not allowed for state assessments. If used, they will invalidate the test.
Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Computer-Based Assessment

The Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) assessment is designed to measure student growth and achievement in the Alaska English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards (adopted in 2012). AMP is administered to all students (except those with significant cognitive disabilities who participate in the Alternate Assessment program) in grades 3-10 in the spring.

The accessibility tools and accommodations available on the computer-based AMP and the paper/pencil AMP are largely the same. However, some differences exist and educators must refer to the specific tables for each assessment.

Student Supports for the AMP Assessment

Universal Design
The Alaska Measures of Progress is designed with the principals of Universal Design. “Universally designed assessments” are developed from the beginning to allow participation of the widest possible range of students, and to result in valid inferences about performance for all students who participate in the assessment. As such, universally designed assessments add a dimension of fairness to the testing process. According to the National Research Council (1999), “fairness, like validity, cannot be properly addressed as an afterthought once the test has been developed, administered, and used. It must be confronted throughout the interconnected phases of the testing process, from test design and development to administration, scoring, interpretation, and use” (p. 81). The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing also address this need by requiring that “all examinees be given a comparable opportunity to demonstrate their standing on the construct(s) the test is intended to measure. Just treatment also includes such factors as appropriate testing conditions and equal opportunity to become familiar with the test format, practice materials, and so forth. Fairness also requires that all examinees be afforded appropriate testing conditions” (p. 74).

Universally designed assessments are based on the premise that each child in school is a part of the population to be tested, and that testing results should not be affected by disability, gender, race, or English language ability. Universally designed assessments are not intended to eliminate individualization, but they may reduce the need for accommodations and various alternative assessments by eliminating access barriers associated with the tests themselves.

Universal Tools, Accessibility Tools, and Accommodations

Universal Tools
Universal Tools are supports or preferences that are available to all students taking the AMP computer-based assessment or the paper/pencil assessment. Universal Tools are available at all times and their use is based on student choice, need and preference. Some Universal Tools for computer-based assessments, such as a highlighter or screen magnification, are embedded in the computer testing system; others are outside of the computer testing system, such as scratch paper. These tools do not alter the test construct (what the test is measuring) or change the reliability or validity of the assessment. Universal Tools do not change score interpretation. Similarly, Universal Tools require no additional test security measures.
Accessibility Tools

Accessibility Tools are supports that are available to all students with a documented need taking the Alaska Measures of Progress computer-based assessment. The documented need does not have to be an IEP, 504 Plan, or ELL Plan. A documented need may be existing documentation in the school, such as the additional reading support provided to a student who is reading below grade level. For further guidance on determining a student’s need for an Accessibility Tool, refer to the guidance accompanying this document. The Accessibility Tools do not alter the test construct (what the test is measuring) or change the reliability or validity of the assessment. Accessibility Tools do not change score interpretation. Similarly, Accessibility Tools require no additional test security measures.

Accommodations

Accommodations are practices and procedures that provide equitable access during instruction and assessments to students with disabilities and English language learners; Accommodations do not alter the validity of the assessment, score interpretation, reliability or security of the assessment. Accommodations must be made available to students with disabilities with an IEP or 504 plan, students with transitory impairments, and LEP students, as documented in student plans.

Activating Accessibility Tools and Accommodations Embedded in the Alaska Measures of Progress System

AMP Personal Needs and Preferences (PNP) Profile

The Alaska Measures of Progress test engine uses a PNP to control the Accessibility Tools and embedded accommodations provided to a student. Accessibility Tools and embedded accommodations, unlike Universal Tools, are only available for students to use when activated by an educator via the Personal Needs and Preferences (PNP) Profile prior to testing. It is a local decision to determine who (teacher, special education teacher, site coordinator, etc.) will complete the PNP for students.

The PNP is completed using the information in the existing IEP, ELL Plan, 504 Plan, or documented student. The educator assigned the role by the district and school for completing the PNP utilizes the Educator Portal of the AMP Assessment System to select the appropriate tools to activate for the student. The PNP is unique to each student, providing an individualized testing experience that ensures that the student is able to access the content being measured. If a student transfers schools or districts, the PNP is linked to the student’s test record and “follows” the student. It can be accessed by the educators at the new school once that student is enrolled. However, the educators at the new school do not need to open the PNP again unless they want to make changes.

More information about the PNP can be found at http://akassessments.org/

Embedded and Non-embedded Accessibility Tools and Accommodations

Accessibility Tools and accommodations are provided to students based on the decisions of the instructional team. Accessibility Tools and accommodations can be either embedded or non-embedded.

- **Embedded Accessibility Tools and accommodations** are those that are within the test engine. They are activated for an individual student via the Personal Needs and Preferences (PNP) Profile process.
- **Non-embedded Accessibility Tools and accommodations** are those that are outside of the technology. For example, the use of math manipulatives.
The test administrator provides accommodations that are not technology-based to students during testing. An example of a non-embedded accommodation is the use of preferential seating or providing a paper checklist to remind students of steps to be completed.

Types of Student Supports for the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Computer-Based Assessment

For detailed information on how to use these supports for students, refer to the Handbook for the Participation Guidelines: How to Select, Administer and Evaluate the Use of Student Supports for Assessment at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/accommodations.html.
### Universal Tools for AMP Computer-Based Assessment

#### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSAL TOOL</th>
<th>TOOL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlighter</td>
<td>Allows students to select text on the screen and highlight the selected text with a yellow background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striker</td>
<td>Allows students to place a line through an answer choice that is not desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eraser</td>
<td>Removes highlighting and striker marks from screen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tags</td>
<td>Allows students to place small graphics in reading passages to mark important parts such as the main idea, supporting details and key words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide line</td>
<td>When selected, follows the student’s pointer and lightly highlights the text of a reading passage line by line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Tool</td>
<td>Allows student to enter search terms. Matching words are then highlighted in orange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculator</td>
<td>Completes simple operations when directed by the student. Available only for selected items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphing Calculator</td>
<td>Allows students to graph functions. Available only for selected items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical formulas</td>
<td>Formulas will be embedded in the test question if the skill being measured is the application of the formula. Math reference sheets are not allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of whole screen magnification</td>
<td>Allows students to use whole screen magnification tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text-to-Speech for test directions</td>
<td>Allows students to start, stop or replay computer synthesized audio of the text associated with the directions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provided by Test Administrator:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of graph paper or scratch paper</th>
<th>Scratch paper must be securely destroyed after assessment session.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using a device to screen out extraneous sounds</td>
<td>Students may wear headphones that block sound for testing (this does not include music devices).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of technology directions</td>
<td>Students may request clarification of technology directions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For a list of expected formulas students must know for Alaska’s mathematics standards, refer to the Handbook for the Participation Guidelines: How to Select, Administer and Evaluate the Use of Student Supports for Assessment at [http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/accommodations.html](http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/accommodations.html).
## Accessibility Tools for AMP Computer-Based Assessment

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY TOOL</th>
<th>TOOL DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditory calming</td>
<td>Provides relaxing, peaceful music that can play while testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification - default level</td>
<td>The PNP default for magnification can be set to x2, depending on student need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masking portions of the test to direct attention to uncovered items or to maintain place</td>
<td>Two available options: 1. On-screen masking shows answer choices one at a time. 2. Student-controlled option provides a black, rectangular box on the screen that can be resized and moved. The student moves the mask on the screen or adds additional masks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Text-to-Speech (Read aloud) for Math:  
  - Embedded directions  
  - Math items  
  - Graphics | Allows students to start, stop or replay computer audio of the text associated with the content on the screen for math. **Not for ELA items.** |
Accommodations for AMP Computer-Based Assessment

The accommodations table in this section are provided by the test proctor or administrator. This is not an exhaustive list of the allowable accommodations for students with disabilities for content assessments. Additional accommodations are listed in Appendix A of this document.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMMODATION</th>
<th>ACCOMMODATION DESCRIPTION OR USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Administering the test individually or in a small group in a separate location | Students who need additional assistance must take the test in a separate location.  
Note: Many accommodations that require a small group or individually administered assessment when using a paper/pencil assessment may be provided successfully in the standard testing group when using a computer-based assessment. For example, text-to-speech (read aloud) does not require small group or individually administered assessment. Educators should evaluate each student’s needs carefully and only use individual and small group testing when absolutely necessary for students to be successful. In addition, as with all accommodations, it should be a frequently used and successful instructional strategy if used for testing. |
| Using a specific test proctor | For students who need a familiar test proctor or test administrator. |
| Clarification of embedded test directions:  
  • student requests clarification  
  • student restates directions | Test administrator or proctor provides accommodation; separate location for testing strongly recommended. |
| Allowing alternative responses:  
  • oral response  
  • signing  
  • pointing  
  • recorded response | Scribe will enter student responses verbatim into test engine. |
| Use of math manipulatives | Student use of physical objects for math items, such as fraction circles. |
| Signing to student:  
  • directions  
  • embedded directions  
  • math items  
  • ELA questions & answer choices | Interpreters must sign Test Security Agreement and may not provide additional information to student, such as drawing pictures of math problems.  
Reading passages must not be signed to the student. This would invalidate the assessment. |
| Use of adaptive devices, equipment and furniture. | Some adaptive devices may require individual test administration as well as a scribe to type responses verbatim into test engine. |
| Note: Math reference sheets are considered a modification and are not allowed. |
Accommodations

For students with disabilities, as documented in an IEP or 504 Plan. Embedded in the computer-based assessment; activated by an educator with the Personal Needs Profile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMMODATION</th>
<th>ACCOMMODATION DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Text-to-Speech (read aloud) for English language arts items.**  
  - Embedded directions  
  - Items (questions only, not passages)  
  - Answer choices | Allows students to start, stop or replay computer audio of the text associated with some of the content on the screen.  
  **Does not read the passages associated with the items.**  
  **Note: only available to students with a documented reading disability who regularly receive read aloud as part of a successful instructional strategy. Documentation of the successful use of this strategy in both instruction and assessment is required to be maintained locally.** |
| **Using Braille edition provided by test contractor** | The test engine is designed to interface with assistive technology such as Braille Writers |
| **One and two switch scanning**                     | An assistive technology device used to respond to test questions. |
Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Paper/Pencil Test Administration

AMP paper and pencil test administration is available for districts that demonstrate a lack of technological capacity required to participate in the computer-based assessment. Schools must have an approved Waiver from Computer-based Administration of AMP to administer the paper/pencil assessment. Additionally, a paper/pencil assessment may be chosen for a student by an IEP team as an accommodation if the student’s disability prevents the successful use of a device.

The accommodations table in this section is not an exhaustive list of the allowable accommodations for students with disabilities for content assessments. Additional accommodations are listed in Appendix A of this document.

Universal Tools for AMP Paper/Pencil Test Administration

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSAL TOOL</th>
<th>TOOL DESCRIPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlighter</td>
<td>Students may use a highlighter to highlight desired test items or selections; if a highlighter is used in student test booklet, answers may need to be transcribed into a clean test booklet in order to be properly scored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of visual magnification</td>
<td>Students may use devices that magnify text such as a magnifying glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of graph paper or scratch paper</td>
<td>Scratch or graph paper must be securely destroyed after assessment session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masking portions of the test to direct attention to uncovered items</td>
<td>Students may use blank paper or other unmarked device to mask portions of the test to help them focus on one item at a time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using place markers to assist student in tracking test items</td>
<td>Students may use a device, such as an unmarked ruler, to help track test items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing papers to work area with tape or magnets</td>
<td>Students may use devices to secure papers to work area; care must be taken to not damage the paper for scanning and scoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using headphones to screen out extraneous sounds</td>
<td>Students may wear noise blocking headphones for testing (this does not include music devices).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Accessibility Tools are not available for the AMP Paper/Pencil test administration because they are specific to a computer-based testing system.
### Accommodations for AMP Paper/Pencil Test Administration

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Accommodation Description or Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test individually or in a small group in a separate location</td>
<td>Students who need individual or group test administration should take the test in a separate location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a specific test proctor</td>
<td>For students who need a familiar test proctor or test administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent breaks or additional time</td>
<td>For students who need frequent breaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and re-reading if requested, directions and embedded directions</td>
<td>Individual or small group test administration; reading done by test administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of test directions:</td>
<td>Test administrator or proctor can provide clarification of test directions (this does not apply to test questions or answer choices).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student requests clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student restates directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing to student:</td>
<td>Interpreters must sign a Test Security Agreement and may not provide additional information to student, such as drawing pictures of math problems. <strong>Signing of reading passages would be a modification and is not allowed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- embedded directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- math items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ELA questions and answer choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Braille edition provided by test contractor</td>
<td>The test contractor will provide a paper Braille test by special order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of large print form</td>
<td>The test contractor will provide a Large Print form by special order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of adaptive devices, equipment or furniture</td>
<td>Some adaptive devices may require a scribe to transcribe student responses verbatim into the test booklet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud or audio CD for math or ELA test questions and answer choices.</td>
<td>Use of test contractor audio CD required unless specified ‘read aloud’ by proctor or test administrator as justified in IEP/504 plan. Read aloud only test questions and answer choices. <strong>Reading of reading passages would be a modification and is not allowed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing alternative responses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral response</td>
<td>A scribe may need to type student responses verbatim into the test engine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- signing</td>
<td>Use of a word processor must have other programs disabled and spelling, grammar check and other features turned off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pointing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recorded response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use of word processor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow student to mark in test booklet</td>
<td>Student may strike out unwanted choices, make notes etc. A scribe may be needed to transcribe answers into a clean test booklet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of math manipulatives</td>
<td>Students may use physical objects for math items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a special pen or non-#2 pencil</td>
<td>This requires a scribe to transcribe responses verbatim into test booklet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Accommodations

For students with disabilities, as documented in an IEP or 504 Plan.
Provided by Test Administrator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auditory amplification device</td>
<td>Assistive listening devices help amplify sounds, especially with background noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide detailed monitoring to ensure student marks responses in correct answer area.</td>
<td>Proctor or test administrator monitors student responses – individually or in small group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide student with additional room for writing responses</td>
<td>This may require a scribe to transcribe responses verbatim into test booklet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of graphic organizers</td>
<td>Student can use items such as basic flow charts and story webs that <strong>do not</strong> contain text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Supports for ELLs for Content Assessments

All students identified as LEP must participate in statewide academic assessments. For the purposes of this document, the term English language learner (ELL) refers to currently identified LEP students, not former LEP students. The Accessibility Tools listed below in Table 7 are allowed for AMP Computer-Based and Paper/Pencil test and the Alaska Science test.

The research-based LEP accommodations in Table 7 are ELL-responsive, i.e., have been shown to support ELLs linguistically in order to more accurately assess their academic content knowledge. Careful selection of ELL-responsive accommodations allows for meaningful participation in content assessments and ensures information obtained from the assessment is an accurate reflection of what the assessment is meant to measure rather than a measure of the students’ English proficiency level.

ELLs may also use the Universal and Accessibility tools available as documented in their student files. The accommodations listed below are the only allowable accommodations for ELLs for content assessments.

### Accessibility Tools for ELLs for Content Assessments

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY TOOL</th>
<th>AMP Computer-Based Assessment. Requires educator to activate using the Personal Needs Profile.</th>
<th>Paper/Pencil Assessments ELA/Math &amp; Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text-to-Speech (Read aloud/audio CD) • directions • questions • answer choices • embedded directions</td>
<td>Allows students to start, stop or replay computer audio of the text associated with the content on the screen. Allowed for the computer-based AMP math test. Not allowed for the computer-based AMP ELA test.</td>
<td>Use of provided audio CD strongly recommended unless unavailable or specified ‘read aloud by proctor’ as justified in ELL plan. Allowed for the paper/pencil AMP math test. Not allowed for the paper/pencil AMP ELA test. Allowed for the Alaska science test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masking portions of the test to direct attention to uncovered items or to maintain place</td>
<td>Two available options: 1. On-screen masking shows answer choices one at a time. 2. Student-controlled option provides a black, rectangular box on the screen that can be resized and moved. The student moves the mask on the screen or adds additional masks.</td>
<td>Students can use blank paper or unmarked plastic masking tools to manually limit the amount of visible text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accommodations for ELLs

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMMODATION</th>
<th>Computer-Based AMP Assessment and/or Paper/Pencil AMP Assessment, and/or Alaska Science Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test individually or in a small group in a separate location</td>
<td>Students who need individual or group test administration should take the test in a separate location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a specific test proctor</td>
<td>For students who need a familiar test proctor or test administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In English or the native language provide written version of written/oral test directions</td>
<td>Written version of test directions must be verbatim of what is provided in the Test Administration Manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In English or the native language, read aloud and/or repeat written and/or oral test directions, including embedded directions</td>
<td>Translation should be an exact translation, as much as possible; additional clarifying ideas or examples are not allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of test directions in English or the native language:</td>
<td>Clarification should not provide additional directions or examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student requests clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student restates directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a commercial word-to-word bilingual dictionary</td>
<td>Dictionaries that include pictures or word definitions are not allowed. Electronic dictionaries are not allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the native language word for an unknown word in a test item when requested by student</td>
<td>Translation should not include additional words, ideas or examples. *Not allowed for reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the student to respond orally to constructed response items in English for reading, math, and/or science test.</td>
<td>Requires a scribe to transcribe verbatim into the test engine or test booklet. <strong>Not allowed for writing test.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodations specific to either computer based assessment or paper/pencil assessment English language arts test:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text-to-Speech for computer-based AMP English language arts test.</th>
<th>Allows students to start, stop or replay computer audio of the text associated with some of the content on the screen. <strong>Does not read the passages associated with the items.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Questions</td>
<td><strong>Note: only available to students with a documented linguistic support need who regularly receive read aloud as part of a successful instructional strategy. Documentation in the ELL file of the successful use of this strategy in both instruction and assessment is required to be maintained locally.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Answer choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Embedded directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text-to-Speech for paper/pencil AMP English language arts test.</td>
<td>Test administrator must read the directions, questions, and answer choices verbatim. Cueing, emphasis, and pausing is not allowed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** ELL students with disabilities may be given ELL-responsive accommodations as well as accommodations that are afforded all students with disabilities, according to documented student need.
Alaska Science Standards Based Assessment (SBA)

The Alaska Science Standards Based Assessment (SBA) is administered to all students in grades 4, 8, and 10. It assesses the Alaska Science Standards and Grade Level Expectations. The Science SBA administered in 2015 will be a paper/pencil assessment. Alaska will transition to a computer-based science assessment to be administered in spring 2016.

The accommodations for students with disabilities for the Science SBA are different than those for the English Language Arts and Mathematics content assessments. The accommodations allowed for this paper/pencil test must remain consistent with those allowed from the first administration of the assessment.

The accommodations table in this section is not an exhaustive list of the allowable accommodations for students with disabilities for the Science SBA. Additional accommodations are listed in Appendix A of this document.

Accommodations for Alaska Science SBA

Table 9a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Accommodation Description or Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allowing frequent breaks during testing.</td>
<td>Student may take supervised, additional breaks. Caution should be taken that student does not disrupt other testers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing additional time</td>
<td>The Science SBA is an untimed test; a student with an IEP or 504 accommodation can take additional days, within the window, to complete the assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering test at a time of the day most beneficial to the student</td>
<td>Students are required to take the Science SBA on the same day at the same time due to test security; if a student takes the assessment at a different time/day care should be taken to ensure that security of the test is maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Accommodation Description or Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test individually or in a small group in a separate location</td>
<td>Students who need individual or group test administration should take the test in a separate location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing special lighting, furniture, or acoustics</td>
<td>Students with physical disabilities may need specific adjustments to their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential seating</td>
<td>Student may need close proximity seating to teacher for additional support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9c

**Accommodations for Students with Disabilities**

**Presentation.**

Documented in the IEP or 504 Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOMMODATION</th>
<th>ACCOMMODATION DESCRIPTION OR USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the Braille edition or large type edition</td>
<td>Provided by the test contractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading aloud and, if request, re-reading the test directions (including embedded directions) and/or questions and answer choices</td>
<td>Test must be administered in one-one setting or in small group. Test administrator must read the directions, questions, and answer choices verbatim. Cueing, emphasis, and pausing is not allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of test directions:</td>
<td>Clarification must not provide additional directions, examples or cueing students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student requests clarification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- student restates directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing directions to the student</td>
<td>Interpreters must sign Test Security Agreement and may not provide additional information to student, such as drawing pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing highlighted words in the directions</td>
<td>Caution: highlights on the answer sheet make the assessment unscorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing helpful verbs on the board or a piece of paper</td>
<td>Verbs must be written verbatim; no additional explanation or examples are allowed, including drawing pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a checklist to remind student of tasks to be completed</td>
<td>Students with organizational or processing challenges may need this accommodation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine whether an adaptation not found in this table or in Appendix A is an accommodation or modification, refer to the procedure outlined in the *Introduction to Participation in Assessments and Student Supports* section of this document.

ELL students with disabilities may be given ELL-responsive accommodations as well as accommodations that are afforded all students with disabilities, according to documented student need.
Alaska Alternate Assessment (AK-AA)

Overview of the Alaska Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

Students with significant cognitive disabilities will have access to, participate in, and make progress in the general education curricula in compliance with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA; 2004). All students must participate in statewide assessments in compliance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). If students meet the eligibility criteria, they will take an alternate assessment. It is expected that only a small number (less than two percent) of all students will participate in an alternate assessment.

Alternate Assessments are designed for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. These assessments are based on the grade-level content covered by the general assessment, but at reduced depth, breadth, and complexity. These assessments describe achievement based on what is determined to be high expectations for these students.

Students with significant cognitive disabilities have a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior. Adaptive behaviors are essential to live independently and to function safely in daily life. When adaptive behaviors are significantly impacted it means that the individual is unlikely to develop the skills necessary to live independently and function safely in daily life. In other words, significant cognitive disabilities impact students both in and out of the classroom and across life domains, not just in academic domains. The alternate assessment is designed for students with these significant instruction and support needs.

Students taking the Alaska Alternate Assessment are not eligible to receive a high school diploma but may be awarded a Certificate of Completion. The Alaska Alternate Assessment assesses students with significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3 through 10 in English language arts and mathematics. Students in grades 4, 8, and 10 will also take the science alternate assessment. After grade 10, there are no required assessments for students who have been eligible for the Alternate Assessment. Students with significant cognitive disabilities in grade 11 or 12 may take the WorkKeys assessment in applied mathematics, reading for information, and locating information if the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team determines it supports the transitional plan of the IEP. A student who takes the Alternate Assessment and participates in the WorkKeys assessment is not eligible for a high school diploma.

Content Standards and Achievement Standards

The Alaska Alternate Assessment is based on content standards called the Alaska-Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Essential Elements, which are aligned to the Alaska Standards but reduced in complexity, breadth, and depth. Students taking the alternate assessment are primarily being instructed using the Essential Elements in English language arts and mathematics. The Essential Elements are located on the department website at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/alternateEE.html. The science alternate assessment will continue to be based on the Extended Grade Level Expectations, http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/alternate.html.

The alternate achievement standards are proficiency scores and proficiency level descriptors that are different from the achievement standards for the general education assessment. The proficiency levels, (cut scores and descriptors), reflect a different set of academic expectations for students with significant cognitive disabilities and are reduced in depth, breadth, and complexity.

Administering the Alaska Alternate Assessments

District personnel must be trained and qualified in order to administer the Alternate Assessment. Districts are encouraged to have a lead Alternate Assessment Mentor prepared to train test administrators or assessors. Contact the Alternate Assessment Program Manager for information on the Alternate Assessment Mentor program.
Determining Student Eligibility for the Alaska Alternate Assessment

Eligibility for the Alaska Alternate Assessment is a decision made by the IEP team members on an annual basis during the IEP meeting. The IEP team will use the “Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist” found in this section and on the EED Alternate Assessment website to make the determination. Decisions made by the IEP team are reflected in the student’s IEP and kept in the student’s special education file. Parents must be informed when their child’s instruction will be based on Essential Elements and their achievement will be based on alternate achievement standards.

Documenting the Decision in the Individualized Education Program (IEP)

The IEP form found in the Special Education Handbook includes a page for selecting state and district-wide assessments. The section for students taking the Alaska Alternate Assessment must be completed and filed in the student’s special education file. This section includes the following information:

1. A statement that the Alaska Alternate Assessment is based on alternate achievement standards, and therefore, does not lead to a high school diploma.

2. Parents/guardians must be informed when their child’s achievement will be based on alternate achievement standards that will lead to a Certificate of Completion and not a high school diploma. A parent’s (guardian’s) signature section is included on the IEP to acknowledge that her/she has been notified that the student is taking the Alternate Assessment for the current school year. If a parent/guardian does not attend the IEP meeting, a letter of notification may be sent by the district.

3. A statement in the IEP by the team describing why the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) assessment is not appropriate. The team must refer to the student’s Evaluation Summary and Eligibility Report (ESER), the Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP), and the “Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist” to provide evidence that support the decision.

4. A statement in the IEP by the team describing why the Alaska Alternate Assessment is appropriate based on the participation criteria. The team must refer to the student’s ESER, the PLAAFP, and the “Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist” to provide evidence that supports the decision.

5. The “Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist” must be reviewed and included in the IEP annually. The “Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist” is available on the Department of Education and Early Development’s Alternate Assessment website at [http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/alternate.html](http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/alternate.html).

6. If a student meets the eligibility criteria for alternate assessment, the student will take the alternate assessments in all content areas.
# Alaska Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist

**Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities**

Participation in the Alaska Alternate Assessment requires a yes answer to each of the following questions. Students eligible for Alternate Assessment must take the Alternate in all the content areas: English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Criterion</th>
<th>Participation Criterion Descriptors</th>
<th>Agree (Yes) or Disagree (No)? Provide documentation for each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The student has a significant cognitive disability | Review of student records indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior.  
*Adaptive behavior is defined as essential for someone to live independently and to function safely in daily life.* | Yes / No |
| 2. The student is primarily being instructed (or taught) using the AK-DLM Essential Elements as content standards. | Goals and instruction listed in the IEP for this student are linked to the enrolled grade level AK-DLM Essential Elements and address knowledge and skills that are appropriate and challenging for this student. | Yes / No |
| 3. The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measureable gains in the grade-and age-appropriate curriculum. | The student requires extensive, repeated, individualized instruction and support that is not of a temporary or transient nature and uses substantially adapted materials and individualized methods of accessing information in alternative ways to acquire, maintain, generalize, demonstrate and transfer skills across multiple settings. | Yes / No |

The following are not allowable (or acceptable) considerations for determining participation in the Alaska Alternate Assessment:

1. A disability category or label.
2. Poor attendance or extended absences.
3. Native language/social/cultural or economic difference.
5. Academic and other services student receives.
6. Educational environment or instructional setting.
7. Percent of time receiving special education.
8. ELL status.
9. Low reading level/achievement level.
10. Anticipated student’s disruptive behavior.
11. Impact of student scores on accountability system.
12. Administrator decision.
13. Anticipated emotional duress.
14. Need for accommodations (e.g., assistive technology) to participate in assessment process.
Student Supports for the Alaska Alternate Assessment

Accommodations and Assistive Technology

Students taking alternate assessments may use appropriate accommodations and assistive technology during testing. Accommodations and assistive technology must be listed on the IEP and should be used frequently with the student in the classroom. This ensures that the appropriate accommodations/assistive technologies have been selected for the student and that the student is familiar with the use of the accommodations and technologies. Refer to the Handbook for the Participation Guidelines: How to Select, Administer and Evaluate the Use of Student Supports for Assessment located at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/accommodations.html.

Accessibility Provided by the Computer Based Assessment System

Accessibility to the English language arts, and mathematics assessment is provided via the Personal Learning Profile (PLP) and technology. The PLP consists of two sources of information: the Access Personal Needs and Preferences (PNP) Profile and the First Contact survey. This information is needed prior to testing so that the system knows how to customize each student’s experience and can determine which test form from the most appropriate linkage level to deliver.

The PNP profile is used to select the appropriate accessibility features and supports within the system, and thus to tailor each student’s experience based on individual needs. It can be completed any time before testing begins and can be changed as a student’s needs change. Once updated, the changes appear the next time the student is logged in to the test engine, which is the platform used to administer the English language arts and mathematics alternate assessments. The PNP is unique to each student, providing an individualized testing experience that ensures that the student is able to access the content being measured. If a student transfers schools or districts, the PNP is linked to the student’s record and can be accessed by the educators at the new school.

The First Contact survey is completed prior to assessment administration and is used to determine the initial placement of the student into the assessment. Instructions on how to fill out the First Contact survey are located in the Test Administrators’ Manual.

The following tables identify the accessibility features available for students. Test administrators and students may try out these features in provided practice tests to determine what works best for each student. These options are designed to deliver a personalized, accessible user experience as they are matched to assessments within the test engine system.

The terms used distinguish between the accessibility features and supports that can be utilized by selecting online features via the PNP, those that will need additional tools or materials, and those that can be selected outside of the system. Table 10 (Table 1 in the Accessibility Manual) shows which features fall under which category of supports, and each feature and support is described in the following section. Accessibility tools should be documented in the IEP.

Support Categories

Category 1: Supports provided within DLM via the PNP profile

Online supports include magnification, invert color choice, color contrast, and overlay color, and read aloud. Descriptions about how to select supports provided by the PNP are found in Step 4 of the six-step DLM accessibility customization process.
Educators are advised to test the following color options in advance to make sure they are compatible and provide the best access for students:

- **Magnification** – Magnification allows educators to choose the amount of screen magnification during testing. Educators can choose between a magnification of 2x, 3x, 4x, or 5x. Without magnification, the font is Report School, size 22. Scrolling may be required when the level of magnification is increased and the entire item can no longer been seen on the screen. This will vary due to the level of magnification, the amount of text in the item, and the size of the screen.

- **Invert Color Choice** – In Invert Color Choice, the background is black and the font is white. Images display with a white background in both ELA and mathematics.

- **Color Contrast** – The Color Contrast allows educators to choose from several background and lettering color schemes.

- **Overlay Color** – The Overlay Color is the background color of the test. The default color is white; educators may select the alternate colors blue, green, pink, gray, and yellow.

- **Read Aloud with Highlighting** – Text to Speech (TTS) is read from left to right and top to bottom. There are four preferences for TTS: text only, text and graphics, graphics only, and nonvisual (this preference also describes page layout for students who are blind).

If test administrators decide to adjust the PNP-driven accessibility features during the assessment, they can select **Exit Does Not Save** during the assessment, log out of KITE, change the PNP features in Educator Portal, and log back into KITE. More information about KITE and Educator Portal is provided in the Test Administration Manual.

**Category 2: Supports requiring additional tools or materials**

These supports include Braille, switch system preferences, iPad administration, and use of special equipment and materials. These supports typically require prior planning and setup. These supports are all recorded in the PNP even though two-switch system is the only option actually activated by PNP.

- **Uncontracted Braille** – This support will be available for the spring assessment in 2015. Because the testlets are determined dynamically, fixed form Braille versions are not possible.

- **Single-switch system** – Single switch scanning is activated using a switch set up to emulate the "Enter" key on the keyboard. In PNP, educators can set scan speed, indicate whether scanning should begin automatically when the page appears, and select the number of times the scan cycle repeats before stopping.

- **Two-switch system** – Two-switch scanning does not require any activation in PNP. The system automatically supports two-switch step scanning, with one-switch set up to emulate the "Tab" key to move between choices, and the other switch set up to emulate the "Enter" key to select the choice when highlighted.

- **Administration via iPad** – Students are able to take the assessment via an iPad. Other tablet options are not available at this time.

- **Adaptive equipment used by student** – Educators may use any familiar adaptive equipment needed for the student. While educators are able to test devices beforehand, we cannot guarantee all devices are compatible (e.g., keyboard, mouse, touchpads).

- **Individualized manipulatives** – Educators may use manipulatives that are familiar to students (e.g., abacus, unit cubes, interlocking blocks, counters, linking letters, etc.).
Category 3: Supports provided outside the DLM system

These supports require actions by the test administrator, such as reading the test, signing or translating, and assisting the student with entering responses. These supports are recorded in the PNP even though they are delivered by the test administrator:

- **Human Read Aloud** – If the student does not respond well to the synthetic voice, the test administrator may read the assessment to the student.
- **Sign interpretation of text** – Sign is not provided via the computer. For students who sign, test administrators may sign the content to the student using American Sign Language (ASL), Exact English, or personalized sign systems.
- **Language translation of text** – For students who are English learners or respond best to a language other than English, test administrators may translate the text for the student. Language translations are not provided via the computer.
- **Test administrator enter responses for student**– If students are unable to select their answer choices themselves, they may indicate their selected responses through normal response types and/or forms of communication, such as eye gaze, and then test administrators are able to key in those responses. This should only be used when students are unable to independently and accurately record their responses into the system.
- **Partner-Assisted Scanning (PAS)** – PAS is a strategy in which test administrators assist students with scanning, or going through, students’ answer choices. Students make indications when their desired choices are presented.

Timing and setting options are not defined in the DLM system because there are no timed or group tests, so any flexibility the student needs is permissible. For example, the student may take as many breaks as needed throughout the assessment. The system can sit inactive for up to 28 minutes before automatically logging out. If additional time is needed, the student will need to be logged back into the system.

**Supports Not Available in DLM**

IEP teams may be accustomed to seeing longer lists of supports than are provided in DLM, especially when they consider accommodations that students with disabilities may need for the general education assessments. Because students participating in DLM also have significant cognitive disabilities, many of these accommodations are not appropriate for DLM:

- Sign language using human or avatar videos on screen is not provided. Fewer than 2,000 students who participate in DLM use ASL; many students who sign use exact English or personalized sign systems.
- Tactile graphics are too complex and abstract for most blind students with significant cognitive disabilities. Instead, DLM incorporates the use of objects for concrete representations of content.

Decisions about supports not available in DLM alternate assessments were made using results from more than 50,000 First Contact survey responses, feedback from national experts on sensory impairments who also have expertise in this population of students, and lessons learned from test administration observation studies.
### Accessibility Features and Supports for the Alaska Alternate Assessment

**Table 10**  
(Table 1 in *Accessibility Manual for the Alternate Assessment*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility Feature*</th>
<th>Supports Provided Within DLM Via PNP</th>
<th>Supports Requiring Additional Tools/Materials</th>
<th>Supports Provided Outside the DLM System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invert Color Choice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Contrast</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Overlay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Aloud with highlighting – Text to Speech (TTS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Text Only</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Text &amp; Graphics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Graphics Only</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nonvisual</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontracted Braille</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-switch system/PNP enabled</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-switch system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration via iPad</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive equipment used by student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Manipulatives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Read Aloud</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign interpretation of text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language translation of text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrator enters for student</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner-Assisted Scanning (PAS)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Accessibility features and supports used for writing assessments will be added later.  
Note: These supports are described for the DLM system as of spring 2014. As new features are added, updated versions of this manual will include additional descriptions and procedures.
### Common Allowable Supports for the Alaska Alternate Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Need</th>
<th>Allowable Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student has limited experience with, motor skills for, and/or devices for interacting directly with the computer.</td>
<td>The test administrator may navigate the screens. The student may indicate answer choices to the educator and the educator may enter the responses on behalf of the student. The test administrator may only repeat the question as written until the student makes a choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student is blind and typically reads Braille.</td>
<td>Until Braille forms become available, the test administrator may read aloud using the feature available in the test engine (synthetic) or human read aloud. The test administrator may use objects in place of graphics. Descriptions of graphics may be provided through synthetic read aloud or human read aloud using scripted descriptions. Once Braille forms become available, further instructions will be provided on how to access those forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has a severe visual impairment and needs larger presentation of content than the 5x magnification setting provides.</td>
<td>The test administrator may use an interactive whiteboard or projector, or a magnification device that works with the computer screen. For familiar texts in ELA assessments, the test administrator may retrieve the texts from the DLM bookshelf in the Tar Heel Readers library and print the texts in the size the student needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student uses sign language to communicate and has limited proficiency in reading text.</td>
<td>The test administrator may sign the text, spelling unfamiliar words and adapting or interpreting the language as needed based on the signs the student is familiar with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student has uses eye gaze to communicate.</td>
<td>The test administrator may represent the answer options in an alternate format or layout and enter the student’s response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student needs special equipment for positioning (e.g., slant board) or non-computerized materials (e.g., Velcro objects on a board) to respond to questions.</td>
<td>The test administrator may use the equipment and materials the student is familiar with. The student should still interact with the content on the screen but the educator may navigate and enter answers the student has demonstrated outside the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student uses graphic organizers, manipulatives, or other tools to complete academic work.</td>
<td>The test administrator may use the equipment and materials the student is familiar with. The student should still interact with the content on the screen but the educator may navigate and enter answers the student has demonstrated outside the system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Science Alternate Assessment

#### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowable Accommodations for Standard Test Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarging the pictures for a student with limited vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing colored pictures or photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing real objects from the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing student to use assistive devices/supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompting after a delay with no response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 12a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowable Accommodations for Expanded Levels of Support Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Level/Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early Literacy Screener

Alaska regulations AS 14.07.020(b) and 4 AAC 06.710, require the use of literacy screening assessments in the early grades to ensure that all students are gaining the fundamental reading skills that are essential for building strong literacy skills through graduation. Screening helps to identify or predict students who may be a risk for poor learning outcomes before students fall significantly behind and remediation is needed. These brief, skill specific assessments provide teachers with the information they need to provide targeted instruction to students. **Students with special needs must also participate in the early literacy screening. The test administration guidelines will have specific guidance about accommodations for students with disabilities.**

Districts are to administer an approved early literacy screening assessment to all students in:

- Kindergarten
- First grade
- Second grade
- Third grade students identified as experiencing delays in attaining early literacy skills during the second grade.

Literacy screeners are designed to screen students’ literacy skills in the fall, winter, and spring. The regulation requires that the screening assessment be given at least once annually between April 1 and May 30. Screening data must be submitted to the Department no later than July 15. The Early Literacy Screening may be administered by the classroom teacher, a specialist, or a team of teachers who assess all students.

The screener must:

- accurately identify students experiencing delays in attaining early literacy skills;
- be individually administered; and
- have an administration format that permits testing not less than three times per school year.

**There are two options for screeners from which to choose.** For the current list of approved screeners and FAQs go to [http://education.alaska.gov/akassessments/earlyliteracyscreener_faq.pdf](http://education.alaska.gov/akassessments/earlyliteracyscreener_faq.pdf)

1. **Option A** includes AIMSweb, easyCBM, DIBELS, and Star. These tools have the following characteristics:
   - Measures the early literacy sub-skills of letter sound fluency, phoneme segmentation fluency and oral reading fluency;
   - Are individually administered; and
   - Yield data that includes the number of words read correctly in one minute.

2. **Option B** is NWEA MAP. This tool has the following characteristics:
   - Measures the literacy sub-skills of phonological awareness, phonics, concepts of print, vocabulary, word structure, and writing;
   - Permits data to be reported in Rasch units.

Screeners other than those listed on EED’s website may not be used for this assessment, however, districts are not restricted to the use of one screening tool. This current list of screening assessments has been evaluated by the Center on Response to Intervention as moderate-to-strong for validity and reliability. The Center’s evaluation of these screening tools can be found at [http://www.rti4success.org/resources/tools-charts/screening-tools-chart](http://www.rti4success.org/resources/tools-charts/screening-tools-chart).

Districts are required to share the screening data with parents not less than once annually for all tested students. For students experiencing delays, data should be shared not less than twice annually.

**Note: Refer to the individual literacy screener test administration manuals for allowable accommodations.**
English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

Students in grades Kindergarten through 12 who have been formally identified as limited English proficient (LEP) students must be assessed annually to monitor their progress in acquiring academic English. Alaska’s secure large-scale English language proficiency (ELP) assessment is based on the WIDA* English Language Proficiency Standards, 2007. It is a tool used to assess the proficiency levels of LEP students’ receptive and productive skills in English in the areas of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. The English language proficiency assessment focuses on the progress and proficiency levels of academic language rather than content area knowledge and skills, therefore, some accommodations that might be appropriate for the classroom or content areas tests should not be used with the ELP assessment as they will invalidate the test. Assessment administration information is available at http://wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/.

For the purposes of this guide, the term English language learner (ELL) refers to currently identified LEP students, not former LEP students.

In general, accommodations for ELLs for the ELP assessment are not allowed. However, ELLs with disabilities may receive some accommodations. Allowable accommodations for ELLs with disabilities are as listed in Table 13.

Accommodations are appropriate when the standard test presentation, timing or response format prevents a student from accessing or responding to the test items because of physical, emotional, cognitive, or learning disabilities, thus denying the student the opportunity to demonstrate what he or she can do in English as measured by the ELP assessment. Accommodations decisions should be made by the IEP or 504 team and documented within the student specific plans.

Note: the accommodations recommended here are NOT appropriate for ELLs with significant cognitive disabilities. Students with significant cognitive disabilities who cannot participate fully in the regular ELP assessment, with or without accommodations, may be eligible to take the Alternate ELP assessment if they meet the required criteria. Assessment administration information is available at http://www.wida.us/assessment/alternateaccess.aspx.

Accommodations for ELLs with Disabilities for the ELP Assessment

Table 13
Applies to the regular ELP and Alternate ELP Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation FOR ELLs WITH DISABILITIES</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of directions into native language</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing directions to students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of directions in English and/or native language</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating directions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of directions that have been marked by teacher in the Student Response Booklet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Test “directions” refers to all text in the Test Administrator’s Script that is provided to explain logistics of the test, including all practice items. Directions include what is scripted in the Test Administrator’s Script. For Speaking, the directions end just before the test administrator reads “Part A,” and for Listening, the directions end just before the test administrator presses Play.
Accommodation FOR ELLs WITH DISABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation Format</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation of test into native language</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation of test into sign language</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading of test in English</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading of test items in native language</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of bilingual dictionary</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of highlighters (yellow only) by student, in test booklet text only; must not be used in answer area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of marker to maintain place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Print (Student responses must be transcribed into a standard test booklet)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vision aids or magnification device</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio amplification device or noise buffer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reads questions or responses aloud to self</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reads questions or responses aloud and records with tape recorder</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Test” refers to test items (including introductory text and graphic support), but not scripted test directions (previously defined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting Format</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test may be administered...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By trained school personnel in non-school setting (e.g., home or hospital)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With preferential seating</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In study carrel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In space with special lighting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In space with special acoustics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With special furniture for student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With equipment or technology that the student uses for other tests and school work (e.g., pencils adapted in size or grip, slant board, or wedge)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing/Schedule</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility with timing of test is permitted for students who require extra time or have limited attention spans as documented in their IEPs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More breaks as needed by student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-segment testing (refers to administration of very brief sections of the test at a time, such as three or four items related to a common theme)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended testing time within same school day</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended testing sessions over multiple days</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Accommodation FOR ELLs WITH DISABILITIES

### Response Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braille writers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, word processor, or similar assistive device (spell check, grammar check, and dictionary/thesaurus must be turned off)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape recorders for recording student responses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribes: all student responses must be transcribed verbatim, including spelling, punctuation, and paragraph breaks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses in native language</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers are given orally or by pointing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Test Administration Considerations for all Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be school personnel familiar to student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be special education personnel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer the test in a separate room</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer the test in a small group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer the test to students individually</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide verbal praise or tangible reinforcement to increase motivation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer practice test or examples before the administration date of the assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Accommodations NOT RECOMMENDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braille edition of assessment</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing questions or answers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list of accommodations can also be found in the ELP Test Administration Manual at [http://www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/](http://www.wida.us/assessment/ACCESS/).
The Alternate ELP assessment is an assessment of English language proficiency (ELP) for students in grades 1-12 who are formally identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) and have significant cognitive disabilities that prevent their meaningful participation in the regular English language proficiency assessment. (An Alternate ELP assessment is not available for kindergarten.) The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2001) requires that all students identified as LEP be assessed annually for English language proficiency, including students who receive special education services. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004) also mandates that students with disabilities participate in state-wide and district-wide assessment programs, including alternate assessments with appropriate accommodations, when it is documented in their Individualized Education Programs (IEP).

Each test form in the Alternate ELP test assesses the four language domains of Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Test forms are divided into the following grade-level clusters: 1–2, 3–5, 6–8 and 9–12.

If any response to the criteria below is “No” or “Disagree”, the student must participate in the regular ELP assessment with or without accommodations.

- a. The student is currently identified as LEP
- b. The student has a significant cognitive disability and receives special education services under IDEA; 2004
- c. The student’s IEP team determined the student cannot participate in the general education curriculum or assessments
- d. The student is or will be participating in the Alternate Assessment (content)

The student should NOT participate in the Alternate ELP Assessment

The student is eligible to participate in the Alternate ELP Assessment
The following Participation Criteria Checklist should be a part of the decision making process for students who may be eligible to take the Alternate ELP assessment.

### Alternate ELP Assessment Participation Criteria Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Alternate English Language Proficiency Assessment Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student has an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and is currently identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP). The student meets the eligibility criteria for special education related to the areas of, but not limited to, cognitive impairment, autism, traumatic brain injury, or multiple disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For grades 3 – 10, the student takes the Alaska Alternate Assessment instead of the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student demonstrates deficits in adaptive behavior/skills that adversely impacts the student’s educational performance and prevents completion of the standard academic curricula that leads to a diploma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student requires extensive, frequent, individualized instruction in multiple settings to acquire, maintain, generalize and demonstrate performance of skills, including English language skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectives written for the student in the designated content area are less complex than the Alaska English/Language Arts and Math Standards, making the regular ELP assessment, even with accommodations, inappropriate for this student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The accommodations or modifications needed by the student to participate in the regular ELP assessment would compromise the validity of the test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The decision to participate in the Alternate ELP assessment is not based solely on language, social, cultural, or economic differences or excessive or extended absences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The decision to place the student on the Alternate ELP assessment is not being made for program administration reasons, such as the student is expected to perform poorly on the regular ELP assessment; the student displays disruptive behaviors or experiences emotional duress during testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alaska Policy for Administration of the Alternate ELP Assessment**

- It is strongly recommended that districts designate a contact person to oversee the alternate ELP assessment and to work closely with special education staff to meet the testing needs of these students.
- It is strongly recommended that certified teachers administer the alternate ELP assessment.
- The alternate ELP assessment is designed only for current LEP students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- The IEP team will determine if the student will take the alternate or regular ELP assessment. For students in grades 3-8, the students must also be taking the Alaska Alternate Assessment (content assessment) instead of the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP). For students in grades 1, 2, 11 & 12 who do not take the AMP, the IEP team makes the decision about the alternate ELP assessment using the checklist above.
- Test administrators must be certified online annually to administer this assessment.
- The alternate ELP assessment does not address Proficiency levels 4, 5, or 6, therefore, a student cannot exit LEP status as ‘Proficient’ on this assessment.
The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is a national assessment of a representative sampling of America’s students in grades 4, 8, and 12 conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics. Results are only given at the state-level; no school or student results are provided. Only students with disabilities who participate in the Alaska Alternate Assessment based on alternate achievement standards will be automatically excluded from any NAEP assessment. All other students with disabilities should participate in NAEP with or without NAEP allowed accommodations.

NAEP strives to obtain as complete a picture as possible of the educational progress of all students. Thus, the NAEP sample includes students who have been identified as having physical, emotional, or developmental disabilities; or who have had limited exposure to the English language. NAEP’s goal is to include as many students with disabilities and/or limited English proficiency as possible; therefore, NAEP’s advice to schools is, when in doubt, include the student.

NAEP has specific accommodations for students with disabilities or who are English language learners. The allowed accommodations and requirements for administration of NAEP are determined by NCES and the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) and information about them is provided to the schools prior to the NAEP assessment. NAEP accommodations for each assessment year are typically finalized in late fall prior to the assessment year.

The Department of Education & Early Development expects that most English language learners (ELL) will be included on the NAEP. Only English language learners who have been enrolled in United States schools for less than 1 full academic year before the NAEP assessment may be excluded from any NAEP assessment. All other English language learners should participate in NAEP with or without NAEP allowed accommodations.

NAEP is administered by a federally contracted assessment team that receives extensive training to ensure consistent administration across the nation. School personnel may be asked to assist with some accommodations, such as signing questions for students.

School personnel with the best knowledge of the student’s accommodation needs should use the guidance provided by NAEP to decide if the student should be included in the NAEP assessment and the accommodations needed.

The information regarding accommodations for NAEP can be found at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/naep.html. If you have questions about the NAEP accommodations, please contact the NAEP State Coordinator at 907-465-8729.
College and Career- Readiness Assessments

House Bill 278, or The Education Act, requires all students to take a college-readiness or career-readiness assessment (CCRA) to earn a high school diploma in addition to meeting all local and state credit requirements. The approved college-readiness assessments are the ACT and the SAT; the approved career-readiness assessment is WorkKeys.

As stated in 4 AAC 06.717, the Department of Education & Early Development (EED) will pay for one administration of one assessment for every grade 11 student. Grade 12 students who did not have the opportunity to take the assessment in grade 11 may also have one paid administration.

Districts must administer the career-readiness assessment and one or both of the college-readiness assessments. Students are only required to take one CCRA; students choose between the career-readiness assessment (WorkKeys) and the provided college-readiness assessment(s) (ACT and/or SAT). The assessments must be provided on school days in session; provisions for taking the test on a National Test Day are also available.

WorkKeys, ACT, and SAT assessments each have distinct registration, administration, and accommodation policies as determined by the testing company. Educators are encouraged to refer to the assessment website for the most up-to-date information.
SAT Assessment

Developed by the College Board, the SAT is a national college admission test that provides college-readiness information to students, families and colleges. The SAT is an aptitude test which assesses reasoning and verbal abilities. Students are required to take the three sections in the SAT: Mathematics, Critical Reading, and Writing. The writing section includes an essay.

| Mathematics | Total of 70 minutes: one 20 minute multiple choice and student produced response, two 25 minute multiple choice, and one 20 minute multiple choice section. | The questions require students to apply mathematical concepts and to use data literacy skills in interpreting tables, charts, and graphs. They cover skills in four major areas:  
| Numbers and operations  
| Algebra and functions  
| Geometry and measurement  
| Data analysis, statistics, and probability |
| Critical Reading | Total of 70 minutes: two 25 minute and one 20 minute multiple choice sections. | The critical reading questions are all multiple choice. They can have one of two formats:  
| Sentence completion  
| Passage-based reading with long and short excerpts from works in natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, and literary fiction  
| The questions assess students’ reading skills, such as:  
| Identifying main and supporting ideas  
| Determining the meaning of words in context  
| Understanding the authors’ purpose  
| Understanding the structure and function of sentences |
| Writing | Total of 60 minutes: 25 minute essay, 25 minute and 10 minute multiple choice sections. | The writing section consists of two types of questions:  
| An essay  
| Multiple-choice questions  
| The multiple-choice questions ask students to:  
| Recognize sentence errors  
| Choose the best version of a piece of writing  
| Improving paragraphs |

SAT Accommodations Policy

If a student has a documented disability, they may be eligible for accommodations on SAT tests. Specific information is available from the test vendor. Students are required to apply and provide required documentation. The College Board’s request process can take up to seven weeks. Documentation of the student’s disability and need for specific accommodations is required and submitted for College Board review. Further information about the approval process is available at [https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities](https://www.collegeboard.org/students-with-disabilities).
American College Testing (ACT)

The ACT is a national college admissions test that provides college-readiness information to students, families, and post-secondary institutions. There are five required subtests: English, Mathematics, Reading, Science, and an optional Writing test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>Measures standard written English and rhetorical skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>Measures mathematical skills students have typically acquired in courses up to the beginning of grade 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35 min</td>
<td>Measures reading comprehension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35 min</td>
<td>Measures the interpretation, analysis, evaluation, reasoning, and problem-solving skills required in the natural sciences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Test</td>
<td>1 prompt</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>Measures writing skills emphasized in high school English classes and in entry-level college composition courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accommodations Allowed for the ACT**

ACT has established policies regarding documentation of an applicant's disability and the process for requesting accommodations. Further details are available at [http://www.actstudent.org/regist/disab/policy.html](http://www.actstudent.org/regist/disab/policy.html).

If a student currently receives accommodations in school due to a professionally diagnosed and documented disability, documentation must be submitted to ACT to request accommodations.

The ACT and ACT Plus Writing are offered only in English. Accommodations (including extended time) are not available solely on the basis of limited English proficiency.
## WorkKeys Assessment

WorkKeys is a career skills assessment. The three assessments given to students consist of Applied Mathematics, Locating Information, and Reading for Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55 minutes</td>
<td>This assessment measures the skill people use when they apply mathematical reasoning, critical thinking, and problem-solving techniques to work-related problems. The test questions require the examinee to set up and solve the types of problems and do the types of calculations that actually occur in the workplace. This test is designed to be taken with a calculator. A formula sheet that includes all formulas required for the assessment is provided. While individuals may use calculators and conversion tables to help with the problems, they still need to use math skills to think them through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>(WorkKeys Internet Version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating Information</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55 minutes</td>
<td>The Locating Information test measures the skill people use when they work with workplace graphics. Examinees are asked to find information in a graphic or insert information into a graphic. They also must compare, summarize, and analyze information found in related graphics. The skill people use when they locate, synthesize, and use information from workplace graphics such as charts, graphs, tables, forms, flowcharts, diagrams, floor plans, maps, and instrument gauges is a basic skill required in today's workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>(WorkKeys Internet Version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for Information</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55 minutes</td>
<td>The Reading for Information test measures the skill people use when they read and use written text in order to do a job. The written texts include memos, letters, directions, signs, notices, bulletins, policies, and regulations. It is often the case that workplace communications are not necessarily well-written or targeted to the appropriate audience. Reading for Information materials do not include information that is presented graphically, such as in charts, forms, or blueprints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>(WorkKeys Internet Version)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Allowable Accommodations for WorkKeys

The Department of Education & Early Development has developed a separate document to assist school districts with selecting accommodations for students with disabilities and identified LEP students prior to testing with WorkKeys. ACT has provided guidance in the *ACT WorkKeys Supervisor’s Manual for State Testing-Special Testing*. This additional supplement should only be used when selecting accommodations for students with disabilities and identified limited English proficient students for WorkKeys testing. The *Alaska Supplement for WorkKeys Assessment, June 2014* can be found at [http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/ccra.html](http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/ccra.html).

Become familiar with the column headings in the tables below during the selection process. Both Internet Testing and Paper/Pencil Event Testing administration are represented. The letter “I” for Internet Testing and/or “P” for Paper/Pencil Event Testing is printed in the WorkKeys-Eligible and/or State-Allowable columns indicating the accommodation is allowed. WorkKeys reportable scores and National Career Readiness Certificates (NCRCs) will be issued for students using the accommodation if it is marked in the appropriate column. The NCRC is contingent on the student’s level score. A blank in any column indicates not allowable or consequences apply. **Both WorkKeys-eligible and state-allowable accommodations must be administered according to the special criteria noted on the tables and WorkKeys Supervisor’s Manual for State Testing-Special Testing.**
**Note:** Manipulatives for WorkKeys tests are not eligible accommodations. Other accommodations in the tables that are grayed out are not allowable or applicable accommodations for WorkKeys, and if used may invalidate the assessment.

### Accommodations for Students with Disabilities for WorkKeys

**Applies to students on an IEP/504 and Transitory Impairment Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>WorkKeys Eligible</th>
<th>State Allowable</th>
<th>NCRC</th>
<th>Special Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing/Scheduling</strong></td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow frequent breaks during testing.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Internet Testing - Only between Assessments- no stop-the-clock breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing additional testing time.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paper/Pencil Event Testing use codes for stop the clock breaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering at a time of the day most beneficial to the student.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test over several days completing the testing on or before the last day of the test window.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• May be administered at any time during school day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SETTING</strong></td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test individually in a separate location.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Study carrel must be observable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test to a small group in a separate location.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Room supervisor must be able to view student and work area at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing special lighting.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proctor must meet all ACT, Inc.’s staffing requirements in Supervisor’s Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing adaptive or special furniture.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must meet all ACT, Inc.’s staffing requirements in Supervisor’s Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing special acoustics.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must meet all ACT, Inc.’s staffing requirements in Supervisor’s Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administering the test in locations with minimal distractions (e.g., small group, study carrel, or individually).</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must meet all ACT, Inc.’s staffing requirements in Supervisor’s Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a communication device such as auditory amplification to give directions.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be used accommodating form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a specific test proctor (e.g. examinee’s regular or special education teacher).</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be used accommodating form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential seating.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be used accommodating form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of physical position of student by increasing or decreasing opportunity for movement.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be used accommodating form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a checklist to remind student of tasks to be completed.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be used accommodating form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENTATION: Test Directions</strong></td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must be used accommodating form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Braille edition or large-type (20 font) edition, which are provided by the test contractor.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing the verbal instructions to the student.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• May use American Sign Language or Exact English Signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing student to ask for clarifications on test directions.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\( I \) = Internet Testing  
\( P \) = Paper/pencil Event Testing  
\( = \) = allowable  
Gray indicates not allowable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodations</th>
<th>WorkKeys Eligible</th>
<th>State Allowable</th>
<th>Reportable Scores</th>
<th>NCRC</th>
<th>Special Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying directions by having student restate them.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading, and re-reading if requested, embedded directions.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing written version of verbal instructions.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting directions through use of projection equipment.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing highlighted words in embedded directions.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing helpful verbs from the directions on the board, or on a separate piece of paper.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENTATION: Test Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading or signing math, science, and/or writing items on the state required assessments to student. (Signing is allowed as long as the sign does not cue the correct response to a question.)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All signing must be Exact English Signing only</td>
<td></td>
<td>All WorkKeys tests may be read or signed aloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>order Reader Script</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using test contractor signing DVD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DVD does not exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using test contractor audio version.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Supervisor’s Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use/</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use/ order Audio DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>order Audio DVD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading or signing multi-step math, science, or writing test items one step at a time. (Signing is allowed as long as the sign does not cue the correct response to a question.)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All signing must be Exact English Signing (American Sign Language will result in state allowable scores only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use/ order Reader Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All WorkKeys tests may be read or signed aloud</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting student in tracking or sequencing test items.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing detailed monitoring to ensure student marks responses in correct answer area.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning pages for student.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masking portions of the test to direct attention to uncovered items.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using color screens to direct attention to specific sections on a page.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow student to highlight words except in answer document area.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRESENTATION: Use of Assistive Devices/Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a calculator with minimal functions: having only addition, subtraction, division, multiplication, percentage, square root, and memory functions.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to Supervisor’s Manual for list of approved calculators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using visual magnification devices.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using templates to reduce visible print.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>WorkKeys Eligible</td>
<td>State Allowable</td>
<td>Reportable Scores</td>
<td>NCRC</td>
<td>Special Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using auditory amplification device, hearing aid, or noise buffers.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing papers to work area with tapes/magnets.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tape or other adhesive on the answer document will make the test unscorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a device to screen out extraneous sounds (does not include music devices).</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using adaptive equipment to deliver test (requires consultation with the department for security reasons).</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using masks or markers to maintain place.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using special pen or pencil such as felt-tip marker or ink pen.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Responses must be transcribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using an adaptive keyboard.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using math manipulatives.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only individual/small group testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE: Test Format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using graph paper.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing students to mark responses in test booklet if test employs a separate answer sheet.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student with additional room for writing response.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using color visual overlays.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using ruler or object to maintain place in test.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using shield to reduce glare.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE: Use of Assistive Devices/Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing student to tape response for later verbatim transcription.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Responses must be transcribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computer without spell or grammar Checker.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If extended time applies, order an accommodated form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reference scribe procedures in the Participation Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictating to a scribe for all tests.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If extended time applies, order an accommodated form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reference scribe procedures in the Participation Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing alternative responses such as oral, sign, typed, pointing.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If extended time applies, order an accommodated form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reference scribe procedures in the Participation Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a Brailler.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Responses must be transcribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a specially-designed #2 pencil.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Internet Testing  
P = Paper/pencil Event Testing  
*= allowable  
Gray indicates not allowable
## Accommodations for LEP Students for WorkKeys

### Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State-Allowable Accommodations</th>
<th>WorkKeys Eligible</th>
<th>State Allowable</th>
<th>Reportable Scores</th>
<th>NCRC</th>
<th>Special Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Linguistic Support Accommodations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref Materials</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a commercial word-to-word bilingual dictionary. Dictionaries that include pictures or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word definitions are not allowed. Electronic devices are not acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Directions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In English or the native language:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• provide written version of written/oral test directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only individual/small cluster testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• read aloud and/or repeat written and/or oral test directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• read aloud and/or repeat embedded test directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clarify/explain test directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Items</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read aloud, and repeat if requested: writing, math,</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or science test items in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide test contractor audio version.</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use/order a Reader Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide the native language word for an unknown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer the Supervisor’s Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word in a test item, when requested by student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use/order Audio DVD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow the student to respond orally to constructed response items.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Linguistic Support Accommodations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide extended time.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only individual/small group testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide scheduled breaks as needed during testing.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must use accommodated form only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule: Administer the test over several days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only individual testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Administration Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer the test individually.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to page 6 of the Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administer the test to small groups in a separate location.</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td>I/P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I = Internet Testing
P = Paper/pencil Event Testing
* = allowable
Gray indicates not allowable
Appendix A: Allowable Accommodations for Assessments

The accommodations appendix is not an exhaustive list of the allowable accommodations for students with disabilities for content assessments. To determine whether an adaptation not found in this table or the appendix is an accommodation or modification, refer to the procedure outlined in the Introduction to Participation in Assessments and Student Supports section of this document.

Additional Accommodations Allowed for AMP Computer-Based Assessment:

- Frequent or additional breaks
- Providing special lighting
- Providing special acoustics
- Preferential seating
- Support of physical position of student by increasing or decreasing opportunity for movement
- Using a checklist to remind student of tasks to be completed
- Using color contrast, reverse contrast or color overlays (requires PNP)
- Using a shield to reduce glare (requires PNP)
- Auditory amplification device for students unable to understand computer voice (requires PNP)

Additional Accommodations allowed for AMP Paper/Pencil Administration:

- Using a specific test proctor or test administrator
- Preferential seating
- Support of physical position of student by increasing or decreasing opportunity for movement
- Allowing student to ask for clarifications on test directions
- Presenting directions through the use of projection equipment
- Assisting student in tracking or sequencing test items
- Turning pages for student
- Frequent or additional breaks
- Extended testing time
- Administering at a time of day most beneficial to the student
- Providing special lighting
- Providing special acoustics
- Using a checklist to remind student of tasks to be completed
- Using color screens to direct attention to specific sections on a page
- Securing papers to work area with tapes/magnets etc.
- Using a device to screen out extraneous sounds (does not include music devices)
- Using adaptive equipment to deliver test (consult with the department for security reasons)
- Using masks or markers to maintain place
- Using special pen or pencil such as felt-tip marker (student responses must be transcribed)
- Using an adaptive keyboard or computer with all other programs and features turned off
- Using color visual overlays
- Using shield to reduce glare
- Allowing student to record response for later verbatim transcription
- Dictating to a scribe
- Allowing alternative responses such as oral, signed, typed, pointing, etc. (student responses must be transcribed)
- Using a Brailler
- Providing highlighted words in embedded directions
- Write helpful verbs from the directions on the board or a separate piece of paper

Additional Accommodations allowed for the Alaska Science SBA Paper/Pencil Administration:
- Using a specific test proctor or test administrator
- Preferential seating
- Support of physical position of student by increasing or decreasing opportunity for movement
- Allowing student to ask for clarifications on test directions
- Presenting directions through the use of projection equipment
- Assisting student in tracking or sequencing test items
- Turning pages for student
- Frequent or additional breaks
- Extended testing time
- Administering at a time of day most beneficial to the student
- Providing special lighting
- Providing special acoustics
- Using a checklist to remind student of tasks to be completed
- Using color screens to direct attention to specific sections on a page
- Securing papers to work area with tapes/magnets etc.
- Using a device to screen out extraneous sounds (does not include music devices)
- Using adaptive equipment to deliver test (consult with the department for security reasons)
- Using masks or markers to maintain place
- Using special pen or pencil such as felt-tip marker (student responses must be transcribed)
- Using an adaptive keyboard or computer with all other programs and features turned off
- Using color visual overlays
- Using shield to reduce glare
- Allowing student to record response for later verbatim transcription
- Dictating to a scribe
- Allowing alternative responses such as oral, signed, typed, pointing, etc. (student responses must be transcribed)
- Using a Brailler
- Providing highlighted words in embedded directions
- Write helpful verbs from the directions on the board or a separate piece of paper
Appendix B: Modifications NOT Allowed for Testing

The following are examples of modifications that are not allowed for testing. Modifications will invalidate an assessment because they change what the assessment is measuring and/or give the student an unfair advantage. This is not an exhaustive list of modifications.

- Clarification of a test item
- Paraphrasing test items
- Using spell or grammar check
- Reading the passages of the reading test
- Use of a dictionary or thesaurus (this does not include the specific type of dictionary allowed for ELLs as an accommodation)
- Use of a mathematics or English language arts resource guide or reference sheets
- Use of a calculator outside of the test delivery engine
- Proctors providing synonyms for unknown words
Appendix C: Acronyms and Definitions

AA – Alternate Assessment
AA-AAS – Alaska Alternate Assessment based on ALTERNATE Achievement Standards for NON-diploma track students
ACT – American College Test
ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act of 2008
AMP – Alaska Measures of Progress, Alaska’s assessment that is designed to measure student growth and achievement in the Alaska English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards
CBA – Computer-based Assessment
CCRA – College and Career-Readiness Assessments
COA – Certificate of Achievement, a certificate for students on an alternate assessment or who are unable to fulfill all requirements to receive a diploma
DLM – Dynamic Learning Maps, a system of assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities
EED – Education and Early Development (Alaska State Department of Education and Early Development)
ELA/Mathematics – English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards
ELLS – English language learners
ELP – English language proficiency assessment
ESEA – Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a federal act that emphasizes equal access to education
ESER – Evaluation Summary and Eligibility Report, a special education eligibility report
FC – First Contact survey, an initial placement survey for the computer-based Alternate Assessment
IDEA – Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004
IEP – Individualized Education Program, individualized education plans for students with disabilities
LEP – Limited English proficient, a formally identified English language learner
NAEP – National Assessment of Educational Progress, a national assessment of a representative sampling of America’s students in grades 4, 8, and 12 conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics
NAGB – National Assessment Governing Board, the governing board that makes decisions regarding accommodations for the NAEP assessment
NCES – National Center for Education
NCLB – No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
NCRC – National Career Readiness Certificates, a WorkKeys certificate documenting a student’s level of career readiness
PLAAFP – Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance, a section within the IEP that documents the student’s academic and functional skills and knowledge

PNP – Personal Needs and Preferences, student supports that are selected in a computer-based assessment system prior to testing

SAT – A college-readiness assessment

SBA – Standards-Based Assessment
PUBLIC COMMENT
November 3, 2014

Commissioner Mike Hanley
Commissioner’s Office
Department of Education and Early Development
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 2002
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Attention: Draft Participation Guidelines

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

In response to the request for review and public comment to the proposed changes in Title 4 of the Alaska Administrative Code to amend 4 AAC 06, specifically to changes as they relate to the revised Draft Participation Guidelines, Anchorage School District (ASD) provides the attached comments.

I appreciate the opportunity to forward our comments as they relate to the proposed adoptions in the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) regulations.

My staff and I are available to answer any questions regarding our responses and will forward any additional remarks to the proposed regulation changes, as you deem necessary.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed Graff
Superintendent

Cc: Anchorage School Board
   Mike Graham, Chief Academic Officer
   Linda Carlson, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Support
   Diane Hoffbauer, Assistant Superintendent, Instruction
   Mike Henry, Executive Director, Secondary Education
   Jane Stuart, Executive Director, Assessment and Evaluation
4 AAC 06: Draft Participation Guidelines

1. An increased emphasis on the connection between instruction and assessments when choosing and documenting the need of accessibility tools for general education students

   a. The process of selecting and documenting the need for students to use accessibility tools is a new concept for educators, especially when it comes to students who have not been identified with specific needs via their IEP, 504 or ELL plan. The emphasis of the critical connection between student supports provided during instruction and how those are then used on assessments is important for educators to recognize throughout the Participation Guidelines. On page 5, a few statements are made in relation to Accommodations, but this same sentiment should be applied to accessibility tools for students without a plan but with a documented need.

2. EED statement of support for districts to provide criteria and/or guidance for the use of accessibility tools

   a. With the generic language and lack of definition of ‘documented need’ in reference to the use of accessibility tools, a statement in the Participation Guidelines that directs districts to have a universally applied system used by educators to assist in the selection of accessibility tools would assist districts in implementing a standardized approach to the utilization of the accessibility tools. The school in which a student attends should not impact the accessibility tool selection process since the goal of a standardized assessment is that no matter where the student tests, they have the same experience. Without an EED and/or district decision-making matrix, we are concerned that the access/use level of perceived need of the accessibility tools will vary widely from school to school depending on the philosophy and opinions of the educators at those locations. We want all students to have equitable access. Explicit EED support of criteria and/or guidance for the use of accessibility tools will support districts in their implementation of these tools, namely Text-to-Speech.

3. Inclusion of the shift away from the need for small group testing

   a. Implementation of computer-based assessments increases the number of accommodated students who are able to test with the rest of their classmates as opposed to testing in a small group. This increase is due to the availability of accommodations that are embedded into the test engine in a way that negates any impact on the students testing around them. For example, the read aloud accommodation for paper-pencil testing needed to be provided in a small group only with other students who also received read aloud. Now that Text-to-Speech is delivered using headsets, these students can test with all the other students.

   b. With some accommodations being accessed only through small groups, it has seemed to increase the number of IEP/504/ELL plans that include small group as an accommodation of need. However, small group needs to be looked at as a stand-alone accommodation that is not only used on assessments but is used extensively during instruction. Small group testing should be limited only to the students who utilize this accommodation during instruction and not because of the practice of including it to ensure access to other accommodations. Inclusion of this shift in the Participation Guidelines would go a long way to inform educators in their practice of writing IEP, 504 and ELL plans.

4. Change in categorization of Clarification of Directions from an Accommodation to an Universal Tool

   a. Based on the information that Universal Tools, Accessibility Tools and Accommodations do not alter the validity of the assessment, score interpretation, reliability or security of the assessment, all students should have access to clarification of directions. The new testing mode shifts the thinking away from asking questions on the test directions being an
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accommodation to now being a universal tool. This then would be addressed in the Test Administration Manual for Test Administrators. In past conversations and EED presentations surrounding the test administration of AMP, test administrators have the freedom to clarify directions and assist students in using the technology enhanced items in various ways. Since clarification of directions assists with students being able to access a test and this being a new test with new tools/directions that could be unfamiliar, all students should be able to ask questions about the directions.

5. Use of 3 levels of Student Supports

   a. The verbage of three categories: Universal Tools, Accessibility Tools and Accommodations is the simplest and clearest way to explain the new student support structure. In various places, there are only two categories referenced (specifically on page 5, Accessibility Tools and Accommodations) which is a harder and confusing way to look at the new components. It seems misleading and inaccurate. Use of the three categories seems to be critical for communication, user understanding and application.

6. ELL Accessibility Tool Chart

   a. ELL students are covered on Table 2 on page 14 so there is no need to have an additional chart that is only for those students (Table 7).

7. Other Errors/Revisions Needed

   a. Errors/Updates/Misunderstandings to the current version of the PG for Universal Tools
      i. Reference Sheet needs to be taken off the chart
      ii. Use of Whole Screen magnification needs to be taken off the chart (based on a conversation with AA1, this needs to be set using a PNP and therefore fits under the accessibility tool category)
   b. Errors/Updates/Misunderstandings to the current version of the PG for Accessibility Tools
      i. Add whole screen magnification
   c. Errors/Updates/Misunderstandings to the current version of the PG for Accommodations
      i. Description of the accommodation use of a calculator should indicate that they can be provided and use a calculator for all math test items

November 3, 2014
Name: Steve Atwater  
E-Mail: satwater@kpbsd.k12.ak.us  
Telephone: 907 714-8836  
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.710 and 4 AAC 06.717 My Comments: November 3, 2014

Dear Chair Cox,

I am writing to comment on the amendments to 4AAC 06.775(a) that require a district to follow the requirements of the department’s Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments. While I understand that the guidelines are primarily the department’s concern, I do want to share some reservations that I have regarding them. Our Director of Assessment has also shared these concerns with the department.

KPBSD’s biggest concern with the guidelines is that meeting the new requirements for all the various assessments in the same year is a “heavy lift.” We are most concerned with the short time period to prepare once the guidelines are adopted. Specifically, it will be a challenge to properly put testing accommodations into place for our students with IEPs. Convening meetings for many of our 1,490 KPBSD students who have IEPs and some of the 61 students with 504 plans in four months will be an enormous task.

A secondary concern is with regard to the Accessibility tools. In particular, is the loose guidance for determining whether a student will be eligible for text to speech-Read aloud accommodations. I feel that loosely leaving this decision to the district is a mistake and that the department should have tighter guidelines to avoid the wide variance of its use that could occur. I fear that a lack of uniformity with determining its use will in turn, skew the ability to compare test results across the state. Or, considering that the Participation Guidelines state that Accessibility Tools do not alter what the test is accessing or the validity of the score, then perhaps it makes sense to simply make the Read aloud option a universal tool.

In closing, I realize that the department is under a lot of pressure to get everything in order for the assessments. I want to commend them for all of their good work as they react to the tight timelines.

Sincerely,

Steve Atwater, Superintendent
I am commenting on: Participation Guidelines - to amend 4 AAC 06. The proposed regulations implement AS 14.03.075 and AS 14.07.165, My Comments: Overall, very pleased with the amendments and the approach using universal design.

Suggestions:
Pages 5-11: "Universal Tools" should be explicitly listed and defined in all explanations of the supports for students. On page 11, the Universal Tools section should NOT be under the PNP heading, since a PNP is not required for the use of those tools.

Page 12: That chart is not accurate in portrayal of the embedded nature of supports. Delete it. Expand the diagram/graphic on page 9 to include the definitions, and to include Universal Tools, and then repeat or reference that graphic again on pages 12 or 13.

Page 13: A specific reference to "time" (e.g., no time limits) should be added.

Pages 13 -21:
* There is no reference in these charts to "Frequent Breaks" - which is currently a very common accommodation listed in IEPs. That accommodation is referenced in the Appendix on page 46, and an awesome Universal Tool is described for movement... but need those earlier in the document.
* Consider moving Appendix A into the body of the document.
* Add a reference or explanation about the use of varied platforms/ devices (e.g., iPads).
* Table 11 could move to the Guidance section v. Regents.
Name: Melissa Sadlowski  
E-Mail: Melissa.Sadlowski@matsuk12.us  
Telephone: 907 761-4020  
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 06.775, 4 AAC 06.721-.724 Assessments  
My Comments: Mat-Su would like to know when and how it is appropriate to use Dragon Speak on the AMP assessment. We have students who use it during their regular classroom instruction. Thank you.
The Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education (the Council) is the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) for Alaska as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Council members are former special education students, parents of students with disabilities, special education teachers, school administrators, staff from the Department of Education & Early Development (EED) and others involved in the education of students with disabilities. The Council works on issues and activities of concern to make changes in the education system that improves the lives of students with disabilities. The Council is making comments on 4 AAC 06.721. College and career readiness assessment waivers.

The Council previously made comments on assessments and for the most part has been very pleased to finally see some real thought put into the needs of students with disabilities addressed in these regulations. Our initial reaction has been quite favorable. However we do question the reasoning in 4 AAC 06.723 Rare or unusual circumstances. Section (B) allows for applying for a waiver if there is a “a medical condition that is a serious and sudden illness or physical injury that occurs in the last semester of the student’s year of intended graduation and that prevents the student from taking a college and career readiness assessment” This section further goes on to say that this condition must be beyond the control of the student or parents to be considered for a waiver. Then the regulation specifically states that teen pregnancy and childbirth, depression, stress or stress related conditions or drug or alcohol addiction are not medical conditions that warrant consideration for a waiver. This seems unduly harsh, judgmental and restrictive. We doubt that there are many students and their families looking at such enormous challenges that would say that these conditions are controllable. We ask the Department to reconsider these “not rare or unusual” exemptions and offer the same opportunities for waiver consideration to students with mental health and substance abuse challenges and other life changing events the same options as a student with traumatic brain injury or the sudden death of a parent.

Taylor Gregg
Chair of the Education Committee
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Commissioner Mike Hanley
Commissioner's Office
Department of Education and Early Development
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 2002
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Attention: Draft Participation Guidelines

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

In response to the request for review and public comment to the proposed changes in Title 4 of the Alaska Administrative Code to amend 4 AAC 06, specifically to changes as they relate to the revised Draft Participation Guidelines, Anchorage School District (ASD) provides the attached comments.

I appreciate the opportunity to forward our comments as they relate to the proposed adoptions in the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) regulations.

My staff and I are available to answer any questions regarding our responses and will forward any additional remarks to the proposed regulation changes, as you deem necessary.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed Graff
Superintendent

Cc: Anchorage School Board
   Mike Graham, Chief Academic Officer
   Linda Carlson, Assistant Superintendent, Instructional Support
   Diane Hoffbauer, Assistant Superintendent, Instruction
   Mike Henry, Executive Director, Secondary Education
   Jane Stuart, Executive Director, Assessment and Evaluation
4 AAC 06: Draft Participation Guidelines

1. An increased emphasis on the connection between instruction and assessments when choosing and documenting the need of accessibility tools for general education students

   a. The process of selecting and documenting the need for students to use accessibility tools is a new concept for educators, especially when it comes to students who have not been identified with specific needs via their IEP, 504 or ELL plan. The emphasis of the critical connection between student supports provided during instruction and how those are then used on assessments is important for educators to recognize throughout the Participation Guidelines. On page 5, a few statements are made in relation to Accommodations, but this same sentiment should be applied to accessibility tools for students without a plan but with a documented need.

2. EBD statement of support for districts to provide criteria and/or guidance for the use of accessibility tools

   a. With the generic language and lack of definition of ‘documented need’ in reference to the use of accessibility tools, a statement in the Participation Guidelines that directs districts to have a universally applied system used by educators to assist in the selection of accessibility tools would assist districts in implementing a standardized approach to the utilization of the accessibility tools. The school in which a student attends should not impact the accessibility tool selection process since the goal of a standardized assessment is that no matter where the student tests, they have the same experience. Without an EBD and/or district decision-making matrix, we are concerned that the access/use level of perceived need of the accessibility tools will vary widely from school to school depending on the philosophy and opinions of the educators at those locations. We want all students to have equitable access. Explicit EBD support of criteria and/or guidance for the use of accessibility tools will support districts in their implementation of these tools, namely Text-to-Speech.

3. Inclusion of the shift away from the need for small group testing

   a. Implementation of computer-based assessments increases the number of accommodated students who are able to test with the rest of their classmates as opposed to testing in a small group. This increase is due to the availability of accommodations that are embedded into the test engine in a way that negates any impact on the students testing around them. For example, the read aloud accommodation for paper-pencil testing needed to be provided in a small group only with other students who also received read aloud. Now that Text-to-Speech is delivered using headsets, these students can test with all the other students.

   b. With some accommodations being accessed only through small groups, it has seemed to increase the number of IEP/504/ELL plans that include small group as an accommodation of need. However, small group needs to be looked at as a stand-alone accommodation that is not only used on assessments but is used extensively during instruction. Small group testing should be limited only to the students who utilize this accommodation during instruction and not because of the practice of including it to ensure access to other accommodations. Inclusion of this shift in the Participation Guidelines would go a long way to inform educators in their practice of writing IEP, 504 and ELL plans.

4. Change in categorization of Clarification of Directions from an Accommodation to an Universal Tool

   a. Based on the information that Universal Tools, Accessibility Tools and Accommodations do not alter the validity of the assessment, score interpretation, reliability or security of the assessment, all students should have access to clarification of directions. The new testing mode shifts the thinking away from asking questions on the test directions being an
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accommodation to now being a universal tool. This then would be addressed in the Test Administration Manual for Test Administrators. In past conversations and BED presentations surrounding the test administration of AMP, test administrators have the freedom to clarify directions and assist students in using the technology enhanced items in various ways. Since clarification of directions assists with students being able to access a test and this being a new test with new tools/directions that could be unfamiliar, all students should be able to ask questions about the directions.

5. Use of 3 levels of Student Supports

a. The verbage of three categories: Universal Tools, Accessibility Tools and Accommodations is the simplest and clearest way to explain the new student support structure. In various places, there are only two categories referenced (specifically on page 5, Accessibility Tools and Accommodations) which is a harder and confusing way to look at the new components. It seems misleading and inaccurate. Use of the three categories seems to be critical for communication, user understanding and application.

6. ELL Accessibility Tool Chart

a. ELL students are covered on Table 2 on page 14 so there is no need to have an additional chart that is only for those students (Table 7).

7. Other Errors/Revisions Needed

a. Errors/Updates/Misunderstandings to the current version of the PG for Universal Tools
   i. Reference Sheet needs to be taken off the chart
   ii. Use of Whole Screen magnification needs to be taken off the chart (based on a conversation with AAI, this needs to be set using a PNP and therefore fits under the accessibility tool category)

b. Errors/Updates/Misunderstandings to the current version of the PG for Accessibility Tools
   i. Add whole screen magnification

c. Errors/Updates/Misunderstandings to the current version of the PG for Accommodations
   i. Description of the accommodation use of a calculator should indicate that they can be provided and use a calculator for all math test items

November 3, 2014
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Commissioner Mike Hanley
Department of Education and Early Development
801 West Tenth Street, Suite 2002
P.O. Box 110500
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0500

Dear Commissioner Hanley,

In response to the request for review and public comment to the proposed changes in Title 4 of the Alaska Administrative Code to amend 4 AAC 06.775, 4 AAC 06.721-.724, which will require a college-ready or career-ready assessment as a condition of receiving a high school diploma and standards for a waiver from the assessment, the Anchorage School District provides the attached comment.

My staff and I are available to answer any questions regarding our responses and will forward any additional remarks to the proposed regulation changes, as you deem necessary.

Sincerely,

Ed Graff
Superintendent

Cc: Anchorage School Board
    Mike Graham, Chief Academic Officer
    Jane Stuart, Executive Director, Assessment and Evaluation
4 AAC 06.775, 4 AAC 06.721-.724 Assessments

The Anchorage School District supports the use of a waiver and the appeal process as outlined in the regulation.

As stated in the regulations, there will be a process for filing a waiver that allows for two situations. First, a student entering the public school system late—after the completion of all scheduled administrations in the student’s year of intended graduation—and secondly, a rare and unusual circumstance including the death of a parent, an ongoing illness or debilitating accident.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
December 5, 2014

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 12I

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations regarding the restriction on expending money to implement educational curriculum standards established by the Common Core Standards Initiative.

♦ BACKGROUND
• This proposed regulation supports the actions of the legislature and the Governor when passing and signing into law HB278, enrolled as Alaska Statute 14.07.020 (b).

• The testimony offered when this amendment was added to HB278 in the legislature expressed the intent that this was to prevent Alaska from adopting the Common Core State Standards and accepting any obligations that such adoption would involve.

• The testimony during the legislative session further clarified that this amendment to HB278 was not to prevent Alaska from implementing the content standards the State Board adopted in June 2012, and was not to prevent the department from the work involved in the implementation of those adopted standards.

• This regulation clarifies that “any money” as referenced in Alaska Statute 14.07.020 (b) includes state money or any money received from other sources.

• Behind this cover memo are the proposed regulation and public comment.

• Commissioner Hanley will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is a work session item. Action will take place under Agenda Item 14I.
4 AAC 04 is amended by adding a new section to read:

4 AAC.04.145. Common core standards initiative restrictions. In accordance with AS 14.07.020(b), the department may not expend state money or money received from any other source to implement the set of educational curriculum standards for grades kindergarten through 12 established by the Common Core Standards Initiative. (Eff. ___/___/____, Register ___)

Authority: AS 14.07.020 AS 14.07.060
PUBLIC COMMENT
Name: Graeme Taylor  
E-Mail: graeme.t.taylor@gmail.com  
Telephone: 907 957-0051

I am commenting on: 4 AAC 04.145. Common Core Standards Initiative restrictions.  
My Comments: As a parent, it's discouraging to see that Alaska is one of only seven states that have not adopted Common Core Standards. Concern about being a front runner on an untested trail makes sense, refusing to catch up when almost everyone else has left for the next milestone does not.  

This is obviously politically driven regulation, you don't regulate out all the improper things to teach in the education system, there's too much to cover. What's next, are we going to adopt regulation prohibiting the teaching of divination or astrology? No: you set a standard that schools have to live up to in educating our children.  

Playing politics with children's education is abhorrent and immoral. Do not adopt regulation 4 AAC 04.145.
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 04.145 PROHIBITION OF FUNDING FOR COMMON CORE STANDARDS INITIATIVE

My Comments: This concerns me simply due to the challenges in interpreting and implementing this regulation. Common Core does have overlaps to Alaska Standards and separating them would be incredibly difficult. Also, publishers of all types of material are making an effort to align much of what they do to common core and I question how that would be viewed with this regulation. For example, if a fiction book being considered for a library comes with a free set of common core aligned lessons, and the school receives state funding, would this book be excluded? I think the regulation is simply too difficult to apply and consequently would not serve it's intended purpose.
Name: Rachelle Seiber  
E-Mail: wdseiber@ideafamilies.org  
Telephone: 907 841-1341  
I am commenting on: 4AAC 04.145  

My Comments: I applaud the proposal to prohibit funding for implementation of the common core standards initiatives; however, this regulation is powerless against funding the same standards being implemented across Alaska under Alaska’s new educational standards which are nearly identical to the common core standards. If we are interested in improving education across our state, we need to be clear on our standards. We should be implementing standards that allow for variables, teacher, community, and parental input and not a list of unproven standards. Teachers and families deserve better than the common core standards. The state standards need to be based on proven methods and real standards that are grade-level and age appropriate.
Name: Elaine O'Rourke
E-Mail: rubydoo99@hotmail.com
Telephone: 907 675-4283
I am commenting on: 4 AAC 04.145

My Comments: As a long-time educator, I was dismayed to read that the Alaskan Legislature is considering a move that will harm education in our state. Prohibiting the use of "funds from any source" to be used in the implementation of the Common Core standards is short-sighted and irrational.

Do you realize that practically ALL of the current curriculum from all of the major publishing houses are aligned to Common Core? Are you even aware that most of the Professional Development available for teachers and other educators is also Common Core based? If you remove all funding for anything Common Core, you are not only hurting the school districts that chose to go with Common Core, but also all of the districts that went with the Alaska Standards. They really have no choice but to use materials that are Common Core based. Does this mean that they also will lose funding to buy curriculum or pay for professional development?? The school districts were given the choice of Common Core or Alaskan Standards (which, as we all know, is MOSTLY Common Core anyway, with a few words changed here and there and someone stamped ALASKA on it....) The districts who chose Common Core did so after careful examination of both sets of standards and chose the one that would fit with the students of their districts. It is shameful, that after being given the choice, the Legislature would choose to pull the rug from under these districts who chose Common Core and in the process even hurt the Alaska Standards districts as well. Do your homework. Think of all of the effects that this will have on ALL of our school districts in the future. This knee-jerk reaction to Common Core is ridiculous and seems like a thinly veiled intrusion into local control issues. The Legislature needs to think about ALL of the ramifications of this and do the right thing by Alaskan children- not play politics.
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ACTION NARRATIVE

CHAIR LORA REINBOLD called the Administrative Regulation Review Committee meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. Representatives Tarr and Reinbold were present at the call to order. Representatives Keller and T. Wilson (via teleconference) were also in attendance.

1:15:26 PM
CHAIR REINBOLD announced that the only order of business would be discussion related to the Department of Education & Early Development regulations: Restraint & Seclusion of Students -- 4 AAC 06.175 & 177; Accountability -- 4 AAC 06.812(b), 883, 895, 899; Common Core Standards Initiative -- 4 AAC 04.145; Internet Speed Costs -- 4 AAC 33.665(b) & 670.

DEENA PARAMO PhD, Superintendent, Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) Borough School District, offered to answer questions related to the regulations being considered by the committee.

CHAIR REINBOLD, referring to Internet speed in public schools, related her understanding that some legislators believe that "while this regulation's clearly filed, it lacks the clear articulation of ongoing fiscal responsibility." She asked Dr. Paramo to state what her stance is on Internet speed in the Mat-Su Borough School District.

DR. PARAMO said Mat-Su, along with the other larger schools in proximity to larger city centers, has access to Internet speed connectivity greater than 10 megabits (Mb/s). She said "all of our schools" share a connectivity of between 30-100 Mb/s, and some of the high schools are over that." She said the district had been in a planning phase for some time and received federal grants to "build out fiber to our schools." She said "our delegation" - including Representative Keller - assisted the school district by [obtaining] matching state funds to have a request for proposal (RFP) to "build out to schools." She pointed out that the "trunks" that were added benefited the entire community, because surrounding neighborhoods were connected.

DR. PARAMO said certainly the five largest school districts are a minority as compared with the rest of the fifty-three districts in Alaska, and she said she is not certain how many districts have speeds above ten Mb/s. She said the issue of connectivity has been of concern to superintendents, because colleges and universities are beginning to use on-line learning to deliver curriculum.
CHAIR REINBOLD asked if it is Dr. Paramo's understanding that all the school districts in Alaska will have to increase their Internet speeds to meet the demand of on-line testing that is approaching, and - if so - at what cost.

DR. PARAMO answered that those of the districts in the core areas can use the enterprise system and access the Internet in "the cloud." She offered her understanding that because there is not enough speed in some of the remote school districts, the department has arranged for caching of the assessment." She continued as follows:

The next two years of the assessment is designed to be a straightforward test; multiple - I guess - copies of similar tests with similar questions for the next two years. In the third year out is ... what's called a dynamic test where, depending on the individual who is taking the test, his or her right answer or wrong answer would select another question to really target the learning area. But until that time, the test is a multiple form test just given on-line, which is easy to cache in a system where it resides on a local server. And so, my understanding, from the training I received from the department, is that it can be done, but in the future, certainly connectivity is a concern, I think, not just for school districts but for medical places and other places in the state of Alaska.

DR. PARAMO indicated that paying according to Mb/s, without a clause in a contract, can result in higher Internet costs when "you crank up those pipes." She said she does not know how much data would be used, but noted that when her children use the Internet, the costs vary depending on whether they are texting or streaming video.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked how much the district received in the aforementioned federal grant.
DR. PARAMO answered that the Mat-Su district received $6 million in combined monies from the federal and state governments, and she offered her understanding that the project is just being completed. She said the district partnered with MTA - a local provider that applied for a grant available to local providers that partner with school districts - and MTA received $1.3 million to bring "fiber" to the area inclusive of Glacier View, the district's remote K-12 school, which has under 150 students.

DR. PARAMO, in response to Chair Reinbold, clarified that the $6 million was for connectivity to schools, including on-line learning, video conferencing, and "pushing out a class from one school to another." She said the district has been doing on-line testing through the measures of academic progress, and has found the connectivity to be an added bonus in that regard.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked Dr. Paramo to relate the cost to her district of on-line testing, including the cost of increased staffing and training.

DR. PARAMO replied that she was unsure of the specific cost to the department. She explained that the cost would depend on the system, for example, whether setup could be done on one computer, which then could communicate with multiple computers, or if someone would have to program each individual computer. She said it would also depend on how updated the buildings were in terms of wireless and firewalls. She said the district has always incurred costs during testing time because of rules and regulations related to how many students can be in a room, and proctors needed to administer the tests. She said the district has utilized outside space, such as churches and senior centers, to accommodate large numbers of students for testing.

1:26:00 PM

DR. PARAMO, in further response to Chair Reinbold, explained that "pushing out" is when one computer can be set up to then connect the information or image to many other computers. She said if districts have that ability, then it is easier to set up for testing. In response to a follow-up question, she said an image relates to the verification and security of a student's name and test information. Each child enters his/her key name to log on, and it would take much longer to set up each computer to take the child's name rather than just doing that from one computer and "pushing that out."

1:28:44 PM
CHAIR REINBOLD, regarding the concern over privacy, asked if any private information is being released about the students or if any "mining of information" is happening on the assessments.

DR. PARAMO said the district gets students' scores from each school; parents receive information on their child's progress following Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) laws; each district has a housing network for its own data, as well as the On-line Alaska School Information System (OASIS) numbers, which identify each child. She explained that the OASIS numbers reside at the state level, and the district has a district number.

1:29:53 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD relayed that the committee had heard testimony during its August meeting about a breach of data that occurred in Kansas. She opined that "we're ramping it up an entire year and kind of throwing the districts into a kind of tailspin, basically, trying to get ready for these assessments." She indicated areas of concern include lack of teacher training, curriculum, and Internet speed. She asked Dr. Paramo to explain the OASIS numbers.

DR. PARAMO replied that an OASIS number is provided to each child in a school district so the state can determine funding for the child. Prior to OASIS numbers, there were times during a 20-day count period where a student had moved from one district to another and there would be a duplication of student enrollment at two schools. She said the OASIS number is 10 digits. Before the testing, that number was primarily used for the accountability of revenue that was given to school districts. She said under current the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) law, districts have to report their students' progress number. She added further details.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked Dr. Paramo to confirm that "they're not in aggregate; they actually go down directly to the student."

DR. PARAMO answered that's correct.

1:32:25 PM

DR. PARAMO said students are unaware of their OASIS numbers, but are given six-digit identifier numbers in kindergarten that follow them through school. Children who receive free and
reduced lunches can key in their numbers and no longer be identified as a child of low socio-economic base. She said parents from home can put money on an account, which students access through their numbers. Students also use their numbers to check out library books and to log on from home and look up their assignments. For testing purposes, an adult aligns a student with a computer that is coded with that student's information, much like in the past when a booklet, in which a student's information was included, was handed out to that student.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked Dr. Paramo if she was comfortable with the idea of allowing an outsider to develop Alaska's student assessments, which teachers do not get to see, when the results of those assessments are used to evaluate teachers' performances. She said she knows there are a lot of teachers who are concerned about this, and she asked if teachers are relaying their concerns to Dr. Paramo.

DR. PARAMO confirmed that there are many teachers who are concerned about assessments being used prior to review of the assessments. She said the district has shared that with the commissioner of the department, and she offered her understanding that "they are in the process of getting a waiver to the waiver to not have to put those assessments in the evaluation until we are sure that these assessments reflect learning." She said the tests are secure, and educators are involved in the "process of advising." She said her doctorate is in assessment, and she does not think it would be desirable to have teachers create the tests that are used to determine students' outcomes. She said there are professional test makers for reliability and validity. She said, "Some questions that we ask aren't really valid." She offered her understanding that the state "jumped off board with Smarter Balance," in order to have more control of and input into the state's assessments. She said she has not seen the assessment, but said the thought is that "it is an Alaskan test and they're making it for Alaska."

1:37:23 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD stated that it is a huge move away from the system where a teacher got to choose the curriculum and develop the tests. She said, "We don't know those tests; we don't know the FERPA laws." She asked Dr. Paramo if she understands that there have been changes to the FERPA laws, in that there has been an executive decision to loosen some of them. She
indicated that many parents have expressed concerns about on-
line testing in general, allowing an outsider develop the tests,
and sufficient state statutes to protect the privacy of
students. She expressed concern that haste makes waste in terms
of fast-forwarding new assessments. She stated her
understanding that Dr. Paramo supports the Common Core
Standards, which she said are virtually identical to the Alaska
Academic Standards.

DR. PARAMO said the Mat-Su Borough School District (MSBSD) does
not say it follows Common Core Standards, because under current
law, it must follow the Alaska State Standards. She said her
district has concerns about the Common Core Standards, which the
Anchorage School District (ASD) has adopted as its curriculum.
She said, as allowed by law, MSBSD has its own standards
informed by state standards. In response to Chair Reinbold, she
indicated that the district's standards must be "with the Alaska
[Academic] State Standards."

1:40:15 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD indicated that the Common Core Standards and the
Alaska [Academic] State Standards are 95 percent the same. She
questioned why, if the assessments are the same, the district
would not be "straight up with your people and just say, 'We're
doing Common Core'?"

DR. PARAMO answered that this is part of a process in reaction
to universities saying that students are not being prepared for
post-secondary education - especially in mathematics. She said
the result of that conversation was that "they raised the
standard and they raised the rigor." She related that one young
student got caught between the new and old level of standards,
where "the expectation of knowledge grew without the years and
matriculation through our school system." There are more
standards to teach children starting in kindergarten; however,
those older children have a lot to make up. She said the
district is trying to solve the problem by offering free access
to on-line programs to encourage self-learning. She said the
change is a result of discussions that are happening nationwide.
She concluded, "Students are being asked to do much higher
learning at lower grade levels."

CHAIR REINBOLD said she knows that the marketing message is that
there is greater rigor, but said it is debatable in the upper
grades. She said it sounds like Dr. Paramo is a supporter of
the Alaska Academic Standards and is fully implementing them.
DR. PARAMO responded that it is her duty as a superintendent of a school district to follow the law of the state, and "that is the law of the state."

1:43:19 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said state legislators do not set those standards; the [State Board of Education and Early Development] does that, and maybe the law needs to be changed "where we actually are the ones [who set standards], because we're the elected policy setters." She told her to make sure she knows that it is unelected people who are running away with this policy on a train so fast that no one can catch it. She added that she has deep concerns, because one of the [board] members said, "I don't have time to study this, I'm a volunteer," so Chair Reinbold asked, "Do you have any idea what you're doing to our students as you have no time to study this?" She said that the marketing message is very debatable, and she spoke of outsiders coming in through the NCLB waiver, and they "pretty much used the federalized standards ... and now choosing the curriculum and doing these assessments is very, very alarming to me personally and also to hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands, of people out there that are just waking up to figuring out what's going on." She asked Dr. Paramo to explain [Apex Learning Inc.].

DR. PARAMO said that Apex is an on-line company that provides curriculum for courses, and she is not sure about Common Core, because she does not use Apex to look it up. It has courses approved by the College Board, and in her district, five years ago, they were looking at ways for credit recovery for students who had fallen behind. On-line learning was an effective way to do that, and what they found was that students who had access to on-line learning were "doing it more" because it was a choice. Approximately 90 percent of the students in her district who were choosing to take an on-line course were doing so to get ahead or to learn something different. She said there are courses in English and science. Previously, students who were trying to make up a course had problems with alignment; so there were holes in the system. She said, "We use APEX for the alignment, and what we get good at as teachers is — what we're qualified to do — is to teach it." Apex was chosen because it is NCAA-approved. There had been problems regarding scholarships for students who took on-line learning that was not approved. She added that self-motivated students choose on-line learning more than others who need feedback from their teachers.
"So we wanted to have higher level courses," and Apex learning is one of the only approved College Board courses. She added that the teachers are the ones who are coaching the students through the courses, "and so you have the course and the assessments and things like that all built-in in the curriculum in the Apex, but it is one of our teachers on the other end on-line...."

CHAIR REINBOLD interjected and said this where all of the concern is. The Alaska Academic Standards are virtually the same as Common Core [Standards], and "then they're picking the curriculum, then they're approving assessments, now all of the ACTs and SATs are now aligned to Common Core, so it really is a complete takeover." She said that when she looked at the on-line description of Apex, it says that the content is geared to the Common Core, and they are misleading everyone. She expressed her belief that people should quit hiding from the term Common Core. She said she wants to know who paid for Apex.

1:48:43 PM

DR. PARAMO said the College Board has controlled all of the curriculum for advanced placement (AP) for over 25 years. When giving assessments, the school does not control any of that information. She said MSBSD does not own the assessments, and that is what SATs and ACTs are for — they give a level of achievement. She said it would be difficult to find any materials for math courses that are mass-produced without having Common Core stamped on them.

CHAIR REINBOLD said monopolization of education is her concern. It is a dangerous road to go down. She asked about paying for Apex.

DR. PARAMO said, "We're moving into $45 a student and they can take up to seven courses a day." Her district uses Apex for language classes in the Spanish immersion program and for financial literacy courses. She added that 75 percent of all funds in the school district are state funds, and 25 percent are local.

CHAIR REINBOLD surmised that the state paid for 75 percent of Apex. She asked about seeing a cost of $500,000 for APEX.

DR. PARAMO said that was for creating on-line classrooms, not for curriculum. The state provided a grant for computers and furniture to create "cyber centers."
CHAIR REINBOLD asked if Dr. Paramo knows that there is language in HB 278 to prevent funds from being used for anything having to do with Common Core [Standards]. There are a lot of people out there who want nothing to do with Common Core, so the intent is to prevent public funds from implementing Common Core or a program like Apex.

1:52:44 PM

DR. PARAMO said she is not exactly sure, because Common Core is stamped on everything.

CHAIR REINBOLD said the State Board of Education has done that, not the legislature.

DR. PARAMO asked for clarification.

CHAIR REINBOLD said everything goes through EED, is her understanding, for the base student allocation, so none of that money can go toward the Common Core [Standards]. That is what Chair Reinbold's intent is, so she asked Dr. Paramo if she had any concerns.

DR. PARAMO said she is not familiar with this. Her understanding is that HB 278 provides the state's 75 percent funding.

CHAIR REINBOLD said this raises a serious concern when the intention is to not use the Common Core [Standards], and everything is Common Core. She asked where it has been internationally benchmarked, that makes "you guys so excited about this." She asked if this is just "an expensive experiment to you guys."

DR. PARAMO said it has not been internationally benchmarked. One of the concerns mentioned by Chair Reinbold earlier was that the higher-end students are always fearful of "leveling-out" education. That is why her district uses the [Dynamic Learning Maps Consortium (DLM)] assessment to make sure that those kids continue to learn at an accelerated rate, she explained.

CHAIR REINBOLD said a lot of people think the higher levels are much lower. She stated that she understands the marketing message, but reality is not meeting that message. That is a discussion for another day when she invites experts on that
topic, she added. She asked what will happen if the school district does not do well under the new standards.

DR. PARAMO said the district will look at the standards and at what kids know and what they are able to do. It may review what is being taught in the classrooms by using its teacher experts, and it will use that to improve learning, she said. The outcomes for students are what the district is concerned with, whether they go into the workforce, the military, or to college.

1:56:14 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD asked if her district needs the federal government or if the local teachers can be responsible for the jobs that are in the area. She said she does not think that a student from an Alaska village needs to know the same things that New York students need to know. She said she does not believe the Common Core [Standards] will ever work. She said billions of dollars are being spent, and Alaska better be getting something for the money. She asked if the standards are outcome- or process-based.

DR. PARAMO said it would depend on what is being asked of the students. To determine if they are able to achieve at the next level would be outcome-based. Responding to further questions, she said the school district is caught in the middle of "standards-jumping-rigor," so it is trying to work with that, but the feedback from the universities and workplaces is that "we're" not preparing kids well enough. The state's reaction was to change the standards....

CHAIR REINBOLD said spending this kind of money on this experiment is not acceptable.

DR. PARAMO said, "We'll find out." The standards will be more difficult, she added, and the state will get involved through the Alaska School Performance Index (ASPI) in a low-achieving school district. She noted that Alaska would have 95 percent of schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) without the NCLB waiver.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked what the difference is between academic achievement and school progress.

DR. PARAMO said it is debated by experts, but academic achievement is based test scores, and progress refers to growth and movement on a continuum of learning. All kinds of students
come to her schools, and "we start where they are and move them on the continuum." If a student is behind, her district looks for more than a year's growth in a year, she stated. She said they also look at the upper end students, because the district's philosophy is: If you are a year in a school, you've got to grow by at least a year. Just because a student is ahead, that does not mean that student can stall out, she added.

2:00:34 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said that ACT and SAT are aligned with the Common Core [Standards]. What percentage of kids in Alaska get a four-year degree?

DR. PARAMO said, nationally, only about 30 to 40 percent of any population has a four-year degree, but she does not know about Alaska. In Mat-Su, to see if kids are getting what they need, there was a study assessing where the students go, and it found that 48 percent get some type of degree from a two- or four-year [program], and about 17 percent get on-the-job training. She noted that the information is on the district's website and is called, "Post-Outcome Survey Data."

CHAIR REINBOLD said she heard that 10 percent of Alaska kids get a four-year college degree and questioned why every child takes the ACT and SAT, "and why in the world should the state be paying for that?" She noted that parents used to pay, but now it is costing the state.

DR. PARAMO explained that students can take WorkKeys if they are not interested in college, and apprentice programs look at those, but she is unsure of the costs. The department is giving one opportunity to every child, which assists families who cannot pay. She said one would want academic and career plans for students and make the assessments match what they want to do with their lives. She explained that her district encourages technical training for many; however, some apprenticeship programs expect students to take Algebra I and higher math. "We're taking a look at that because we're working with IBEW and labor unions to know what it is that their kids need," she said.

2:04:46 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said, "So are you happy with the math, the Common Core math? It's all over the Internet. I mean it's a joke nationwide."
DR. PARAMO said at this point she does not know enough about the Common Core math, but she has heard the complaints and there are more than usual because the district changed its math program. She said her district is using "Go Math!" for K-8 and it is "an entirely different presentation." The district has had two math programs and one was very traditional, and that is what Dr. Paramo taught with. Then the district had "Math Expressions," which was more similar to "Go Math!" To match the new standards, "we kicked up the levels for kids so we had to find textbooks for which the teachers could use." Some of the features of the textbooks are nice, like scanner codes that take parents to a YouTube video that helps them teach their children if they are not understanding their lesson.

CHAIR REINBOLD said that parents should be able to do K-12 math, and if math is being taught in a way that parents do not understand it, that is another serious red flag. Every single parent she has talked to preferred "Saxon Math," and she questioned "why we went and did this" as math is so important and she wants to get to the bottom of why this has happened. She asked why change something when it is working.

DR. PARAMO said some people thought it was not working.

CHAIR REINBOLD noted that Dr. Paramo said there were more complaints.

DR. PARAMO said the complaints were based on the outcomes. "That they weren't achieving at the levels they needed." The calls about the math program specifically relate to the way the textbook is set up. The bigger picture is that the Alaska [Academic] Standards changed because of the achievement levels, she explained.

CHAIR REINBOLD said that is debatable. Some people believe that "you have to dig deep," and she is inviting experts to debate that. She said, "We have heard that marketing message that they've got all of you guys talking about," but whether it is accurate is another thing. It is the methodology that the parents are having difficulty with, and she will certainly continue to listen to the parents because they have the responsibility for educating their children, she stated. She said she could go on and on about the Board of Education and EED signing things that were not vetted and putting the cart before the horse. "It's just a shame that a lot of people are really paying the price, dearly."
DR. PARAMO said she is a strong believer in math facts; every Mat-Su student will need to know their math facts. CHAIR REINBOLD said she loves math, and she piloted her children through math because she saw some of the crazy things [schools] were doing with "Everyday Math." She wants them to get it right, and they are not getting it right. She cannot believe that these standards were virtually rubber stamped, and no one can hide from the fact that Alaska [Academic] Standards are Common Core [Standards].

DR. PARAMO said, in response to a question, that "Go Math!" was put in this year for most schools, and some schools determine their own curriculum, but district-wide, 36 middle school and elementary teachers vetted text book companies, but they were unable to buy a book without Common Core on it. They narrowed the books down to three and teachers and parents tried them out. Go Math! was one that both the middle and elementary schools chose. High schools used a different text for Algebra 1 and Algebra 2, so there were gaps in the learning, and "that's what we were dealing with and now it's starting to level out, but our first month of school was very rough for kids learning algebra."

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER said he was helping his grandson with math.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked if EED limited her choice of textbooks to the ones that included Common Core.

DR. PARAMO said no. Individual districts choose their materials, and EED has nothing to do with determining her district's textbooks. "We liked the math inside of a textbook," but every page was stamped with Common Core. "And we said we don't want to buy that; we don't like that. We see your math matches our standards in Alaska, but we don't want Common Core on there. And ... we went to the companies and said we don't want to buy those, and they said there isn't one [without Common Core]. I guarantee, because of the trouble across the United States, in a year or two they will start publishing the same exact textbook without Common Core written on them."

CHAIR REINBOLD said it is clear raw deception. She said to call it what it is and not hide from it. She noted that Dr. Paramo said "they" would only let the district pick one book, and she asked who "they" were.
DR. PARAMO said no. Her district went to the textbook companies after the teacher and parent group chose the textbook they preferred – the one that matched the curriculum the best. "And we said we didn't like the look of the book, because it had Common Core on it, and we were told by the companies that there was no other option." The companies did not have the books – with the content the district wanted – that did not have Common Core stamped on them.

2:13:17 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said David Coleman has changed AP [advanced placement] history. She said it is all over the Internet. There is push-back from the left and the right—"it's massive." She asked Dr. Paramo about it.

DR. PARAMO said the Common Core [Standard] is bi-partisan regarding who likes it, and it is bi-partisan regarding who does not like it. Her district likes to offer advanced placement courses, and the advantage is that they give students college credit, depending on the university. She said the University of Alaska (UA) allows credit for AP scores of 3, 4, and 5, she added. The AP curriculum and the AP test are purchased through the College Board. She said she has not seen the AP history changes, but it is different and the testing will be different. She noted that her mother is an AP history teacher.

CHAIR REINBOLD urged a review of AP history by superintendents, as it all boils down to David Coleman. There are a few puppet masters of all of this, she explained, and the state is losing its autonomy and the legislators are losing power. She said she is very, very concerned and she will not stop until she gets to the bottom of this. Alaska likes independence, she said, and U.S. history is very, very critical to the understanding of how this wonderful nation was built. "What our kids learn about our country is very, very important," she stressed. She said the legislature is being blamed, "and we didn't adopt the standards – that is ridiculous." She said the contracts were signed before "the bill" even passed, and it is terrible public policy. She loves education and she wants to learn more about who did this and the different timelines. She said she is really concerned about the homeschoolers; they are losing control over education because they are being told to use Common Core [Standards]-aligned items.

2:17:56 PM
DR. PARAMO said that her district does not pre-determine the math books. The homeschool parents have multiple vendors to choose from, and they can even create their own programs, she added. The district is only concerned about the outcomes, and if the students are achieving at appropriate levels, the district has no concern and does not get involved. There are over 500 approved vendors listed on the district website.

CHAIR REINEBOLD said that is good in theory, but in reality, if homeschooled students take the same assessments as everyone else, they are forced into the Common Core [Standards]. If ACTs, WorkKeys, and SATs are tied to the Common Core [Standards], there is no getting away from it. She added that if those students do not make the cut score, then they do not even get a diploma.

DR. PARAMO said those tests do not have cut scores.

CHAIR REINEBOLD countered that the bottom line is that the tests are aligned to the Common Core [Standards]. She said she is concerned about what jobs are available in the Bush communities, and the concept of everyone learning the same thing is not the right approach. She said Alaska is losing its sovereignty and individuality, and it is very concerning to her. She noted that there is language in HB 210 to set up the expectations that any crisis or intervention training must be evidence-based, but the regulations seem to say that it is a peer-reviewed process. She noted her concern and then asked Dr. Paramo about it.

DR. PARAMO answered that in MSBSD there has been a program since 1991 that is evidence-based, and it is called Mandt Training. Since 2008, anyone who might need to restrain someone must be trained. Regarding seclusion, the immediate reporting to EED and parents is new to the district. If a child in a classroom is restrained, "we need to be sure that every principal knows so that they can ensure that every phone call was made." She pointed out that the legislation might be research-based.

2:22:22 PM

CHAIR REINEBOLD read AS14.33.127 [in part], "the department shall approve crisis intervention training for the schools, which shall include evidence-based techniques that have been shown effective in the prevention of restraint and seclusion...." It does not appear that the regulation reflects the intention of the statute, she said.
DR. PARAMO said her understanding is that if something is peer-reviewed in a scholarly sense, it is research-based. She noted that her district is partnering with a few small school districts that do not have on-site trainers. Larger school districts probably have the economy of scale and have these partnerships, and her district is the one providing the training for the two small districts in order to meet this law.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked her about fiscal concerns with this new regulation.

DR. PARAMO answered that the district has a choice to do the training on the weekend or in the evening, and would pay teachers an honorarium, or if the teachers were trained during their workday, the school would need to pay for substitute teachers.

CHAIR REINBOLD stated that zero fiscal notes are unacceptable when there truly is a cost to the district.

DR. PARAMO said, "A lot of this we would do it anyway," but if the district has to train more people, then it will cost more. Her district will not pay for a trainer to fly to the smaller school districts, she noted.

CHAIR REINBOLD said the committee is here to empower the school districts and the individuals, and it is listening to both sides.

DR. PARAMO added that the district would prefer not to have any kind of stipulation about the amount of courses being "core" or "non-core." In the district, if a school is functioning well, the district does not change it, and the same is true for its homeschool parents whose children are learning. "We would not want the department to put any stipulation that we would never put on our homeschool folks," and that includes taking away funding based on scoring. "Our homeschool is one of our schools, and I can determine the funding and the support at every building ... EED does not determine how much money goes to this class or that," she said.

2:27:56 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER said he wants to see the list of the curriculum available to homeschools and how that list is selected.
2:28:46 PM

DR. PARAMO said there are some religious-based vendors that were not approved. She said the district was not looking to buy religious material, so "we run into problems there." Parents bring forward the vendors and then they are vetted at the school. There are some "silly" rules, whereby a calculator sold at a religious store would be denied. But there are 500 statewide and local vendors available, she added.

2:29:59 PM

RACHELLE SIEPER(ph), said she homeschools her children through IDEA in the Mat-Su Valley, and she noted that Dr. Paramo said there were over 500 vendors available, and that is true. She is able to select the best curriculum for her students, but she is concerned that the new regulations state that curriculum materials for a course of study must be aligned to state standards. She expressed concern that vendor options will be reduced. The regulations also say that test scores will change how contact teachers monitor and suggest curriculum for the students. She stated that many homeschool [parents] are choosing to avoid teaching to the Common Core, so the students will not perform well on the tests, and then there will be more monitoring. She asked how the new assessments will impact her curriculum choices in the future.

2:33:36 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said the screws are getting tighter and tighter, and "we were told for years that it would have nothing to do with curriculum at all." She kept disagreeing, because if there are standards and assessments, the choices will be limited. She asked the witness to submit her concerns in writing. She said this goes against the U.S. Constitution.

2:34:55 PM

TIM CLINE, Director, Interior Distance Education of Alaska (IDEA), informed the committee that IDEA is the largest school in Alaska and it is focused on providing customer service to families, which is foremost in his mind when reviewing new regulations and laws. He applauded the efforts of Senator Dunleavy in drafting this new law, but the regulations sometimes "miss the mark, and change is hard." His organization exists to support parents in educating their children as they see fit, and it is done by becoming partners with the parents instead of
telling them what to do. Drawing from his experiences traveling around the country, Mr. Cline opined that there is no program like IDEA and there is no other state school system that allows state funding for homeschools. Members should expect for IDEA to be around for a long time as it understands what works, he said. Mr. Cline expressed concern with the [proposed] curriculum changes and the social implications to history. Once IDEA parents are told to teach their students in a certain way and use a certain curriculum, they will be "out in force." Customizing education to the individual child allows IDEA to meet the expectation of the parent, which is IDEA's goal. He characterized the new rules regarding the SAT, ACT, or WorkKeys as a hoop that students have to go through, but said there will be a problem if cut scores are established.

2:40:08 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD related her agreement with Mr. Cline's comments and added that [the regulations] infringe upon parental rights. Research shows that parent involvement is the number one indicator of success. She stressed that it's wrong to strip these homeschool parents, who are giving up their lives to educate their children, of choice for their children. Furthermore, homeschool education is some of the most cost-effective education, she opined. Therefore, she wanted to protect and preserve cost-effective education, particularly in today's economic climate. She then urged any individual or organization that is being told what curriculum to use or how to teach something to contact her office. She emphasized that she will vehemently protect parents' rights, state's rights, and local districts' rights.

2:41:34 PM

MR. CLINE then turned to curriculum, which he characterized as a critical piece. He opined that [the state] needs to hang on to the curriculum it has already approved through the [state] School Board and keep those materials available for those who choose to use them to teach their children because they are going to become less available on the open market. With regard to children who perform poorly, Mr. Cline related that with no more than support for the parents [IDEA] students perform close to other students [in other education models] on tests. He related that homeschoolers struggle in certain areas just as students [in other education models] struggle in certain areas. He stated that in general homeschool students struggle in math. The goal with IDEA is to search for solutions for parents who
teach their children. To that end, many great ideas are being developed. For example, the early literacy screening requirements for kindergarten through second grade was a potential difficulty for those in IDEA as it was being thrust on the IDEA parents with short notice. Parents in the IDEA don't like that kind of change being thrust upon them. In response to that change, IDEA found a tool that allowed the parents to be in the room while the child took the on-line test, and provided the parent with the results. Once parents understood [the test] wasn't threatening and that there were no consequence regardless of [how] their child [scored/ranked], [the test] was found by most to be valuable. Although in most cases the test validated what the parent already knew about their child, there were some surprises that provided an opportunity to offer suggestions for the challenges the child might be having. Drawing from his 34 years in education, of which the first 20 were in building base programs, Mr. Cline said he has never seen anything that works as well as IDEA. He attributed the success of IDEA to parental involvement, which he opined is a critical component.

CHAIR REINBOLD mentioned a symposium that is planned for 12/9-10/14 in Anchorage and invited Mr. Cline to attend.

2:46:58 PM

)MIKE HANLEY, Commissioner, Department of Education and Early Development, said Dr. Paramo is a strong leader for education in Alaska, and many people look to MSBSD for innovation and leadership in providing opportunities for their students. The district often thinks outside the box to get the job done, including its use of Apex courses and College Level Examination Program (CLEP) tests.

2:47:32 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said one of the many issues of the legislature is that HB 278 provided funding to increase Internet speed, and there is no fiscal note attached.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said the fiscal note was attached to the bill itself, so the funding has already been appropriated by the legislature. Fiscal notes on regulations represent additional funds that the department would need, he explained. The fiscal note is a zero because EED does not need additional funding to implement what the legislature put in place, he added.

2:48:29 PM
CHAIR REINBOLD said, "So how much did this cost?"

COMMISSIONER HANLEY stated that the legislature appropriated $5 million. It was sponsored by Senator Olson, and the goal was to get all districts up to 10 megabits, which is a minimal Internet speed. The original proposal was $7 million, he said.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked, "Do you anticipate going above 10 megabits?"

2:49:21 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said no, 10 megabits was the goal. Such a speed is much lower than found in most houses in Anchorage and Fairbanks. He noted that Dr. Paramo mentioned that some of her schools have a speed of 100 megabits. It is recognized as a place to start, he explained.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked if he anticipates "going higher."

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said the idea was driven by the legislature, "so I’m not sure what the legislature would plan in the future."

2:50:06 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said a lot of the legislature is influenced by the department, so she asked him to please tell her what the anticipated needs will be, and the complete, total cost for the 10 megabits.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said this is an area where EED and schools are consumers, not drivers. The Statewide Broadband Task Force is in the Department of Commerce and Economic Development (DCCED), he explained. He believes school Internet availability is a positive step forward, but, again, the bill was driven by a couple of legislators with input from DCCED.

2:51:23 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD asked for the total costs of the legislation and future costs.

2:51:48 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said $7.3 million was estimated by DCCED and the Broadband Task Force to get all schools up to 10 megabits.
CHAIR REINBOLD asked if he believed that was correct.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY answered in the affirmative.

CHAIR REINBOLD said HB 278 explicitly prohibits spending of money to implement the Common Core Standards, and yet certain schools are fully implementing Common Core Standards. "How do you deal with the prohibition of spending on Common Core Standards yet unrestricted funding goes to a Common Core district such as ASD?"

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said there were a couple of versions of the bill, and when introduced, there were conversations between legislators about if the legislation will "stop the work we're doing." In the House Finance [Committee], the person who introduced the legislation said:

We have adopted the Alaska State Standards and we have not adopted the Common Core Standards as written, so if you're going to get assistance to be able to put the Alaska State Standards in place, and being able to find curriculum and others to do with the standards that we have adopted (and they are our own standards that we've adopted) so this does not stop the department from going forward with the standards that they have out there.

So, he said, the testimony during the hearing was "basically around putting a hedge between the work that's being done in Alaska and our work that is currently being done with the Alaska [Academic] Standards." That is what EED focuses on, he added. The EED does training and professional development for school districts on the Alaska standards—not the Common Core, but this does not prevent ASD from getting funding in the future even though it had adopted the Common Core. He said he doubts there would have been much support for the bill if Anchorage legislators thought that their school district would not be funded because it had adopted the Common Core.

CHAIR REINBOLD noted that he referred to a small amount of testimony, but there was a lot more, and she is aware of that
because she worked on the bill for about 91 days. One of the versions stated that no state funding may be spent to implement the Common Core, and many legislators did not want this federal overreach in education, she said. "I know you can debate one comment here and there, but I was there ... and I know I stripped a lot of this language out in the House Education [Committee]." The committee took public testimony, she said. She told him to look globally, not just at a little snapshot, and she asked, "Are we doing Common Core or are we not?"

2:56:03 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said, "We adopted the Alaska Academic Standards; they are substantially similar, as we've said, to the Common Core [Standards], but we didn't join the club, which means we didn't buy into anybody else having overreach or a say into our standards. We still get to determine where we go."

2:56:40 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said that someone said, in 2010, that Commissioner Hanley stated that the Alaska Academic Standards were 97 percent the same and 3 percent better. She said it was a very, very prominent person who said that. "Why are you hiding from the word Common Core?"

2:57:03 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said [EED] intentionally did not buy the Common Core. A Chevy and a Ford are both pickup trucks, and they might even have the same engine, but there are differences. When he made the quoted statement he was talking about the outcomes of the students.

2:58:18 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD told him to take a guess at the differences [between the Alaska Academic Standards and Common Core Standards].

COMMISSIONER HANLEY estimated that 40 percent of language arts was changed and 50 percent of the math.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked if the changes were significant or just grammatical.
COMMISSIONER HANLEY said that he would say they are substantial because the stakeholders in Alaska determined that they were important enough to include. [After obtaining information], he said that 42 percent of English language arts standard were changed, and 49 percent of math standards are different from the Common Core Standards, but the outcomes that are expected of the students are similar.

3:00:34 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said that Commissioner Hanley said 95 percent at one hearing, "and in an email you said nearly identical; from a very prominent person in the community you said 97 percent the same, and now you're saying that they are 49 percent changed and 42 percent changed." That is a serious conflict of testimony, she surmised.

3:01:09 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY clarified that at the end of the day Alaska wants its kids to be competitive with their peers around the country. The expectations [EED] has are substantially similar to Common Core expectations, but changes have been made on how to get there, based on the stakeholder input, and he repeated the percentages of the standards that have been changed.

3:02:22 PM [3:02:14]

CHAIR REINBOLD remarked that a lot of the books are being stamped "Common Core" and the testing is being aligned to the curriculum, and she offered her understanding that the U.S. Department of Education had to approve "the waiver in these standards."

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded that he has no control over the publishers of curriculum. He said the responsibility of the department is to set expectations.

CHAIR REINBOLD clarified that she wanted to know whether the U.S. Department of Education has anything to do with the College and Career Ready Standards.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded as follows:

The State Board of Education approved these standards; they were vetted by the University of Alaska; and, as such, they
were deemed as vetted by the university as college and career Ready.

CHAIR REINBOLD reiterated her question as to whether the U.S. Department of Education had anything to do with that.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY answered no. He said one of the things the department had to do when it applied for the waiver was to have college and career ready standards in place. He said, "They had been adopted eight months earlier and vetted, so they recognized that our standards were vetted by our university and were college and career ready."

CHAIR REINBOLD asked, "Did they approve these standards or not? Did they accept them as part of the waiver?"

COMMISSIONER HANLEY reiterated that [the U.S. Department of Education] accepted the department's standards, because they were vetted by [Alaska's] university as being college and career ready. In response to a follow-up question, he named Diane Hirschberg, who is with the University of Alaska, as well as with ISER [Institute of Social and Economic Research], as the person who initiated the work. He said, "She took that and had several conversations with several professors, as well as some of the technical institute."

3:04:37 PM

REPRESENTATIVE TAMMIE WILSON said she wanted to clarify that she did make the statement [referred to by the commissioner] in a discussion held during a House Finance Standing Committee meeting. Commissioner Hanley said that "we didn't have to worry about any money being spent on Common Core because we had Alaska Standards." Now that Alaska has at least one district that has adopted the Common Core Standards, she asked, "Would not the base student allocation come into play now whether or not they got that because they did?" She then asked, "Because they were allowed to adopt the Common Core, and you could only adopt standards that are more stringent than the current ones, are we saying now that Alaska standards are not as stringent as the Common Core Standards are?"

3:05:25 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded that the Anchorage School District adopted the Common Core Standards prior to the department's adoption of standards in June 2012. He said his conversations
and testimony were that "this would not stop the department's work, because it says that the department will not spend money." However, he said, it did not seem to be his or the legislature's intent to have local control and tell districts that they could not adopt a particular curriculum. He said because the Alaska State Standards are in regulation, it is required that districts address them with their students. He said Ed Graff, the Superintendent of the Anchorage School District, does "a crosswalk" between the Alaska State Standards and the Common Core Standards and has to address the differences between the two.

CHAIR REINBOLD opined that Commissioner Hanley misled at least ten legislators by telling them "we weren't doing Common Core," because she has heard from people who have told her they are being forced to buy curriculum based on the Common Core Standards. She said the assessments that Anchorage is doing are Common Core and "the media's all over that." She said Commissioner Hanley is saying that "we're not doing Common Core, but the tests are based on Common Core, and the same assessments being done in Anchorage are being done statewide." She stated, "I think that you need to own it and come ... outright and ... tell the people of the state that we are doing Common Core, and ... be completely upfront with the alignment for the Common Core and that the assessment ... and, of course, curriculum is ... ending up being selected because of the assessments." She indicated that she had heard from Commissioner Hanley varying percentages of similarity between the two standards, ranging from the 40 percent range to 98 percent. She said this is confusing to legislators, and maybe the real issue is that the legislature needs to change statute so that the legislature does get to select the standard and make the decisions about local control.

3:08:52 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded that the state's standards and assessments are not aligned to the Common Core Standards; they are being custom made for Alaska with Alaskans being involved.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked, "So, you're stating now that our assessments are not aligned to the Common Core?"

COMMISSIONER HANLEY answered, "I'm saying that the assessment that we are working on - the AMP [Alaska Measure of Progress] - is aligned to the Alaska Standards with Alaskan educators helping write the items."
CHAIR REINBOLD offered her understanding that Commissioner Hanley had just said that [the state] is not aligned to the Common Core. She offered her understanding that Marcy Harmon, at a prior meeting, had testified that "we're not doing Common Core," and she said "that was, like, days before my last testimony in August."

COMMISSIONER HANLEY stated, "So, since we're not doing the Common Core, and so our assessment is aligned to the Alaska Standards and is customized for Alaska - and I'm speaking about the AMP."

3:09:39 PM [3:09:58]

CHAIR REINBOLD said, "I know the AMP, trust me." Regarding the BSA [base student allocation], she asked for confirmation that "all this funding comes through DEED" and [the department] sends it out to the districts.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY confirmed that is correct.

CHAIR REINBOLD said the department is, through regulation, prohibited from money from being spent on Common Core; however, "it's being funneled through you." She asked, "Isn't that virtually the same thing?"

COMMISSIONER HANLEY answered no. He explained that the formula that the department distributes to the school districts is based on a student count, and aside from very few restrictions, such as 70 percent needing to go to instruction, there are local decisions made on how the money is spent to best meet the needs of the students. He said, "It's a local control issue."

CHAIR REINBOLD said the regulation prohibits EED from spending money to implement the Common Core, but "you're sending money to someone who is implementing" it, and that is virtually the same thing. It goes against the statute and the regulation.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said, "Well, we don't spend the BSA, so we don't spend that money. We provide it to districts to meet the needs of their kids." He asked Chair Reinbold if she was suggesting that the department stop sending money to Anchorage.

CHAIR REINBOLD answered, "Absolutely not." She said she was just addressing a regulation that EED cannot spend money on Common Core.
COMMISSIONER HANLEY said that is a statutory provision that was put in place under HB 278.

CHAIR REINBOLD said she understands that, but a regulation usually interprets the intent of legislation, and it looks like "it's almost identical, so I don't understand ... why you need this regulation in the first place."

3:12:00 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said the intent of the legislature and the administration was to clarify "what money is." He said the statute says the department may not expend money to implement the set of standards. The regulation has one small difference and that is the department may not expend state money, or money received from other sources, to implement the set of educational curriculum standards. The regulation clarifies that EED could not find grants to support implementation of the Common Core [Standards]. Commissioner Hanley remarked:

Honestly, I think this strengthens the statute not only for myself, but for the people who follow me to make sure that it matches up with the intent of the legislature.

3:13:13 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD stressed that her intention was to not spend state money on the Common Core Initiative in any fashion. She restated that the commissioner had said the state is not doing Common Core, although there have been statements that it is "virtually identical," which has caused confusion for homeschools and for school districts. She said, "Regarding the new regulations on district accountability, what was the need for the new accountability program?"

3:15:07 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY responded that the accountability regulations were a "simple fix." Previously, the WorkKeys assessment was required in 11th grade. Because some students already had plans to go to college, the legislature and the governor provided the option of taking the WorkKeys, the SAT or the ACT assessment tests. The biggest change is that when EED developed its ASPI scores, 2 percent credit was given to schools
for their participation in the WorkKeys assessment, but now schools are given 8-10 percent credit for providing a career readiness indicator. Another change is that the "jury exemption" was already in place in statute for low-performing schools, and the new regulation adds that EED use its one- or two-star designation of a low-performing school instead of AYP.

3:16:43 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD asked why EED needed a waiver from the NCLB.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said that by last year 100 percent of students would have to be deemed proficient and all schools would have been deemed as failing no matter what level of success schools reached. In his contact with principals and teachers, it seemed like an erroneous model because there was no way to get to proficiency. Also, the waiver allowed EED to remove some restrictions on the use of Title 1 [Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965] money; restrictions are placed on schools that are deemed not proficient for a certain number of years.

3:19:02 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD asked what percentage of total funds are federal funds. She clarified that she was asking for what percentage of K-12 education funding comes from the federal, state, and local governments.

3:19:18 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY answered that about 8-12 percent comes from the federal government, and over $200 million comes from local contributions. He added that about 13 percent is federal funds, including Title 1, about 86 percent of the budget comes from general funds (GF), and local funds are not in the EED budget. The department's budget is federal, GF, and 1 percent of other funds.

CHAIR REINBOLD concluded that EED needed the waiver so "all the schools didn't look to be failing." She opined that a tiny amount of federal funding dictates how state dollars are spent. She asked, "First of all explain to me why would all our schools be failing? What were you guys doing wrong, that everybody would be failing?"
COMMISSIONER HANLEY said EED applied for a waiver because a school of one hundred students could be 95 percent proficient and it would be deemed failing because of two students.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked whether the waiver was obtained in order to retain federal funds.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said no. The department obtained the waiver because under AYP essentially all of our schools would have been deemed failing, which is not accurate, he opined. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said the schools would be deemed failing under the NCLB system.

CHAIR REINBOLD noted the amount of money that has been spend on education and restated her question.

3:23:53 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY remarked:

I'll go back and say that I didn't say that all of our schools would be failures, I said that they would all be deemed as failures and the difference is, and the frustration that I would have, is that we've got schools that are doing very well. And yet, based on this 100 percent rule that every child meet proficiency, they would be called failing, and I didn't think it was accurate. So, we, we got out from under that ... but funding wasn't tied to it.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY continued to explain that the use of Title 1 funding was more flexible. In further response to Chair Reinbold he estimated that Title 1 funding is $60 million.

CHAIR REINBOLD restated her question as to why EED wanted the NCLB waiver. She remarked:

You didn't do it for funding, is that correct? O.K. So we ended up implementing these new college and career readiness assessments, these new college and career standards, and all this, for no money, just, just because the federal government wanted you to do this.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said no. The standards are not tied to the waiver, but the department has been working on them for two years, and they were in place in June, 2012, and the waiver came
after that. The standards were not done to get the waiver, but the standards that were in place allowed EED to get the waiver.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked whether there were any requirements or mandates put on the state to get the federal dollars and to get the NCLB waiver. She gave the example of costs to the state for the expansion of Medicaid.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said "Not tied to funding." To get the waiver, the department had to have standards in place, which it did, it had connect teacher evaluations to student learning, and it needed an accountability system in order to get rid of the AYP system.

CHAIR REINBOLD remarked:

So these new standards that you developed, supposedly two years before, started working on them, you weren't doing this in anticipation of the waiver at all.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said correct.

3:27:01 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD asked for an explanation of the difference between academic achievement and school progress in the accountability regulations.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY explained that academic achievement is a function of proficiency - how many students are proficient - and one of the flaws in AYP was that "all students had to get above the bar." The department wanted to get all students to the level of proficiency, but also recognize school progress, which is growth towards proficiency. A low-performing school that moves students towards proficiency should get credit. The difference is: progress towards proficiency and the number at proficiency.

CHAIR REINBOLD returned to the new regulations about district accountability and asked whether the new district accountability standards were developed to ensure that EED was in alignment with the NCLB waiver.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY stated that to get a waiver from AYP, EED needed to develop its own standards. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said EED has a five-star rating system, and a school that does not meet the requirements is rated on a scale
of one to five. The department recognizes and rewards schools at the top end and helps support schools in the one-star range. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said a one-star school will be contacted to understand why it has the rating, for example a small school is impacted by one student, and then EED provides support through coaches, mentors, and/or state support.

CHAIR REINBOLD pointed out that the House Education Standing Committee took out the college and career readiness indicator from HB 278 and asked what percentage of students are getting four-year college degrees.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said he did not have that information.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLEY noted that a one-star school is as low as a school can go. He asked whether there is a point at which the rating system designates a school as a failure.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said there isn't. Previously at EED there was a system of school interventions and his experience was that interventions caused conflict and strife. The one- to five-star system identifies schools that are really struggling and in the last two years districts have appreciated the model and the support coaches.

3:32:20 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD called attention to the committee's 8/14/14 hearing on assessments. She remarked:

Last hearing you were unable to provide the guidelines, when we talked about the cognitive abilities and things like that, but in Appendix D, ... the contract policy for accommodations were due, if you look at the [Achievement & Assessment Institute (AAI)] contract from Kansas, who we're doing the testing through, they were due on August 1. However, you could not provide them to us at the hearing.... Now on your DEED website, these draft guidelines for accommodations are part of regulation 4 AAC 06.775, AAC 06.721-724, and they appeared in October of 2014. Were the draft guidelines on these assessments part of the information that was submitted [to] AAI [in] August for the design of these assessments?
LES MORSE, Deputy Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner, Department of Education and Early Development, responded that the aforementioned guidelines are the participation guidelines and are not used by the test company in designing the test, but are what districts use to determine what accommodations that they provide to students with special needs, either in special education or English language arts. Thus the guidelines are to help work with the special education students when they take the assessment so that they can be appropriately accommodated based on their disability, or on any limitation they may have due to their English language proficiency.

CHAIR REINBOLD referred to a memo from "legal" [document not provided]. She asked whether the guidelines were given to AAI when the new assessments were developed.

MR. MORSE said the guidelines are not needed to "build" the assessment, but are needed to build individual education plans (IEP's) for students so they can take the assessment. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said no, the state board has yet to approve them. He continued:

AAI doesn't need them. They certainly can look at them. There are reasons why AAI would need them ... for example, let's say we decide students can't use a highlighter function that might be on the computer, then of course, AAI would need to know that so that they would not make that a function of our test. Outside of that, AAI really doesn't need those, other than making sure that accommodation is available on the test or is not available. It's the state decides what those are, working with districts.

CHAIR REINBOLD expressed her desire to learn why there was a $700,000 increase in the contract to AAI.

MR. MORSE explained that there was a technical error on the original issuance of the contract. The change was an amendment to correct the amount in the original request for proposal (RFP). In further response to Chair Reinbold, he advised that the final RFP was issued as amended and there are no additional dollars needed at any point, nor any additional appropriation.

CHAIR REINBOLD said this type of mistake raises a red flag. She turned to HB 140 which requires that EED assess the department and other departments and "all the costs associated in aggregate to the private sector and, of course, that would be including
municipalities as well." Chair Reinbold asked whether EED has completed a cost analysis of Common Core, Common Core implementation, the assessments, and [the cost to increase] Internet speed.

3:38:06 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said there are no regulations to implement the Common Core or Common Core assessments. October 15th is the effective date for HB 140, thus any regulation posted after that date is required to go through that process.

CHAIR REINBOLD stated that her interpretation is that House Bill 140 is in effect and asked whether EED will apply the requirements of the bill to the regulations under discussion.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said it is not required for regulations that were posted prior to October 15th.

3:39:06 PM

JIM POUND, Staff, Representative Wes Keller, Alaska State Legislature, said a regulation that is proposed is not filed, and in order for it to be filed, the regulation is required to have the budget as directed by HB 140, because House Bill 140 supersedes the filing of the aforementioned regulations.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY related that EED has been advised by counsel that these regulations do not require [the budget] process. He said EED will seek confirmation in this regard.

CHAIR REINBOLD expressed her belief that HB 140 should apply and said she will formally request costs because people have a right to know how much the Common Core, Alaska Academic Standards, mandates from the federal government, and the Internet speed will cost. She then asked why the assessments were fast-forwarded from 2015 to 2014.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY opined EED has not "fast-forwarded." He said the date on the regulations was changed from 2016; however, all of the districts have known of the change in date for at least one and one-half years. The change was a "clerical fix" in order match the date so all of the districts would know EED's goal.

CHAIR REINBOLD pointed out that assessments are aligned to the Common Core and the standards are fairly new. She inquired as
to the date of the full implementation of "the Common Core Standards, across the state, the Alaska Academic Standards."

COMMISSIONER HANLEY clarified that assessments are aligned to Alaska standards.

CHAIR REINBOLD said:

There is debate there, tremendous debate there.... For all practical purposes, I am choosing to use Common Core and Alaska Academic Standards ... the same.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said the standards were fully adopted in June 2012, and districts had the responsibility to implement them into their districts. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said EED did not set a specific date but districts had the responsibility to review curriculum and plan for moving toward the implementation of the new strategies, which may include new curriculum, to address the new standards.

CHAIR REINBOLD surmised EDD adopted standards and then within a year or so required districts to implement the new standards, and required that assessments are "in trial" two years later in August of 2014.

3:43:47 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said the assessments will be given in the spring of 2015, which is three years. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said assessments were given in the spring of 2014.

CHAIR REINBOLD pointed out that teachers teach to the assessments the year before, and the assessments will take place in the 2014-2015 school year. She questioned the reason for fast-forwarding from the original date of 2015-2016 and whether EED believes "it's putting them in a tailspin at all."

COMMISSIONER HANLEY expressed his belief that the time period is closer to three years. He acknowledged that any transition to higher standards is "going to be a challenge," but there is an urgency for the sake of the kids to eliminate the need for remediation.

CHAIR REINBOLD further questioned why the state is paying for SAT/ACT/WorkKeys testing when about 10 percent of the state's
students get a four-year degree, yet all students are forced to participate in the testing. She officially requested the costs of the SAT/ACT/WorkKeys [assessments] in their entirety, including the cost of proctors, and asked if this testing is part of the NCLB waiver.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said no. The department has not put forward any regulations in regard to that; in fact, that requirement is statutory and is found in HB 278. The intent of the legislature was to provide choice.

CHAIR REINBOLD stressed her disagreement that the state is paying for Common Core aligned tests. She restated her question.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY restated that the assessments have nothing to do with the NCLB waiver.

CHAIR REINBOLD noted that a student who does not take one of the assessments graduates with a certificate of achievement and not a diploma.

3:49:13 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY pointed out that this provision was voted on by the legislature. He said he was very supportive of the provision that was included in HB 278 by the governor, and passed by the legislature.

CHAIR REINBOLD spoke to the controversy surrounding HB 278. She asked whether all students, including homeschoolers, are required to take an ACT, SAT, or WorkKeys assessment to get a diploma.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said yes.

CHAIR REINBOLD opined homeschoolers are forced to "do Common Core," and this was of great concern to schools such as IDEA.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY pointed out that there remains the choice to take WorkKeys, which was previously in statute.

CHAIR REINBOLD asked for confirmation that the legislature is obligated to pay for all students to take these tests even if a student has no college plans or post-high school training aspirations.
COMMISSIONER HANLEY said correct. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he said this has nothing to do with NCLB or the waiver, but was the intention of EED, the governor, and the legislature.

CHAIR REINBOLD restated her opposition to the aforementioned legislation. She restated her question regarding the total cost of the ACT, SAT, and WorkKeys assessments to municipalities, the state, and other agencies.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY answered that the cost was reflected in Fiscal Note 36 for $525,000. In further response to Chair Reinbold, he confirmed this is an annual expense.

3:51:40 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD turned attention to the new regulation addressing the restraint and seclusion of students. House Bill 210 held an expectation that crisis intervention training programs are to be evidence-based. However, proposed regulation [4 AAC 06.175 & 177 Restraint & Seclusion of Students], expects the program to be subject to a peer review process or other scholarly research. She asked for an explanation of the changes to existing regulations.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY stated that there are two recognized methods of determining evidence-based: a peer review process or subject to scholarly research. These are two identified ways to determine a solid program.

CHAIR REINBOLD opined evidence is more outcomes-based, is a proven method, and is very different than a program being looked at by a peer. Her research found that there are two different meanings and she asked for clarification. She paraphrased [in part] from AS 14.33.127 as follows:

**Sec. 14.33.127. Crisis intervention training.** (a) The department shall approve crisis intervention training programs for schools, which shall include training in (1) evidenced-based techniques that have been shown to be effective in the prevention of restraint and seclusion of students; (2) evidence-based techniques shown to be effective in keeping school personnel and students safe when imposing physical restraint or seclusion of students; (3) evidence-based skills related to positive behavior supports, safe physical escort, conflict prevention,
understanding antecedents, de-escalation, and conflict management;

CHAIR REINBOLD restated her question.

3:53:47 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY explained that this is the process that defines evidence-based research. Typically, regulations are intended to clarify the way to move forward and these are two ways to get to [and] identify evidenced-based.

CHAIR REINBOLD cautioned "that has brought concern and others have brought concern in regards to that.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON stated that other educational standards can only be adopted by school districts if they are more stringent than those of the Alaska [Academic] Standards. She asked whether the Common Core Standards that were adopted by ASD are more stringent than the Alaska [Academic] Standards. Also, the basic student allocation comes from EED. Representative T. Wilson stressed the intent of the legislation and asked whether any funding from EED goes to buy curriculum that is going to the Common Core Standards.

3:55:26 PM

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said there are no restrictions on the standards adopted by a local school district, but the district has an obligation to meet the Alaska [Academic] Standards. For example, if a district adopted lower standards it would have to demonstrate that the Alaska [Academic] Standards are being addressed. He expressed his belief that the Common Core [Standards] and the Alaska [Academic] Standards are substantially similar, and there are several areas in which the Alaska [Academic] Standards are slightly higher. The Anchorage School District has the responsibility to address the differences. Regarding paying for curriculum, he explained that through a funding formula EED supports districts based on their student count, but does not determine the local decisions of curriculum. There was no intention to put a restriction on districts purchasing curriculum, and EED does not purchase curriculum.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON understood that to have a different set of standards a district must have approval by EED.
COMMISSIONER HANLEY stated there is no process for a different set of standards; districts are all obligated to address the Alaska [Academic] Standards.

3:57:40 PM

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON observed her concern is not just about how close the Alaska [Academic] Standards are to the Common Core [Standards], but if districts choose their standards, and the curriculum and testing is aligned, changing standards and testing still do not support struggling schools. She asked whether EED will do anything differently than it did during NCLB, such as helping schools academically, not financially, so that students have the ability to pass the tests.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY said yes. The department is working more extensively than in the past; in fact, staff spend more time in districts - to the greatest extent possible - working with all levels in districts and with teachers. The department is switching from an intervention model to supporting low-performing schools to ensure students and schools are successful. It is too early to determine success as assessments will take several years; however, EED will have a new baseline this year and will be able to build from there.

REPRESENTATIVE T. WILSON asked if the amendment was not right regarding monies going to support Common Core standards or curriculum, would it be necessary to make a change in statute so that the intent is clear. She surmised the commissioner believes the legislature is talking about teacher support by EED; however, her constituents do not want to see Common Core anymore. In addition, she expressed her belief that money outside the formula could [support Common Core]. She concluded that the intent was to ensure that the state was not using any of its funding to keep going forward with the initiative.

4:00:00 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said that was her understanding as well. She opined that there's "a bit of trickery with this amendment in not spending any money to implement this set of standards." Our [intent] was not to spend any state public funds on any part of the Common Core Initiative in any fashion. Chair Reinbold expressed her frustration that she was told the state wasn't using the Common Core and that it won't have to do with the curriculum, particularly since the curriculum has to be selected on the specific standards across the state and the assessments
are the same [as] the Common Core [assessments]. Chair Reinbold surmised that the result is the state is following the Common Core Standards, assessments, and curriculum. Therefore, freedom is being lost by the state, individuals, and homeschoolers. Chair Reinbold characterized it as a developing monopoly, for all practical purposes. She related that she would vehemently fight for the state's rights and the legislature's stamp of approval rather than the Board of Education being able to move ahead without legislative approval and her concerns being void upon arrival. Furthermore, she expressed concern with her treatment as an elected official.

4:02:08 PM

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER related his understanding from today that the definition of "evidence-based" is peer review, and asked if that's a standard definition in the education field. He related his further understanding that peer review is taking an unspecified number of people with experience in the same area and obtaining their input. He opined that it seems to be a crude tool.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY confirmed that often in research conversations peer review is how evidence-based is determined. There is a consensus from people in like fields with like expertise to determine whether evidence is valid.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER surmised then that the peer review process can be described in order to review it and obtain a better appreciation of it.

COMMISSIONER HANLEY replied yes.

4:03:44 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD announced that Commissioner Hanley will be receiving a follow-up letter from [the committee] to address additional concerns, including the costs in their entirety.

4:04:23 PM

TARREN LESLIE began by specifying that she is representing herself and her family. She then informed the committee that she homeschools through IDEA and supports the idea of any unused student allotment being allowed to roll over to the next year. Therefore, the unused student allotment would be available in addition to the current year's student allotment. She expressed
her opposition to any students being forced to use state-standards aligned materials because the State Standards are Common Core Standards. Ms. Leslie informed the committee that she has read the Common Core Standards it its entirety and the Alaska State Standards as well as multiple letters from UAF, CCSSO, Commissioner Hanley, and others in which it is stated that the Alaska State Standards and Common Core Standards are "nearly identical." She then pointed out that the Common Core Standard adoption regulations includes the "15 percent rule" under which a state is allowed to adopt the Common Core Standards and refer to them by another name if up to 15 percent of the state's own unique standards are added. That is essentially what Alaska has done, although she questioned whether Alaska added a full 15 percent of its own unique standards. She noted that some of the letters she has delineates the additions Alaska made to the Common Core Standards.

4:06:40 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD said that Ms. Leslie could email her those letters as a follow-up to the remarks provided during the meeting.

MS. LESLIE characterized many of the changes as "minutia" and were grammatical. For instance, "changing the term to 'explain why' where the Common Core Standards say 'know that' or 'design' instead of 'develop.'"

CHAIR REINBOLD, noting that her office has performed a complete word-for-word comparison of the Common Core standards versus the Alaska State Standards, stated her agreement with Ms. Leslie.

4:07:16 PM

MS. LESLIE, continuing her testimony, said that since the Common Core Standards are the Alaska State Standards she opposes any students, especially correspondence students being forced to use any State Standards aligned material. She then urged the committee to uphold a limitation for no funds to be spent on Common Core implementation to include purchase of Common Core curriculum by individual districts. She asked for the removal of limitations on students requiring four fundable or Core courses for the correspondence program. She also urged that no legislated action to be taken if a child scores poorly. Most parents, program contact teachers, and the correspondence programs themselves would be self-corrected. Others, she
opined, are simply on a different sequence and taking a
different route to the same end although at various points in
time will be ahead or behind the public school sequence. The
art of problem solving in math curriculum is a prime example and
although it's a greatly advanced math curriculum, it doesn't
teach math per the Common Core [curriculum]. Therefore, a
student could fail the Common Core test for not knowing to write
paragraphs describing how they reached their answer or to draw
blocks in the Common Core [curriculum]. Ms. Leslie then asked
for the removal of regulations requiring homeschool programs and
their contact teachers to do anything new, extra, or specific in
their response to low Alaska state test scores. Furthermore,
she requested the removal of limitations on purchasing
nonsectarian items from sectarian vendors and highlighted Mr.
Cline's example of purchasing a calculator from a sectarian.
She also requested the removal of the requirement for the SAT,
ACT, and WorkKeys and if that doesn't pass, she requested the
addition of a clause specifying that no SAT, ACT, or WorkKeys
cut scores are to be implemented at any point in the future. In
conclusion, Ms. Leslie said she agrees with the comments of
Chair Reinbold, Representative T. Wilson, and Mr. Cline. She
added that since AAI, Alaska's new testing company, left SBAC is
a Common Core testing company.

4:10:05 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD stated that she will do what she can to empower
responsible homeschooling parents that are caring enough to give
their life. She further stated, "I don't believe we should break
something that is working." She requested Ms. Leslie
email her testimony to her and invited her to an upcoming
symposium for parents in Anchorage scheduled for December 9th
and 10th.

4:11:06 PM

MS. LESLIE, noting that she has been homeschooling her children
for a long time, said that she homeschools her children to keep
them out of the Common Core system. Prior to the implementation
of the Common Core, she explained that she homeschooled her
children because the overall curriculum in public school, but in
particular the math curriculum. Upon reviewing the Common Core
math problems of a friend's child in second grade, she said she
determined that the Common Core math problems are easier than
the public school curriculum her son had in the early 2000s.
Therefore, she disputed the notion that the Common Core
standards are harder or more rigorous.
4:12:14 PM

CHAIR REINBOLD remarked, "For one, there's a reason IDEA is the biggest school." She then agreed that the notion that the Common Core Standards are more rigorous is very debatable.

4:13:05 PM

DRAFT

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the Administrative Regulation Review Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:13 p.m.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 13A

ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on multiple regulations regarding updates to the Alaska Performance Scholarship (APS) program. Proposed amendments include the elimination of a grace period for curriculum requirements, a deadline change for non-public school students and an extension of eligibility time period for students having enrollment delays that are outside of the student’s control.

BACKGROUND
- The APS provides an opportunity for Alaska high school students to earn a scholarship to help cover the cost of an Alaska postsecondary education. Alaska high school students who take a more rigorous curriculum, get good grades, and score well on college placement or work ready exams can earn a scholarship to qualified Alaska colleges, universities, or vocational/technical programs.

- In the initial two years of the APS the Commissioner could grant a grace period of one extra year of eligibility for a student following high school graduation to meet curriculum requirements. This was due to the tiered structure of the APS requirements as increases in rigor were established for two consecutive years until reaching the current levels.

- The current regulations require public school graduates to have eligibility information submitted by July 15 of each year. The current regulations require non-public school graduates to have eligibility information submitted by July 1 of each year.

- The current Alaska Statute 14.43.825 (b) states that a student's eligibility for a scholarship terminates six years after the date the student graduates from high school unless the student qualifies for an extension of time allowed by the department by regulation.

- The proposed amended regulation can be found behind Cover Memo 9A.

- Erik McCormick, Director of Assessment, Accountability & Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and open a period of public comment.
Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS
Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulation.
♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 43.035, Grace period for curriculum requirements; 4 AAC 43.0409(a), Procedures for home-based education and certain religious or other private schools; 4 AAC 43.045, Extensions of eligibility period.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 13B

ISSUE

The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on multiple regulations regarding updates to the state assessment system. Proposed amendments include clarifying language regarding substitute courses under alternative completion requirements and definitions for certificates of achievement and certificates of completion.

BACKGROUND

- 4 AAC 06.078 allows alternative course completion opportunities for a student with a disability when the disability precludes the taking of regular curricular offerings.

- A substitute course in the same subject area may be designed and provided as determined by the team that develops the individualized education program (IEP).

- A proposed regulation amendment defines that substitute courses are available only to students who take the standards based assessment.

- A proposed regulation amendment specifies the Alaska Alternate Assessment as the assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities who are eligible to receive a certificate of completion.

- A proposed regulation amendment defines that a certificate of achievement is a certificate earned by a student meeting all local graduation requirements but has not taken the College and Career Ready Assessment and is therefore ineligible for a diploma.

- The proposed amended regulation can be found behind Cover Memo 9B.

- Erik McCormick, Director of Assessment, Accountability & Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS

- Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulations.
- Amend the proposed regulations and open a period of public comment.
- Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

- Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulation.

SUGGESTED MOTION

I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 06.078 Alternative completion requirements; students with disabilities; 4 AAC 06.717(f)
Work ready/college ready transitional skills assessment; 4 AAC 06.775(b) Statewide assessment program for students with disabilities; 4 AAC 06.790 Definitions.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 13C

December 5, 2014

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on regulations regarding a Type B Limited certification.

♦ BACKGROUND
- During the work session of the December 6, 2013, meeting of the State Board of Education & Early Development, board members discussed possible avenues for amending regulations to permit an alternate route for obtaining a Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement.

- The intent of the board was to encourage a larger pool of applicants for school superintendent positions.

- At the request of the board, proposed regulations establishing an alternate route to obtaining a Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement were developed and put out for public comment at the board meeting on March 14, 2014.

- Currently, in order to qualify for a Type B certificate with superintendent or other administrative endorsement, an applicant must meet the following requirements:
  - Have completed a master’s or higher degree;
  - Be recommended by the preparing institution; and
  - Have completed at least five years of employment as a teacher or administrator with a minimum of three years employment as a teacher.

- The proposed amendment permitted five years of employment in a leadership position on an Alaska school district’s management team to substitute for the five years of employment as a teacher and administrator.

- Public comment included both support and lack of support for the proposed amendments to regulation. Comments supportive of the proposed amendment focused on increasing the applicant pool for superintendent vacancies. Comments in opposition to the proposed amendment centered on the importance of teaching experience for individuals who are permitted to conduct evaluations of teachers.

- At its meeting on June 5, 2014, the board voted against approval of the proposed regulations and requested that the department reconsider alternate paths for obtaining a Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement, including broadening the definition of teaching experience.

- At its meeting on September 18, 2014, the board was briefed regarding the following information:
Relevant statute and regulation;
Current avenues available through statute and regulation for serving as Chief School Administrator;
Current requirements for obtaining a Type B certificate;
Relevant repealed regulation;
Summary of approaches taken in other states.

- At this meeting, the board discussed a limited Type B certificate similar to regulation currently providing for a route to certification for individuals with expertise in military science, career and technical education, and Native language or culture (Type M).

- The proposed regulations provide for the issuing of a limited Type B certificate with a superintendent endorsement to an individual who is sponsored by an Alaska school district. The individual would need to meet the following requirements:
  - Have at least five years of full-time work experience in an administrative position;
  - Possess a master’s degree or higher; and
  - Provide two letters of recommendation verifying expertise in key areas.

- During the first three years of the limited Type B certificate, the applicant would need to complete the following requirements:
  - Three semester hours of educator evaluation coursework;
  - District’s certificated evaluation system training;
  - Three semester hours Alaska studies;
  - Three semester hours multicultural education/cross-cultural communications; and
  - An approved superintendent endorsement program.

- Prior to conducting certified employee evaluations, the individual holding the limited Type B must complete the educator evaluation coursework and the district’s certificated evaluation system training. Additionally, during the first two years of the applicant’s employment, the sponsoring school district is required to provide the applicant with a mentor who is an experienced Alaska superintendent.

- The limited Type B certificate would only be valid in the sponsoring district.

- The proposed regulations can be found behind Cover Memo 9C.

- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Sondra Meredith, Administrator of Teacher Certification, will be present to brief the board.

**OPTIONS**
Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and open a period of public comment.
Seek more information.

**ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS**
Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulation.
SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 12.346. Administrative certificate (Type B Limited).
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 13D

ISSUE
The board is being asked to open a period of public comment on regulations regarding teacher certification fees.

BACKGROUND
- Currently, the Professional Teaching Practice Commission (PTPC) is entirely funded through a general fund appropriation of approximately $300,000.
- The FY 2015 Operating Budget included legislative intent language “that no later than FY 2016, the PTPC be entirely funded by receipts collected from teacher certification fees under AS 14.20.020(c).”
- Currently, the fees structure for certification is only sufficient to support the certification of Alaska educators. In order to have sufficient funds to also support the educational and disciplinary activities of the PTPC, the department will need to increase the certification and renewal fees by $75.
- The increase would impact the fees collected for all certificates and renewals with the exception of the Advanced Type C and the Student Teaching Authorization.
- The proposed increase was calculated by dividing $300,000 by the number of certificates (excluding the Advanced Type C and the Student Teaching Authorization) issued by the department in FY2013, which was 3,926.
- For a regular certificate, the fee increase would be from $125 to $200 every five years. Considering educator certification cost on a yearly basis, the fee increase for a regular certificate would be from $25 per year to $40 per year. For a lifetime or retired certificate, the fee increase would be from $165 to $240.
- The proposed regulations can be found behind Cover Memo 9D.
- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Sondra Meredith, Administrator of Teacher Certification, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and open a period of public comment.
Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS
Open a period of public comment on the proposed regulation.
♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 12.300(g).
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

To:

Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 14A

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations related to charter schools.

♦ BACKGROUND


- The proposed regulations reflect the new requirements of these amended statutes for the following charter school topics:
  - Application procedures;
  - Application appeal procedures;
  - A one-time grant program for new charter schools; and
  - Pupil transportation for students attending charter schools.

- Behind Cover Memo 12A are the proposed regulations, as well as the relevant amended statutes regarding charter schools including AS 14.03.250, AS 14.03.253, AS 14.03.264, and AS 14.09.010.

- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Elizabeth Nudelman, Director of School Finance & Facilities, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
Seek more information.

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 27.057 Charter school transportation policy; 4 AAC 33.110 Charter school application and review procedure; and 4 AAC 33.113 through 4 AAC 33.119 Regarding charter schools.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 14B

December 5, 2014

ISSUE

The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations related to correspondence study programs.

BACKGROUND

- House Bill 278, The Education Opportunity Act, amended AS 14.03 to add Article 3 Correspondence Study Programs.

- This new statute addresses the requirements for students’ individual learning plans and the use of and accounting for student allotments.

- The new statute includes language contained in current regulations, as well as language that requires amendments to current regulation.

- Therefore, the proposed regulations eliminate redundancy between the new statute and current regulation, as well as provide new language to further define or clarify requirements of the new statute.

- In response to public comment, several revisions to the draft regulations are being recommended.

- Behind Cover Memo 12B are the proposed regulations, as well as the new statutes for correspondence study programs including AS 14.03.300 and AS 14.03.320 and public comments.

- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, and Elizabeth Nudelman, Director of School Finance & Facilities, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.

SUGGESTED MOTION

I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 09.160 Fund balance; and 4 AAC 33.421 through 4 AAC 33.426 Regarding correspondence study programs.
ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations related to math credits.

BACKGROUND
• At the March State Board of Education meeting, board members reviewed the number of credits currently being required by 4 AAC 06.075 for high school graduation, as well as how this compares to other states’ requirements and to what is required by school districts in Alaska.

• Currently, 4 AAC 06.075 requires students to complete a total of 21 units of credits to graduate from high school including the following number of subject-specific units:
  o Language arts – four units of credit;
  o Social studies – three units of credit;
  o Mathematics – two units of credit;
  o Science – two units of credit; and
  o Health/physical education – one unit of credit.

• Forty-two states require students to complete more than Alaska’s currently required two units of credit in mathematics.

• Forty-seven school districts in Alaska require students to complete more than the minimally required two credits in mathematics in order to earn a diploma in that district.

• The proposed regulation increases the units of credits required for high school graduation from two to three units of credit.

• This increase brings consistency between what is already being required by the vast majority of both other states and school districts in Alaska.

• Behind Cover Memo 12C are the proposed regulations and public comments.

• Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
• Adopt the proposed regulations.
• Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
• Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS
• Adopt the proposed regulations.
♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 06.075(b) Increasing the units of credit required for high school graduation.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 14D

ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations pertaining to House Bill 210, an act regarding crisis intervention training for school personnel, and restraint and seclusion of students in public schools.

BACKGROUND

- House Bill 210 amended statute to require the following of school districts:
  - Establishing policies and procedures for the use of restraint and seclusion of students;
  - Reporting to parents of affected students incidences involving the use of restraint or seclusion;
  - Complying with limitations regarding the use of restraint and seclusion of a student; and
  - Reporting annually to the department data regarding incidents involving the use of restraint or seclusion of a student.

- As part of HB 210, two amended statutes have implication for regulation.
  - AS 14.33.125 requires the department to collect from school districts data related to incidents involving the use of restraint or seclusion of a student.
  - AS 14.33.127 requires the department to approve crisis intervention training programs for schools.

- The proposed regulations prescribe the timeline for submission by school districts of the required data and outline the department’s process for approving crisis intervention training programs and public comment.

- Behind Cover Memo 12D are the proposed regulations and the relevant authorizing statutes AS 14.33.125 and AS 14.133.127 regarding crisis intervention training and restraint and seclusion of students in public schools.

- Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS

- Adopt the proposed regulations.
- Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
- Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

- Adopt the proposed regulations.
♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 06.175 Reporting restraint and seclusion incidents and expulsions; and 4 AAC 06.177 Crisis intervention training programs.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 14E

ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt regulations regarding residential school programs.

BACKGROUND

- State funding for districts operating residential schools is provided for at AS 14.16.200. The program provides eligible programs with a per-pupil monthly residential stipend for a nine-month year. The stipend rate is set in statute. The program also provides for one round-trip ticket per student, at the least expensive means, between the student’s community of residence and the school.

- House Bill 278, The Education Opportunity Act, amended AS 14.16.100 to provide an annual period of open applications for the residential program. The proposed regulation implements an annual period of applications for the residential program.

- Additionally, the proposed regulations are amended to provide an opportunity for districts to request an alternative count day for variable term programs. The alternative count day must be during the October count period at AS 14.17.600 and must reflect the number of students the district will continue to house throughout the entire school year.

- The proposed regulations and public comment can be found behind Cover Memo 12E.

- Elizabeth Nudelman, Director of School Finance, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS

- Adopt the proposed regulations.
- Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
- Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.

SUGGESTED MOTION

I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 33.090(c); and 4 AAC 33.090(h) regarding district-operated statewide residential educational programs.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 14F

ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt regulations related to the powers of the Alaska State Museum to name other Alaskan museums or cultural centers to be repositories of natural history and cultural materials, per HB 154, which was passed by the recent state legislature.

BACKGROUND
- HB 154 amended AS14.56 to authorize the Alaska State Museum as a designated repository of natural and cultural history collections and enabled the department to designate other such Alaskan repositories.
- Some museums in the state have expressed a strong interest in applying for this designation under the authorization.
- These proposed regulations outline the steps for a review of applications related to applicant’s collections preservation, curatorial practices, scope of collections, knowledge dissemination and compliance with NAGPRA requirements.
- The proposed regulations are behind Cover Memo 12F.
- Linda Thibodeau, Director of the Division of Libraries, Archives and Museums, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
Adopt the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS
Adopt the proposed regulations.

SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt 4 AAC 58.300 through 4 AAC 58.320 Designation of Natural and Cultural History Repositories.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 14G

 ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations regarding accountability updates related to House Bill 278. Proposed changes include a modification to the ASPI accountability reporting system, allowance for teachers to be exempt from jury service while serving in low performing schools, and new reporting requirements that summarize the performance of students from families on active military duty.

 BACKGROUND
- Governor Parnell signed HB 278, Alaska’s Education Opportunity Act, into law on May 13, 2014.
- The law repealed the HSGQE and replaced it with a student’s choice of participation in the SAT, ACT or WorkKeys assessments.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects a slight adjustment in school accountability (ASPI) reporting related to the WorkKeys transition from a required assessment to an optional assessment.
- Prior to Alaska’s approval of the ESEA waiver teachers were eligible for jury service exemption if they were employed by a school that did not meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). HB 278 allows a teacher employed by a low performing school to claim jury service exemption.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects an update to allow teachers to be eligible for jury service exemption if they are employed by a school that is currently identified as a one- or two-star school in the ASPI system.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects a new requirement to include counts and performance data for students from families that are on active military duty. The information will be included in the state Report Card system that is published online.
- The proposed regulations and public comment can be found behind Cover Memo 12G.
- Erik McCormick, Director of Assessments, Accountability and Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

 OPTIONS
Adopt the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
Seek more information.
♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS
Adopt the proposed regulations.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 06.812(b) Growth in student academic performance, 4 AAC 06.883 Jury service exemption, 4 AAC 06.895(I) Report card to the public, 4 AAC 06.899 Definitions.
ISSUE
The board is being asked to adopt multiple regulations regarding assessment updates related to House Bill 278 and changes to the state assessment system. Proposed changes include revisions to the Participation Guidelines for Alaska Students in State Assessments document and the establishment of a waiver system for the college and career ready assessments.

BACKGROUND
- Governor Parnell signed HB 278, Alaska’s Education Opportunity Act, into law on May 13, 2014.
- The law repealed the HSGQE and replaced it with a student’s choice of participation in the SAT, ACT or WorkKeys assessments.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects a need for a waiver system to support individuals that are unable to participate in the college and career ready assessments for reasons that are largely outside of their control.
- A high school student that enters the public school system after the completion of all scheduled administrations of the college and career ready assessments may be considered for a waiver from participating.
- A high school student may also be considered for a waiver from participating in the college and career ready assessments under a limited number of situations that are defined as rare and unusual circumstances.
- A proposed regulation amendment reflects the need to revise the Participation Guidelines document based on major changes to the state assessment system and the state assessment delivery systems. The publication is adopted by reference in 4 AAC 06.775.
- Changes to the Participation Guidelines include combining the Alaska Supplement for WorkKeys Assessment publication to have a single document for all statewide assessments. The WorkKeys Supplement is also adopted by reference in 4 AAC 06.775.
- The proposed regulations and public comment can be found behind Cover Memo 12H.
- Erik McCormick, Director of Assessments, Accountability and Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
Adopt the proposed regulations.
Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.
Seek more information.

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS
Adopt the proposed regulations.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 06.775(a) Statewide assessment program for students with disabilities, 4 AAC 06.721 College and career readiness assessment waivers, 4 AAC 06.722 Waiver for entering the public school system late, 4 AAC 06.723 Rare or unusual circumstances, 4 AAC 06.724 Procedures for appeal from a denial of a waiver from the college and career readiness assessments,
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 5, 2014  

Agenda Item: 14I

♦ ISSUE

The board is being asked to adopt amendments to regulations regarding the restriction on expending money to implement educational curriculum standards established by the Common Core Standards Initiative.

♦ BACKGROUND

- This proposed regulation supports the actions of the legislature and the Governor when passing and signing into law HB278, enrolled as Alaska Statute 14.07.020 (b).

- The testimony offered when this amendment was added to HB278 in the legislature expressed the intent that this was to prevent Alaska from adopting the Common Core State Standards, and accepting any obligations that such adoption would involve.

- The testimony during the legislative session further clarified that this amendment to HB278 was not to prevent Alaska from implementing the content standards the State Board adopted in June 2012, and was not to prevent the department from the work involved in the implementation of those adopted standards.

- This regulation clarifies that “any money” as referenced in Alaska Statute 14.07.020 (b) includes state money or any money received from other sources.

- The proposed regulation and public comment can be found behind Cover Memo 12I.

- Commissioner Hanley will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.  
Amend the proposed regulations and adopt the amended regulations.  
Seek more information.

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATIONS

Adopt the proposed regulations.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION

I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the proposed amendments to 4 AAC 04.145 restricting expending money to implement educational curriculum standards established by the Common Core Standards Initiative.
ISSUE
This is a standing report to the board regarding the Division of Teacher and Learning Support.

BACKGROUND

- The Career and Technical Education team has just returned from the Professional Development Conference sponsored by the Alaska Career and Technical Education Association in Anchorage. The team gathered information and participated in discussions focused on how to best support district activities as well as move forward Career and Technical Education initiatives that align to the statewide CTE plan. The team is preparing for its annual site visits for the Carl Perkins grant monitoring cycle, which starts in November, and will assist districts through April with the Perkins Reallocation Funding cycle.

- Through a team of ten EED Liaisons, the School Recognition and Support team has contacted 84 1-star and 2-star schools, including 16 Priority schools and 28 Focus schools, to offer assistance and reminders regarding the required school improvement plans. Liaisons reviewed plans during the first two weeks of November and provided feedback to schools by the third week in November. The team is assisting 12 districts in developing targeted district improvement plans to support their low-performing schools. Up to $50,000 of Federal Title I 1003(a) school improvement money has been made available to the 44 Priority and Focus schools to be used in attending staff development training and supporting school level interventions as identified in the school improvement plan.

- The Instructional Support Team continues to provide support to districts, schools, and teachers in the transition and implementation of Alaska’s English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards. On September 24 and 25 the team, along with others from the TLS division, offered training at the Teaching and Learning Support Institute around ELA and Math standards implementation to 120 participants from 23 different districts and representatives from three University of Alaska campuses. To support Alaska NEA, the team members presented at the Alaska NEA Train-the-Trainer Conference, which was held concurrently with the Teaching and Learning Support Institute. A follow-up webinar was offered to the Train-the-Trainer Conference attendees to answer questions that remained following the conference. As another way to support districts, the Instructional Support Team held three sessions at the 2014 Alaska Principals Conference, and hosted a booth where participants were invited to gather information concerning current topics in the Department of Education & Early Development. The team continues to offer on-site support as schedules allow, and in the last three months has had the opportunity to work with three districts, including specific training for two charter schools. Additionally, as a part of their work, the content specialists have been reviewing items for the new assessment, Alaska Measures of Progress, to ensure tight alignment to Alaska’s standards.
• The Child Nutrition team is implementing the PrimeroEdge software system, which provides several tools for school districts, including an online application for school meals, eligibility roster systems, scan-able processing of applications, menu planning tools, nutrient analysis, and production records. This software was purchased through a grant received from USDA and is provided at no cost to districts. The team is helping districts implement the new Smart Snack federal regulations, which prescribe the nutritional requirements all foods sold at schools, including items sold in school stores, in vending machines, and at fundraising events. Compliance is assessed as a part of the 3-year administrative review.

• Educator Evaluation & Support training has been ongoing. Sondra Meredith and Cecilia Miller continued to collaborate with Northwest Comprehensive Center and SERRC to offer opportunities for educators across Alaska to learn about the regulatory changes. The student learning objective (SLO) process, which has been used successfully in other states, is being suggested as a means for Alaska districts to satisfy the new student learning data requirement. Educator Evaluation & Support trainings have been offered at the Principals Conference, NEA-AK’s fall event, and the Alaska Career & Technical Education Conference. Efforts to assist districts with the review and revision of their Educator Evaluation & Support System are continuing. The second of three Educator Evaluation & Support Redesign Intensives was held in Anchorage on October 16 and 17. The last of the intensives will be held just prior to the RTI conference, January 22 and 23.

• The ESEA Federal Programs team has been providing significant technical assistance to districts, especially those with new federal programs staff, to approve the federal programs’ funding applications for 2014-2015. Three districts have been monitored this fall, with three more scheduled in November and December. Final documentation has been submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in response to federal monitoring of the Title I-C Migrant program and the Title III-A English Language Learner programs.

• Teaching & Learning Support will support a request from the Alaska Arts Education Consortium Board of Directors to revise the Arts Standards for Alaska Schools, which were adopted in 1996. Through a partnership of the Consortium, the Alaska State Council on the Arts, and EED, a 15-member team of arts educators will be convened to accomplish this revision by fall 2015. Updating Alaska’s arts standards provides opportunities for integration with Alaska’s new English Language Arts and Mathematics Standards, and provides more current standards for use by arts educators across Alaska.

• Dr. Susan McCauley, Director of Teaching & Learning Support, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 5, 2014  

Agenda Item: 16

♦ ISSUE
This is a standing report to the board regarding assessment, accountability and information management.

♦ BACKGROUND
• The board will be briefed on the results of the following recent events:
  o Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting
    ▪ Anchorage, October 22-23
  o District Test Coordinator (DTC) meeting
    ▪ Anchorage, November 10-11

• The board will be briefed on the activities related to the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP), the new statewide assessment system.

• The board will be briefed on the status of the Technology Practice Test (TPT).

• The board will be briefed on the status of the College and Career Readiness Assessments (CCRA).

• Behind this cover memo are:
  1. AMP Information Document
  2. CCRA Letter to Families

• Erik McCormick, Director of Assessment, Accountability & Information Management, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Assessment Information Document

The purpose of this document is to provide regular updates to Alaskan educators and members of the public about the implementation of the new Alaska assessment for grades 3-10, Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP). New information will be **bolded** and the date of the document will be in both the title and the footer as well as summarized on the last page. Contact elizabeth.davis@alaska.gov for more information or visit www.akassessments.org.

Components of the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Assessment Program

**Technology Practice Test:** The practice test will be available in September 2014. The focus of the practice test is to give students experience with the online assessment technology. There will be three practice tests: grades 3-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-10. Each practice test will have traditional item types, such as multiple choice, and items that utilize technology-enhanced items (TE’s), such as dropdown menus or drawing lines. Students, teachers, and members of the community have unlimited access to the practice test.

**Testlets, Assessments for Learning:** The testlets are short, 8-10 item tests available to teachers to use to inform their instruction. These optional, no-stakes assessment tools are designed to give teachers information on student progress on individual standards. Teachers select which testlets to give to students and when to administer them. The testlets will be available beginning in January 2015. Student and teacher rosters must be uploaded into the KITE Educator Portal for teachers to access the Testlets.

**Interim Benchmark Assessment:** The optional interim assessment will be available to districts beginning in **fall 2016**. The purpose of the interim assessment is to provide information on students’ progress on grade-level standards in English language arts and math. The assessments are given twice per year, in fall and winter. AMP Interim will be scored on the same scale as the summative. **The purpose of the Interim assessment is to provide teachers with information to guide instruction. This is one year later than our previous implementation schedule. This change was made to allow time for our test developer to design an assessment that can be used effectively to guide instruction for teachers. The interim assessment will not be approved by the commissioner for use in educator evaluation; it is not designed for this purpose.**

**Summative Assessment:** The summative assessment will have two subtests, English language arts and mathematics. The summative assessments will have between 70-75 questions per content area (ELA & math) delivered in blocks. Each assessment will start with a block of 25 items, followed by three blocks of 15 items. Although the assessment is not timed, each subtest will take most students between two and three hours. The essay (administered as a field test in 2016) will take most students 30-45 minutes.

The summative assessment will be rolled out in two phases.

- The assessment will be fixed form for the first two years. After two years, Alaska will have enough items to have an adaptive assessment; adaptive assessments adjust in difficulty based on student performance, unlike fixed form assessments. Adaptive assessments provide greater score precision and provide an assessment experience for students that is “a good fit.”
Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Assessment Information Document

- Items that require keyboarding (constructed response short answer and essay items) and listening items will also be phased in over the next two years.

**Scoring:** Students will receive scores from 1-4, with 1 being the lowest score and 4 being the highest. The score of 3 is the “meets standard” score. Score descriptions, called Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs), were reviewed by Alaskan educators on September 17, 2014. These revised drafts will be available for teachers in January. Final versions of the ALDs will not be published until after the State Board of Education approves the standard setting cut scores and the ALDs; these will be brought before the board and available for public comment following the July standard setting event.

**Technology:** Most students will take the computer-based assessment. EED and the Achievement & Assessment Institute (AAI) will work with schools in the summer and fall of 2014 to assist them in getting ready for the online delivery. AMP is administered using a test delivery engine called KITE. It can be installed on desktops, laptops, and tablets. EED strongly recommends that districts download the KITE Client on all district devices no later than October 31, 2014. Once the KITE Client is open all other applications on the device are inaccessible, making the test administration secure. The Chromebook app and the iPad app are both available now in the Chrome Web Store and the App Store.

**Support for Computer-based Administration of AMP:** AAI’s Technology Support Team will work with districts that may have technological capacity challenges. Districts can contact the help desk at amp_support@ku.edu or by calling, toll free, 855-277-9752. Additionally, AAI has hired Alaskan technology liaisons who will provide additional virtual and on-site assistance to districts and schools. Districts access this assistance through the help desk.

**Local Caching System:** AMP utilizes a Local Caching System (LCS). An LCS is an application that is loaded onto a laptop or desktop; the LCS enables testing to continue if there is minimal bandwidth. It can be used at the district, school, or classroom level.

**Accessibility and Accommodations:** Students will have access to a greater variety of accessibility tools as part of the computer-based assessment system. These tools are described in detail in the Participation Guidelines. Universal Tools are for all students and are accessible at all times and include: highlighter, striker, eraser, tags, guideline, search, calculators on portions of the test, and text-to-speech for directions. Accessibility Tools are available to students with any type of documented need; these tools include auditory calming, magnification, masking, and text-to-speech on the math portion of the test for items, answer choices, and graphics. Accommodation Tools are available to students with disabilities and students who are English language learners. The embedded Accommodation Tools in AMP include color contrast, text-to-speech on ELA items and answer choices (this does not include reading passages), and one or two switch scanning.

**Information for families and communities:** EED is working with AAI to develop a variety of materials and other methods to communicate to students, families, and communities about the new assessment. Brochures for educators and for families were mailed to schools in August and are also be available on the EED website under the yellow Parents & Community star.
Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) Assessment Information Document

Opportunities for Educator Involvement: 30 educators participated in two passage writing workshops this summer, held in partnership with UAF and UAS. Passages written during these workshops will be used for the assessment, and some writers will be commissioned to write additional passages. More workshops are planned for the summer of 2015. In addition, Alaskan educators reviewed the Technology Practice Test in July and provided valuable feedback to AAI for bias and sensitivity as well as user experience. Over 900 educators are currently in the AMP database and are participating in panels for the review of items for the assessment. To apply complete the application at http://bit.ly/amp_reviews_2014. Reviews are currently scheduled for: August 7 – 13, August 27 – September 2, October 8 – 14, and November 18 – 24.

| ACRONYMS |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| AAI | Achievement & Assessment Institute |
| ALD | Achievement Level Descriptor |
| AMP | Alaska Measures of Progress |
| CBA | Computer-based Assessment |
| LCS | Local Caching System |
| TE | Technology-Enhanced item |
| TPT | Technology Practice Test |

| GLOSSARY |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Achievement Level Descriptors | Achievement level descriptors (ALDs) are a means of describing performance on a standardized test in terms of levels or categories of performance. |
| Adaptive Assessment | Assessments adjust in difficulty based on student performance, unlike fixed form assessments. Adaptive assessments provide greater score precision and provide an assessment experience for students that is “a good fit.” |
| Constructed Response Item | Items that require students to keyboard an answer, such as a short answer or essay question. |
| Fixed Form Assessment | A static assessment that does not adjust to student performance during testing. |
| Item (test item) | The question and answer choices. |
| KITE | Test Delivery Engine for the AMP assessments. |
| Technology Enhanced Item (TE) | Items other than standard multiple-choice. |
| Technology Practice Test | Short tests focused on providing students with experience in the technology-enhanced item types and the computer-based testing experience. |
The AMP Assessment Window: In 2015, the window will be five weeks long: Monday, March 30 – Friday, May 1. Unlike the paper/pencil SBAs, not all students in a district will take the computer-based assessment on the same days.

The following chart shows the designated testing weeks for each grade level. Two options are given. Option A is designed to accommodate larger elementary/middle/high schools with single-grade classrooms; option B is designed to accommodate smaller K-12 schools.

However, districts are not restricted to either option; districts may choose to test students earlier than the designated weeks, but may not delay testing for grades beyond the “finish week” and may not test earlier than March 30, 2015. For example, a school may test grades 3-8 in week 1. A school may not test grade 3 after week 2. EED strongly recommends districts test all students as early as possible within the window. Examples for testing schedules are being developed and will be available in the fall of 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMP Option A</th>
<th>AMP Option B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 March 30-April 3</td>
<td>Begin Grade 3, Grade 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 April 6-10</td>
<td>Begin Grade 4, Grade 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 April 13-17</td>
<td>Begin Grade 5, Grade 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 April 20-24</td>
<td>Begin Grade 6, Grade 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 April 27-May 1</td>
<td>Finish Grade 6, Grade 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Science: The Alaska science content standards have not been revised and there is currently no date for when this revision may happen. The science test for grades 4, 8, and 10 is not changing at this time. The paper/pencil science assessment in 2015 will continue to be managed by Data Recognition Corporation (DRC). Districts must administer the science test March 30 – April 10, 2015. All students of the same grade level must take the science assessment on the same day. Science will be administered as part of our computer-based assessment beginning in spring 2016; it will assess our current science content standards.

AMP paper/pencil: Approved schools will administer the paper/pencil AMP on district-designated days within April 13-24, 2015. If more than one school in a district is approved for paper/pencil administration, they must administer the assessment on the same two days. Students must take the same portions of the assessment on the same day (e.g., all students must take the first math section on the same day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science paper/pencil grades 4,8,10</th>
<th>AMP paper/pencil Approved schools only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 March 30-April 3</td>
<td>Districts designate one testing day per grade in this window (all three grades may test on the same day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 April 6-10</td>
<td>Approved schools will designate 2 testing days for all students within this window.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 April 13-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 April 20-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5 April 27-May 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Activities Timeline (2014-15)

- July 2014: Practice Test item remote-review (bias and sensitivity)
- Summer & Fall 2014: Item reviews with Alaskan Educators begin; ongoing
- August 2014: AMP rollout activities begin; ongoing through year
- September 2014: Technology Practice Test available; will be available throughout year
- September 17: Achievement Level Descriptor Review Meeting
- November 10-11; February 25-27: District Test Coordinator Trainings
- January 2015: Testlets available
- March 30 – May 1 2015: AMP online test window
- July 7- 10, 2015: Standard Setting Meeting for 2015 assessment

Assessment Development Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summative</strong>, fixed form</td>
<td><strong>Summative</strong>, fixed form</td>
<td><strong>Summative</strong>, adaptive</td>
<td><strong>Summative</strong>, adaptive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine scored multiple choice and technology enhanced items</td>
<td>Field test: listening, essay, math performance task</td>
<td>Operational: listening, essay, math performance task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11/04/2014 UPDATES SUMMARY

1. The interim assessment will be implemented in the fall of 2016 instead of the fall of 2015. This is to allow time for our test developer to design an assessment that can be used effectively to guide instruction for teachers. The interim assessment will not be approved by the commissioner for use in educator evaluation; it is not designed for this purpose.

2. Accessibility and Accommodations: Students will have access to a greater variety of accessibility tools as part of the computer-based assessment system. These tools are described in detail in the Participation Guidelines. Universal Tools are for all students and are accessible at all times and include: highlighter, striker, eraser, tags, guideline, search, calculators on portions of the test, and text-to-speech for directions. Accessibility Tools are available to students with any type of documented need; these tools include auditory calming, magnification, masking, and text-to-speech on the math portion of the test for items, answer choices, and graphics. Accommodation Tools are available to students with disabilities and students who are English language learners. The embedded Accommodation Tools in AMP include color contrast, text-to-speech on ELA items and answer choices (this does not include reading passages), and one or two switch scanning. PLEASE NOTE: this is a change from previous statements. ELA text-to-speech is an Accommodation Tool, not an Accessibility Tool.

10/13/2014 UPDATES SUMMARY

1. The Interim Benchmark Assessment will be a fixed form until 2017 at which time it will be adaptive, like the summative.

2. Pending approval by the Commissioner, the AMP assessment will be designed to meet the requirements for educator evaluation regulations.

3. Each AMP subtest will take most students between two and three hours. The essay (administered as a field test in 2016) will take most students 30-45 minutes.

4. Draft Achievement Level Descriptors were reviewed by Alaska educators on September 17, 2014. Revised drafts will be available for teachers in January 2015. They will be brought before the SBOE and available for public comment in July 2015. Pending approval, final versions will be published, along with standard setting cut scores, in September 2015.

5. EED strongly recommends districts download the KITE Client on all district devices not later than October 31, 2014.

6. Chromebook and iPad apps are now both available via the Chrome Web Store and App Store.

7. AAI has hired Alaskan technology liaisons who will provide additional virtual and on-site assistance to districts and schools. Districts can access this assistance through the help desk.

8. AMP brochures for educators and families were mailed to schools in August and are also available on the EED website under the yellow Parents & Community star.

10. Alaska’s science content standards have not been revised. There is currently no date when a revision may happen. Science will be administered as part of our computer-based assessments beginning in spring 2016 and will assess the current science content standards.
September 15, 2014

Dear Parent or Guardian:

On May 13, 2014, Governor Parnell signed into law a comprehensive education bill – The Alaska Education Opportunity Act. One part of this law repeals the High School Graduation Qualifying Examination (HSGQE) and provides funding for all students to take a College- or Career-Readiness Assessment (CCRA). The approved career-readiness assessment is Workkeys; the approved college-readiness assessments are the ACT or the SAT. Students choose which assessment best fits their post-secondary path.

The State of Alaska will pay for one administration of one assessment per student starting in grade 11. Public high school students may take the assessment during the scheduled school day administration or the designated Saturday National Test day administration.

All grade 11 students are required to take a CCRA; students who miss the opportunity in grade 11 may take an assessment in grade 12. Please note: all grade 11 students in the 2013-14 school year were required to take the WorkKeys assessment. These students have met the new requirement for earning an Alaska high school diploma and do not need to take an additional CCRA. Current grade 12 students who did not take the WorkKeys assessment will need to take their choice of a CCRA to be eligible for a diploma.

- Students choose which of the three assessments they will take. School counselors and teachers will share information with students on the difference between the tests. The following websites provide parent information for each assessment:
  - ACT: http://www.act.org/path/parent
  - SAT: https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/get-started/for-parents
- The paid assessments are scheduled for the following dates:
  - WorkKeys Paper/Pencil Testing March 4 or April 1, 2015
  - ACT In-School Day – March 3 or March 31, 2015
  - ACT National Test Day – Saturday, February 7, 2015
  - SAT School Day – February 25 or April 29, 2015
  - SAT National Test Day – Saturday, January 24, 2015
- Minimum scores are not required for high school graduation.
The Alaska Performance Scholarship (APS) also requires students to take WorkKeys, the SAT or the ACT. The APS has different requirements regarding student scores. Please visit http://aps.alaska.gov for more information on qualifying for the APS.

For more information or questions regarding this new requirement, please contact your high school guidance counselor or principal. Further information is also available at http://education.alaska.gov/tls/assessment/ccra.html or by contacting the CCRA project coordinator, Shari Paul, at shari.paul@alaska.gov or 465-6535.

Sincerely,

Erik McCormick
Director
Assessment, Accountability & Information Management
Alaska Dept. of Education & Early Development
To:       Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
December 5, 2014

From:     Michael Hanley, Commissioner  
Agenda Item: 17

ISSUE
This is a standing report to the board regarding rural education.

BACKGROUND
- The Rural Education Coordinator is located in Fairbanks and works from the Juneau department office periodically and more frequently during the legislative session.

- Behind this cover memo is a report of activities since the last board meeting and five resolutions, pertaining to education, passed at the Alaska Federation of Natives Annual Convention.

- Chris Simon, Rural Education Coordinator, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
Rural Education Coordinator Report

November 10, 2014

First Peoples’ Cultural Council Meeting with Doyon Foundation

Traveled to British Columbia courtesy of Doyon Foundation and met with FPCC to learn more about their governance structure, programming, tools, and resources. The FPCC operates three programs, which it provides funding and resources to: promote Native language, arts and archivedigital recordings. Doyon Foundation plans to bring similar programs to the Interior villages it serves.

Visit to Mountain Village

Visited the staff at Lower Yukon School District and attended a portion of their regularly scheduled school board meeting in October. Commissioner Hanley and I were on our way to attend the new school open house at Emmonak but were weathered out by fog.

Small School Closure Task Force

Met several times with the Fairbanks-based Tanana Chiefs Conference Small School Closure Task Force and presented the appropriate statutes and regulations pertaining to school closure. By providing jobs and housing, TCC and the Beaver Tribal Council attracted new families into the community and the school enrollment increased above ten students.

National Indian Education Association Convention

The National Indian Education Association held their annual convention and trade show in Anchorage on October 16-18. The Alaska Department of Education & Early Development had a booth at the trade show in which copies of the Guide to Implementing the Alaska Cultural Standards for Educators were shared.

Alaska Federation of Natives Convention
A week later the Commissioner and I manned the EED booth at the Alaska Federation of Natives Convention in Anchorage. An AFN board member requested I sit on the Credentials Committee for elections, which was accepted.

PITAAS Advisory Board

The University of Alaska Southeast offers the Preparing Indigenous Teachers for Alaska Schools (PITAAS) program, which recently received a federal grant to continue. I will be learning more about it at the first Advisory Board meeting on November 20.

Rural Alaska Community Action Program, Inc.

RurAL CAP was recently awarded an Alaska Native Education Program grant that will provide the continuation of Parents as Teachers services for 286 children in thirteen villages. In addition, RurAL CAP’s Child Development Division agreed to provide program development, management training, and technical assistance to expand licensed child care services in the North Slope Borough. Memoranda of Agreement were entered into with Bering Strait School District, Lower Kuskokwim School District, Yupiit School District, and Kake School District for local Head Start services.

American Indian/Alaska Native Advisory Board

The Northwest Comprehensive Center recently established the NCC American Indian/Alaska Native Education Advisory Board, which held its first meeting in October. The goals created were teacher and education leader preparation in terms of increasing the number of Native teachers and increasing the cultural awareness of future and current teachers. The final goal was to promote equitable access to opportunity before, within and beyond K-12. This was followed up by a meeting with advisory boards from the Comprehensive Centers from the South Central, West, and North Central. The main priority from this meeting is to focus on turning around low-performing schools.

Kivalina Evacuation and School Access Road

The steering committee met on August 29, 2014, with over 30 participants from numerous organizations. It was reported the reconnaissance study is complete and the best case scenario for road construction would be 2016/2017 according to design engineer company WHPacific.
Geotechnical work is still necessary and may be conducted this coming March or April. The Northwest Arctic Borough mentioned they are advertising for a firm or individual to provide services as the Project Manager. The next meeting is planned for early December 2014.

Title IV Review Steering Committee

This committee is wrapping up its work and will present a number of recommendations prior to the legislature session on licensing, role of the ABC Board, underage drinking, and Local Option. Final recommendations will be made available when completed.
REQUEST FOR ALASKA NATIVE TRIBES, VILLAGES, AND REGIONAL NON PROFITS TO COORDINATE, COLLABORATE AND WORK TOGETHER TO IMPROVE RURAL EDUCATION AND KEEP RURAL SCHOOL OPEN

WHEREAS: The Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) is the largest statewide Native organization in Alaska and its membership includes 165 federally-recognized tribes, 146 village corporations, 12 regional corporations, and 12 regional nonprofit and tribal consortiums that contract and compact to run federal and state programs; and

WHEREAS: The mission of AFN is to enhance and promote the cultural, economic, and political voice of the entire Alaska Native community; and

WHEREAS: Education is the key to a better future for Alaska Native peoples; and

WHEREAS: Education of Alaska Native children is a high priority and an essential foundation for building strong Alaskan Native leadership; and

WHEREAS: Case studies and qualitative studies have demonstrated the educational benefits of a culturally based education; and

WHEREAS: Alaska’s tribes and villages are harmed when villages school close and the effects of a school closure are devastating; and

WHEREAS: Resources are used efficiently and effectively when Villages, Regional Nonprofit Organizations, and other Alaska Native Education Stakeholders come together with local boards of education to build partnerships, share information, and develop strategies.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates of the 2014 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives request that Tribes, Villages, Regional Nonprofits, and Alaska Native Education Stakeholders work together with local boards of education and coordinate in sharing information, strategies, and best practices that will bring about positive and culturally relevant education change to Alaska Native students; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that the Alaska Federation of Natives request that Tribes, Villages, Regional Nonprofits, and Alaska Native Education Stakeholders work together with local boards of education and coordinate in sharing information, strategies, and best practices to keep rural school open, thereby keeping villages strong; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be the policy of AFN until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution.

Submitted by: TANANA CHIEFS CONFERENCE
COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS
CONVENTION ACTION: ADOPT AS AMENDED
TITLE: TO AMEND THE ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION EQUITY ACT AND UTILIZE ALL LEGISLATIVE TOOLS TO ENSURE THAT FUNDING IS ADMINISTERED BY ALASKA NATIVE ORGANIZATIONS

WHEREAS: The Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) is the largest statewide Native organization in Alaska and its membership includes 165 federally-recognized tribes, 146 village corporations, 12 regional corporations, and 12 regional nonprofit and tribal consortiums that contract and run federal and state programs; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Native Federation of Natives is the largest statewide Native organization in Alaska and its membership includes 165 federally-recognized tribes, 146 village corporations, 12 regional corporations, and 12 regional nonprofit and tribal consortiums that contract and run federal and state programs; and

WHEREAS: The mission of AFN is to enhance and promote the cultural, economic, and political voice of the entire Alaska Native community; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Native Education Equity Act was enacted by Congress in 2002 and provides approximately $33 million per year in funding for programs across the State that address the needs of Alaska Native students—from early childhood education to secondary school preparation programs; and

WHEREAS: The Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) does not contribute funds to the education of Alaska Native students; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Native Education Equity Act authorizes the use of funds under the Act for the development of curriculum and educational programs that reflect and are aligned with the cultural diversity, language and contributions of Alaska Native people and for other supplemental educational programs that support Alaska Native college and career readiness; and

WHEREAS: The Alaska Native Educational Equity Act states that it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage maximum participation by Alaska Native people in the planning and management of Alaska Native Education programs; and

WHEREAS: The Act also authorizes the Department of Education to fund programs under this act administered by Alaska Native Organizations and tribes, educational entities and cultural and community-based organizations; and

WHEREAS: Assessments of grant funding reflects the following:

- Fewer awards granted to Alaska Native Organizations and tribes
- More awards to school districts, University of Alaska, and other organizations, and
- Alaska Native Organizations and tribes may be identified as “Partners” with school districts, University of Alaska, or other organizations, but in actuality have little to no control or oversight of the grant development, implementation, and programs; and

WHEREAS: Because of the pressure by Congress, the Department of Education, for the first time, used only the priorities listed in the legislation, and has attempted to implement quality controls to
ensure "meaningful partnerships," but school districts and universities still received the bulk of the grants in FY14; and

WHEREAS: The Department of Education has not yet adequately defined "meaningful partnerships" such that Alaska Native Organizations and tribes provide the leadership; and

WHEREAS: School Districts and Universities have access to other funding for which Alaska Native Organizations and tribes are ineligible to apply; and

WHEREAS: The Act specifically prioritizes funding for Alaska Native regional nonprofit organizations or consortia that include such Alaska Native Organizations and tribes; and

WHEREAS: Native Cultures and Languages have been documented to serve as resilience factors in youth, and inclusion of such content in meaningful ways can support academic success; and

WHEREAS: Alaska Native corporations, organizations, and tribes throughout the State of Alaska are working to improve Native Education through intentional and strategic programs that utilize culturally relevant curricula; and

WHEREAS: Over the last ten years, Alaska Native Organizations and tribes have successfully demonstrated that they can provide programs that improve academic performance of Alaska Native students; and

WHEREAS: Alaska Native Organizations and tribes have also offered programs that offer social, emotional and technological supports that demonstrate proven student success in addition to language and culture; and

WHEREAS: Alaska Native Organizations and tribes, working in partnerships with Schools, Universities, or other Organizations as the lead can ensure the success of Alaska Native students; and

WHEREAS: The term Alaska Native Organization has the following definition in the current legislation:

"ALASKA NATIVE ORGANIZATION.—The term 'Alaska Native organization' means a federally recognized tribe, consortium of tribes, regional nonprofit Native association, and another organization that—

(A) has or commits to acquire expertise in the education of Alaska Natives; and

(B) has Alaska Natives in substantive and policymaking positions within the organization;" and

WHEREAS: Though not typically considered Alaska Native Organizations, local boards of education consisting of a majority of Alaska Native Members fit the definition of an Alaska Native organization.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates of the 2014 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives support the continuation of Alaska Native Education Equity Act funding in order to meet the dire needs of Alaska Native students, and urges the Alaska delegation to pursue every means possible to ensure inclusion and continuation of the Alaska Native Education
Equity Act in the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and to ensure that sufficient funding for the program is appropriated and authorized; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Alaska Federation of Natives further urges Congress to take action to ensure that grants funded by the Alaska Native Educational Equity Program are administered through Alaska Native Organizations and tribes and as lead grantees with partners, and that the Department of Education consults with Alaska Native Organizations and tribes to identify programmatic priority areas for future funding; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Alaska Federation of Native calls upon the Department of Education to require evidence of meaningful partnerships including memorandums of agreement, evidence of shared budgets and costs, and partner involvement in planning and implementation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Alaska Federal of Natives requests that the Congressional delegation take action to ensure that the Department of Education issues a Request for Proposals for FY 2015, rather than using the applications from FY2014 to distribute the over $20 million in grants for FY15.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that AFN advocate for full inclusion of tribes and tribal education departments in all funding opportunities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be the policy of AFN until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution.

SUTMITTED BY: COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ALASKA NATIVES
COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS
CONVENTION ACTION: ADOPT AS AMENDED
Title: SUPPORTING EXPANDED STATEWIDE FUNDING FOR EARLY LEARNING

Whereas: From earliest times, Alaska Native people in all the cultures active in AFN have understood young children’s innate capabilities for learning and have demonstrated their love and caring for children, and

Whereas: Today, more than 50% of Alaska children enter school unprepared to read or learn, yet it is well known that to make sure no child is left behind, no child should start behind; and

Whereas: Research shows brain connections grow dramatically from birth to age 6, affecting lifelong learning capability, and parents, child care providers and educators who read, tell stories and have positive daily interactions with young children promote children’s brain development; and

Whereas: Investments in quality early learning programs can return from $7 to $17 for every dollar spent as participating children have higher literacy rates, increased graduation rates and better attitudes toward school, and, as adults, are less likely to commit crimes and are more likely to earn higher salaries; and

Whereas: Pre-Kindergarten pilot programs have demonstrated significant impact of early learning programs, including 70% readiness for kindergarten after rigorous evaluation; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates of the 2014 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives support expanding the early learning funding across the state to make the most important investment in the next generation by:

1. Increasing the engagement of parents, grandparents and extended family in their child’s learning by providing resources and incentives.
2. Developing and increasing access to quality, culturally engaging reading materials.
3. Increasing proven, family centered programs by partnering with other organizations.
5. Implementing a quality rating and improvement system to help parents evaluate child care and early learning programs and to guide program improvement.
6. Increasing the professional development opportunities and qualifications for early childhood educators and provide appropriate compensation.
7. Developing and fully fund a statewide system of voluntary early childhood education.
8. Educating Alaskans about the social imperative of preparing children from birth to age 6 to be ready to read and learn.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be the policy of AFN until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution.

SUBMITTED BY: COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ALASKA NATIVES
COMMITTEE ACTION: DO PASS
CONVENTION ACTION: ADOPT AS AMENDED
TITLE: SCHOOL SUPPORT RESOLUTION

WHEREAS: The Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) is the largest statewide Native organization in Alaska and its membership includes 165 federally-recognized tribes, 146 village corporations, 12 regional corporations, and 12 regional nonprofit and tribal consortiums that contract and compact to run federal and state programs; and

WHEREAS: The mission of AFN is to enhance and promote the cultural, economic, and political voice of the entire Alaska Native community; and

WHEREAS: Mt. Edgecumbe High School (MEHS), Galena Interior Learning Academy, and other rural schools in Alaska provides a unique educational setting for students, whether rural or urban, who want more course offerings or more individualized attention and smaller class sizes, and

WHEREAS: Many MEHS and other rural school graduates have found a variety of post-secondary successes due to the education they received at MEHS and other schools; and

WHEREAS: All rural schools in Alaska are facing incredible challenges as energy infrastructure in rural Alaska is lacking forcing rural schools to expend up to forty percent into heat and electricity taking away essential dollars from students; and

WHEREAS: Some of our rural schools have closed down due to minimum enrollment requirements compromising quality professional education for our rural students; and

WHEREAS: When the Department of Education and Early Development was required to reduce its budget and due to the flat funding of the Base Student Allocation, MEHS and other rural schools were forced to cut teaching positions, causing an increase in class size and potentially reducing the quality of education; and

WHEREAS: This budget shortfall has resulted in fewer course offerings and larger teacher-student ratios; and

WHEREAS: Every year, there are a decrease of funds available from federal grants to fund MEHS and other rural schools; and

WHEREAS: The graduates and parents from across Alaska appreciate the education offered at Mt. Edgecumbe High School and rural schools do not want to see the quality of an MEHS education or rural schools diminish due to budget cuts; and

WHEREAS: Supporters of MEHS and rural schools also support the teachers; and.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates of the 2014 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives advocate for a restoration of needed funding to Mt. Edgecumbe High School to maintain its prior level of services to students and restore funding to re-hire the much needed teachers; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that AFN requests that the honorable members of the Alaska State Legislature pass a legislative resolution providing for a meaningful yearly increase in the Base Student Allocation, which keeps up with inflation and rising fuel costs in order that MEHS and rural schools may continue to provide a consistent level of service and high quality education for Alaskan students; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be the policy of AFN until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution

SUBMITTED BY: COUNCIL FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ALASKA NATIVES
COMMITTEE ACTION:  DO PASS
CONVENTION ACTION: ADOPT AS AMENDED
TITLE: INITIATIVES TO REVERSE THE STATUS OF ALASKA NATIVE LANGUAGES AS ENDANGERED LANGUAGES

WHEREAS: The Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN) is the largest statewide Native organization in Alaska and its membership includes 165 federally-recognized tribes, 146 village corporations, 12 regional corporations, and 12 regional nonprofit and tribal consortiums that contract and compact to run federal and state programs; and

WHEREAS: The mission of AFN is to enhance and promote the cultural, economic, and political voice of the entire Alaska Native community; and

WHEREAS: Alaska Native languages embody our cultures, worldview, and the knowledge of our ancestors; and

WHEREAS: Alaska Native languages exemplify the richness of our land and define our group orientation and kinship; and

WHEREAS: Alaska Native languages personify our tangible and intangible relationship to our land, wildlife and universe; and

WHEREAS: Linguistics have classified Alaska Native languages as deteriorating and nearing extinction; and

WHEREAS: No Alaska Native language group is producing new speakers with a Native language as their first language except perhaps in rare instances; and

WHEREAS: At the time America was colonized more than 300 Native American languages were spoken, but today the number of Native languages spoken has dropped to just over half of the original number and most are identified as endangered; and

WHEREAS: Federal programs have been enacted to support Native American, Alaska Natives and Pacific Islander communities to facilitate language preservation and revitalization activities; and

WHEREAS: In 2012 the total federal dollars spend on all Alaska Natives and American Indian languages was $14.6 million; and

WHEREAS: These federal dollars are totally inadequate to support and reverse the status of Alaska Native and American Indian languages as endangered; and

WHEREAS: The State of Alaska enacted An Act establishing the Alaska Native Language Preservation and Advisory Council in 2012; and

WHEREAS: The State of Alaska enacted An Act Adding Alaska Native languages as official languages as of the State; and

WHEREAS: The State of Alaska failed to allocate any funds under these Acts for language revitalization programs; and
WHEREAS: The State of Alaska established the University of Alaska Native Language Center in 1972 for the documentation of Alaska Native languages; and

WHEREAS: Studies and data have conclusively demonstrated that the integration of Native languages into schools enhances the academic achievement of Native students that result in further and numerous benefits to Alaska Natives and the State of Alaska.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates of the 2014 Annual Convention of the Alaska Federation of Natives urge the President and Congress to adopt the following initiatives:

1. Adopt a Proclamation and Policy that declares that Alaska Native languages are endangered and provide funds to reverse the status of Alaska Native languages as endangered.
2. Issue an Executive Order that Alaska Native Languages are endangered and that the Order shall direct government agencies to support Alaska Native Languages through their agency funding, programs and activities.
3. Provide additional funding for Head Start and early childhood education programs dedicated for the integration of Alaska Native languages into these programs.
4. Direct the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities to expand its language grants to provide for Alaska Native Organizations and tribes to work with first language speakers to document the full and contextualized meaning of Alaska Native languages.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Alaska Federation of Natives urges the Governor and the Alaska State Legislature to adopt the following initiatives:

1. Adopt a Proclamation and Policy that declares that Alaska Native languages are endangered and provide funds to reverse the status of Alaska Native languages as endangered.
2. Issue an Executive Order that Alaska Native Languages are endangered and that the Order shall direct state governmental agencies to support Alaska Native Languages through their agency funding, programs and activities.
3. Provide funding for Alaska Native Language Restoration grants to Alaska Native Organization and tribes including funds to integrate Native languages into Head Start and early education programs under the auspices of the Alaska Native Language Preservation and Advisory Council.
4. Direct the Alaska Department of Education to promote the integration of Alaska Native languages into Alaska schools.
5. Direct the University of Alaska Native Language Center to establish the revitalization of Alaska Native Languages as its highest priority in funding and allocation of resources and to provide for funded professional development and training in language restoration teaching methods that support potential and current Alaska Native teachers' ability to be successful as teachers.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be the policy of AFN until it is withdrawn or modified by subsequent resolution.

SUBMITTED BY: SEALASKA CORPORATION, CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIAN TRIBES OF ALASKA SOUTHEAST ALASKA VILLAGES

BOARD ACTION: CONVENTION ACTION: ADOPT AS AMENDED
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
December 5, 2014

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  
Agenda Item: 18

ISSUE
This is a standing report to the board regarding legislation.

BACKGROUND
- The board will be briefed on the House and Senate Education Committee Chairs as well as the House and Senate Finance Committees for the 29th Legislative Session.

- The Alaska State Budget is due to be released by December 15, 2014, and will not be available at meeting time.

- Any available information on legislative committee assignments will be distributed at the board meeting.

- Marcy Herman, Legislative Liaison, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an information update. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 19

ISSUE
This is a standing report to the board regarding activities at Mt. Edgecumbe High School in Sitka.

BACKGROUND
- Behind this cover memo is the quarterly report for Mt. Edgecumbe High School.
- Superintendent Troy “J” Thayne will present to the board via online.

OPTIONS
This is an informational item. No action necessary
Curriculum Schedule

A few questions came up at the last Board Meeting concerning the process for adopting curriculum at Mt. Edgecumbe High School. The attached materials from the Mt. Edgecumbe High School Policy Manual address this process.

2014-15 Student October Count

We ended the October count at 416 students, 5 over last years count.

Attendance at AFN

September Horton (Admissions) and two of our students attended Elders and Youth/AFN Conference October 20-25 in Anchorage. They spent the week promoting MEHS and making connections with MEHS Alumni. Attending this event helps present MEHS as an educational opportunity for students.

Developmental Assets – Teacher Training

This January teachers at MEHS will receive a similar version of the asset training our Dorm staff received last year in order to increase consistency. The training is taken from “Helping Kids Succeed - Alaskan Style.”

RTI Conference

MEHS will again be sending a team to the January RTI Conference in Anchorage. The group representing MEHS will be members of our RTI Committee. Our RTI Committee is helping to organize practices and procedures related to RTI at MEHS and are working to coordinate appropriate interventions and monitoring procedures related to Tiers 1-2-3.

Activities

- Volleyball finished the year as the Region V Champs as well as the Alaska School Activities Association 3-A State Champions.
- Girls Cross Country won regionals
- Mt. Edgecumbe currently has 50 girls participating in the new Statewide program.

International Education Week
International Education Week is an opportunity for exchange students worldwide to share with their host communities their cultures and highlight the benefits of the international educational exchange program. Mt. Edgecumbe will have guests presenting from Bangladesh, Albania, Russia, Moldova, and Germany.

**Color of Justice**

Mt. Edgecumbe High School will host the Color of Justice this year. 75 MEHS Junior and Senior students will participate. There are only two school districts in the entire state of Alaska that offer this program to H.S. students: The Anchorage School District is one & MEHS is the other.

The Color of Justice program offers exciting workshops and activities designed to encourage diverse youth from across Alaska to consider legal and judicial careers. Law professors from Pacific Northwest law schools will join Alaskan judges, attorneys, and community leaders to challenge & inspire our students with the hope they may one day consider pursuing a legal education and a future in law and judiciary.

Color of Justice is a special program for minority high school students sponsored by the National Association of Women Judges (NAWJ) and co-sponsored by the Alaska Court System, Bruce E. Horton Foundation, University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska Federation of Natives, Alaska Native Justice Center, Seattle University School of Law, Gonzaga University School of Law, and the University of Washington School of Law, with support from the Alaska Bar Association, the Law School Admission Council, the Northwest Indian Bar Association and the Council on Legal Education Opportunity.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
December 5, 2014

From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner  
Agenda Item: 20

♦ ISSUE
This is a regularly-scheduled report from the Director of Libraries, Archives & Museums about the recent activities of the Division. Subjects include:

♦ BACKGROUND
• SLAM: Update on the SLAM (State Library, Archives & Museums) building project
  o Mitigation – flicker feather panels no longer an issue
  o Moving collections: Historical Library and Archives moves accelerated
  o Museum now has processing space and workshop space in SLAM

• National Archives & Records Administration (NARA) update
  o NARA is planning to digitize materials

• Library Projects
  o LEGOS
  o Early Literacy partnership with TLS
    ▪ FY2013: State Library sent early literacy kits to 70 public libraries
    ▪ FY2014:
      • State Library sent early literacy kits to 21 public libraries
      • State Library awarded 13 minigrants to public libraries to develop an early literacy space within their libraries - Coffman Cove, Homer, Hoonah, Kasilof, McGrath, Ninilchik, Nome, Sand Point, Sitka, Sutton, Thorne Bay, Valdez, Wrangell
    ▪ FY2015:
      • Early literacy programming train-the-trainer workshop for 18 librarians
      • More early literacy mini-grants
      • Refresh collections
  o VISTA partnership to work with three small libraries to provide community support and build capacity. Executive Summary is behind this memo.

• Behind this cover memo is the Library, Archives & Museums report.

• Linda Thibodeau, Director of LAM, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
This report is for informational purposes only.
Executive Summary – VISTA application

People living in rural communities rarely enjoy the quantity and quality of library services and programs that make life richer and more rewarding for people living in urban communities. The mission of the Library Development unit of the Alaska State Library is to provide leadership, assistance and expertise to Alaska’s libraries, in support of a cooperative network of strong and vibrant libraries that serve Alaskans’ educational and cultural needs. The Libraries Build Strong Communities project aligns precisely with Library Development’s goal of meeting Alaskan’s educational and cultural needs through improved library services.

This project aligns with the economic opportunity and education focus areas. The VISTA project will seek to improve the financial literacy and job readiness skills of the unemployed and underemployed in three rural communities and will also provide early literacy centers in three rural libraries targeting children in low income families. Three VISTA members will conduct community needs assessments and will subsequently develop workshops, online self-paced training classes and other resources that focus on financial literacy, job readiness skills and entrepreneurship; create early literacy centers in each library with programs that promote early literacy, numeracy skill and school readiness; and will improve library services by developing library trustee training, volunteer recruitment and management procedures and writing grant applications.

Need

Prince of Wales Island is located in Southeast Alaska and is the second-largest island in Alaska with a population of 6,434 people. The primary economic driver on Prince of Wales was once logging, but the timber industry has been in a steady decline since the 1990s. Employment opportunities have shifted to small proprietorships and family-run businesses that focus on tourism, commercial fishing or specialty wood mills. There are 12 communities on Prince of Wales Island which are connected by 2,000 miles of Forest Service roads and accessible to the outside only by air and the Ketchikan-Hollis Inter-Island ferry. The island is highly rural. Alaska Natives make up 40% of the population. The annual unemployment rate is 11.9%. The Libraries Build Communities Project will focus on improving the educational and economic opportunities of residents in four Prince of Wales communities: Coffman Cove, Kake and Thorne Bay.

Coffman Cove was first settled as a logging camp in the 1950s. The city government of Coffman Cove was incorporated in 1989. The town has a population of 163 residents with 14.3% estimated to be in poverty, based on the federal poverty threshold.

The village of Kake was established in the 1890s. In the early part of the 20th century, Kake became the first Alaska Native village to organize under federal law, resulting in U.S. citizenship for community residents. The city was incorporated in 1952. The current population in Kake is 598 with 22.5% estimated to be in poverty.
Thorne Bay began as a company-owned logging camp in the 1960s. In 1962, Ketchikan Pulp moved its main logging camp, which consisted of a shop, barge terminal, log sort yard, from Hollis to Thorne Bay. At this time, it was consider largest logging camp in North America. In 1982, Thorne Bay became an incorporated city. It currently has a population of 518 with 18.9% estimated to be poverty.

The communities on Prince of Wales are in a transitional period as the island economic base shifts from logging and commercial fishing to the visitor industry and small family owned businesses. Technology has significantly changed how business is conducted. Residents on Prince of Wales need to become competent in digital literacy skills, skills required to communicate in a digital environment, obtain digital information and produce products (such as a resumes, job applications or small business plans) in order to compete in today's workforce. Residents will gain a greater level of control over their lives as their financial literacy knowledge improves.

**Sources**


**Strengthening Communities**

This innovative project will focus on improving the education and economic opportunity of residents in three communities: Coffman Cove, Kake and Thorne Bay, while also improving the effectiveness, services and sustainability of the public library in each of these communities.

Public libraries serve a variety of roles in a community. The library is a center of literacy, learning and scholarship, as well as a safety net providing access to materials, information and resources, such as the internet, to those otherwise unable to afford these materials. One of the most important roles a library may play in a community is that as an economic stimulus.

Public libraries support workforce and small business development. Whenever a resident borrows materials from a library rather than purchasing these items, their money is available to be spent elsewhere in the community. Library services such as resume writing
workshops, interview preparation and digital literacy workshops help the unemployed and the underemployed locate, apply for and land a job. When libraries form partnerships with state agencies, chambers of commerce and non-profits to assist small businesses, they can create a civic environment that attracts business.

A VISTA volunteer placed in each community will be based in the library and work collaboratively with local and state agencies, schools and non-profits to conduct community needs assessment and use the information to develop workshops, online self-paced training opportunities and resources that focus on financial literacy, job readiness skills and entrepreneurship. The VISTA volunteer will also work collaboratively with local and state agencies, schools and non-profits to create early literacy centers in each library and develop programs that promote early literacy, numeracy skill and school readiness. The VISTA volunteer will work on improving library services by developing library trustee training, volunteer recruitment and management procedures and grant writing. In Kake, the VISTA volunteer will work with community members and the local school district to develop a plan that addresses the decision-making, financing, policies, services, facilities, staffing and technology involved in creating a combined school/public library.

Project Sites

VISTAs will be placed in Coffman Cove and Thorne Bay on Prince of Wales Island and in Kake, which is located on Kupreanof Island. The Alaska State Library has a strong working relationship with the two libraries on Prince of Wales Island and is re-developing its working relationship with Kake, which is re-developing its combined school/public library after exiting the public library assistance grant program managed by the State Library some years ago.

Outcomes

- To conduct a comprehensive community needs assessment in the communities of Coffman Cove, Kake and Thorne Bay and use the findings to develop workforce development and entrepreneurial programs targeted to the unemployed and underemployed.
- To create early literacy centers in the public libraries in the communities of Coffman Cove, Kake, and Thorne Bay and develop family programs that support pre-reading, numeracy and language development vital to children five and younger.
- To deliver library trustee training in the communities of Coffman Cove, Kake, and Thorne Bay that addresses responsibilities of the library board, the importance to having current bylaws, how to hold effective meetings, how to hire a library director, and how to develop a library budget.
• To establish a combined school/public library in the community of Kake with the collaboration and cooperation of the local school district that meets the needs of the entire community.

**Recruitment and Development**

Project partners have agreed to post the recruitment notice for the three VISTA positions in schools, government offices, public libraries and via their social media networks. The Alaska State Library will share information about these recruitment opportunities on the Alaska Library Association listserv, directly to libraries around the state, in the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development’s Information Exchange newsletter, and via social media networks.

In addition to a sense of adventure, there are five essential skills and characteristics the VISTAs will need to be successful: excellent communication, strong self-direction, ability to resolve conflicts and work in teams, and strong interpersonal skills.
ISSUE
This is a standing report from the Attorney General’s Office on education-related legal matters.

BACKGROUND
- Behind this cover memo is the Assistant Attorney General’s report.
- Assistant Attorney General Rebecca Hattan will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska
Department of Law

TO: Members, State Board of Education
DATE: November 5, 2014

FROM: Rebecca Hattan
Luann Weyhrauch
Assistant Attorneys General
Labor & State Affairs Section
Department of Law

FILE NO.: 663-01-0113
TEL. NO.: (907) 465-3600
FAX NO.: (907) 465-2520
SUBJECT: Attorney General’s Report

The following memorandum describes developments in litigation matters that have occurred since the last board meeting. For information on ongoing matters in which no new developments have occurred, please see previous reports.

ONGOING LITIGATION

1. Disability Law Center on behalf of G.M. v. State (In Re: G.M. II). The Disability Law Center filed an appeal of the Department's findings in the resolution of an administrative complaint. The appeal involved the Alaska Gateway School District’s implementation of a student’s IEP and the sufficiency of corrective action ordered by the Department. In part because the student transferred to another district, the Disability Law Center agreed to withdraw the case. As part of the settlement, the Department agreed to use certain training materials provided by the Disability Law Center for discussion at the Department’s investigator training in October of this year. The order dismissing the case was entered on June 19, 2014.

2. Grasmick v. Mat-Su et al. Parents of a disabled child appealed two due process hearing decisions in federal district court, and simultaneously filed a law suit against the Matanuska Susitna Borough School District, the Department of Education and Early Development as well as a number of District and Department employees. The parents allege violations of the IDEA, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and Section 1983 of the Civil Rights Act of 1971. Judge Burgess denied motions to dismiss submitted by both the district and the department, stating that he first intended to rule on the underlying appeals. On September 23\textsuperscript{rd} Judge Burgess ruled on both appeals, upholding the decisions of the department’s hearing officers in both due process claims. The department renewed its motion to dismiss all remaining
civil claims against the state on November 6, 2014.

3. **Miebs v. Anchorage School District et al.** Ms. Miebs survived an attempted murder committed by her estranged boyfriend, Nicholas Chamberlain. The attack took place at or near Service High School. Both Ms. Miebs and Mr. Chamberlain were students at Service High School. Prior to attending Service Mr. Chamberlain attended several other high schools in the state, including Mt. Edgecumbe. The complaint names numerous plaintiffs, including the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED). Plaintiff's theory of liability as to the Department is that Mt. Edgecumbe culpably failed to adequately warn Service High School about Mr. Chamberlain's behavioral history. Judge Tan granted Ms. Miebs an extension of time in order to properly serve the Department of Education. The State has now been properly served, and has answered Ms. Miebs' complaint. The Department is primarily represented in this matter by Cheryl Mandala, an attorney in the Torts section of the Department of Law, in consultation with Rebecca Hattan. Trial is currently set for September 2015.

4. **DEC Enforcement Matter related to Contamination at Aniak Middle School.** The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has identified DEED, DOT&PF, and the Kuspuks School District, as well as the federal government, AT&TAlascom, Lockheed Martin Corporation, and Exelis-Arctic Services, Inc., as potentially responsible parties (PRPs) for polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination at the site of the Aniak Middle School. The contamination dates back to the use of the site by the U.S. Air Force as a White Alice Communications System site from 1958 to 1979. From that era to the present, numerous factual and legal issues cloud the extent of each party's responsibility.

In September, 2013, the PRPs, along with their consultants and attorneys, convened in Anchorage for a mediation aimed at setting the allocation (percentage of responsibility) that each party would bear in a negotiated agreement to share past and future clean-up costs for PCB and TCE contamination. The mediation is a confidential process; it is part of a settlement negotiation. The parties were able to reach a tentative agreement on some issues, but not on others. The PRPs are now working on the terms of a draft settlement agreement. Once the PRPs agree on the terms of a draft agreement, there will be a separate negotiation with DEC before an agreement can be finalized.

5. **Ketchikan Gateway Borough et al. v. State of Alaska.** On January 13th, 2014, the Ketchikan Gateway Borough sued the State of Alaska, asking the court for declaratory judgment on several points of constitutional law. The lawsuit argues that the Required Local Contribution component of the Alaska
School funding formula violates Article IX, Section 7, the Alaska Constitution's anti-dedication clause. The lawsuit also alleges that the Required Local Contribution unconstitutionally deprives the Governor of his veto power under Article IX, section 13. The plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on February 6th, and the parties have agreed on a briefing schedule and the State filed a cross motion asking for summary judgment in its favor. Briefing in this matter is complete, and oral argument took place in Ketchikan on June 2nd, 2014. Judge Carey has taken the matter under advisement. A decision is expected by early December 2014.

6. *Gates v. Department of Education and Early Development.* On March 22, 2014, the Department received a notice of appeal regarding a teacher certification endorsement determination. An agency record in this matter has been prepared and distributed. The appellant’s brief was filed in late September and the Department filed its responsive brief on November 5th and the appellant’s reply brief is due November 19th.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

Agenda Item: 22

ISSUE
This is a standing report to the board by the Commissioner.

BACKGROUND
- The board will hear a report on the Commissioner’s activities.
- Commissioner Hanley will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
This is an information item. No action is required.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

Agenda Item: 23

ISSUE
The board is being asked to approve its consent agenda.

BACKGROUND
• There are six (6) items being presented on the consent agenda.
• Behind this cover memo are items 23A, 23B, 23C, 23D, 23E and 23F.

23A. Approve Minutes of September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting  
23B. Approve Minutes of October 29, 2014, meeting  
23C. Approve draft annual report to the legislature  
23D. Approve Appointments to the Museum Collections Advisory Committee  
23E. Approve Birchtree Charter School Reapplication  
23F. Approve SLAM Resolution

OPTIONS
Approve the entire consent agenda.  
Remove any number of consent agenda items and approve the remainder of the consent agenda individually; address those items removed.  
Seek additional information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION
Approve the entire consent agenda.

SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development approve the consent agenda consisting of the following: approval of the minutes of the September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting; approval of the minutes of the October 29, 2014, meeting; approval of the draft annual report to the legislature; approval of the appointments to the Museum Collections Advisory Committee; approval of the Birchtree Charter School Reapplication; and approval of the SLAM resolution.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

December 5, 2014  

Agenda Item: 23A

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to approve the minutes of its September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting.

♦ BACKGROUND
- Behind this cover memo are the proposed minutes of the board’s September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting.

♦ OPTIONS
Approve the minutes of the board’s September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting.
Amend the proposed minutes and approve the amended minutes of the September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting.
Seek additional information.

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION
Approve the minutes of the September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting as presented.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development approve the minutes of the September 18 & 19, 2014, meeting.
Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development

Unapproved Minutes

September 18-19, 2014

Anchorage, AK

Thursday, September 18

Chair Esther Cox called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. Kathleen Yarr was excused. Members recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The board unanimously approved the agenda. Jim Merriner declared a potential conflict of interest for agenda items regarding correspondence programs; Mr. Merriner is an administrator in the IDEA correspondence program. Ms. Cox ruled that Mr. Merriner could participate in the agenda items.

Public Comment

Sen. Mike Dunleavy said parents in correspondence programs want more flexibility, especially for students who are proficient or advanced. He asked if the proposed requirement of monthly contact between students and teachers was necessary if teachers agree to less frequent contact.

John Brown of Mat-Su Central School opposed the proposed requirement of monthly teacher contact with students. He said the proposed language regarding tutoring was ambiguous.

Peter Hoepfner of the Cordova School Board asked for alternate pathways to superintendency to create a larger pool of applicants.

Todd Poage, superintendent of the Alaska Gateway School District and president of the Alaska Superintendents Association, supported the rehire of retired superintendents.

Dr. Steve Atwater, superintendent of the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District, supported an alternate pathway to superintendency.

Pat Shier of the Alaska Home Educators Alliance said that correspondence program students who are proficient should be released from some regulatory requirements.

Lisa Parady, executive director of the Alaska Council of School Administrators and the Alaska Superintendents Association, said the hiring of superintendents is becoming more difficult and the candidates’ pool is thin.

Christie Reinhardt of the Governor’s Council on Disabilities and Special Education was pleased with the repeal of the high school exit exam. She approved of the proposed guidelines for student participation in assessments.

Rep. Lora Reinbold submitted a letter from several legislators expressing concerns about the date to first administer the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP), as well as the public notice for the regulation that included the assessment date. Rep. Reinbold said the term “testing material” was
not defined. She expressed concerns about the cost of the AMP and about the cyber security of the state’s AMP contractor.

Work Session

Agenda Item 1. Mt. Edgecumbe High School science curriculum. MEHS educators presented on the school’s science curriculum, noting that the curriculum uses close reading and math skills, in keeping with Alaska’s standards. Staff said they are looking at how the Next Generation Science Standards relate to MEHS’s curriculum. Staff answered board member’s questions about the number of required science credits, the number of students who take science electives, dual-credit courses, and state board’s authority to adopt the school’s curriculum.

Agenda Item 2. Career & Technical Education (CTE). Dr. Susan McCauley, director of Teaching & Learning Support, reviewed the department’s steps to fill CTE openings and provide the federal government with data on the postsecondary credentials of Alaska’s students. Board members said it is important to offer students more CTE options and that it is laborious to grant academic credit for CTE.

Agenda Item 3. Pre-Kindergarten. The department’s lead staff member for early education, Paul Sugar, reviewed his memo on pre-elementary, pre-kindergarten (pre-K), Head Start, and Parents as Teachers programs. He presented a written report on the third year of the department’s pre-kindergarten grant program, showing improvements in students’ measures of growth. Sue Hull asked how the state can prepare more children in pre-K programs, study long-term gains for pre-K students, and best spend the department’s pre-K funds.

Agenda Item 4. Funding. Administrative Director Heidi Teshner reviewed a memo about the department’s budget. Sue Hull asked how the board engages in the budget in a substantive way related to policy. Commissioner Hanley said the department’s budget is a function of the Governor’s budget and the legislature.

Agenda Item 5. Teacher Certification and Praxis Update. Dr. McCauley reviewed the staff memo, saying the department’s proposal for changes to certification requirements would be in firmer form in December, following input from the Education Certification Advisory Group.

Agenda Item 6. Chief School Administrator and Superintendent. Commissioner Hanley reviewed a memo related to the board’s repeal in 1992 of a waiver option for an administrator certificate. He reviewed what is required by statute and what is left to regulation. Board members discussed waivers, including when they should be granted in the hiring process, criteria, local flexibility, training of non-certificated administrators to evaluate educators, and alternate pathways in other certificates. The board directed staff to consider regulations for an initial administrator certificate that would allow an alternate pathway for superintendency.

In a non-agenda item, Ed Graff, superintendent of the Anchorage School District, presented to the board about a picture book and ebook the district has published.

Agenda Item 7. Alaska Arts Education. Shannon Daut, director of the Alaska State Council on the Arts, and Dr. Annie Calkins, special projects coordinator for the council, presented an August
2014 report, “Venture for Alaska’s Youth/Arts Education in Alaska.” The report presents results from a survey of district administrators and case studies from the New Visions project in four districts.

**Agenda Item 8. Assessment Development and Technology Practice Test.** Education Administrator Elizabeth Davis reported on scheduling flexibility, increased accessibility, and technology-enhanced questions in the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP). The board viewed a computer demonstration of the AMP Technology Practice Tests by Marianne Petrie, director of the Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation, which is affiliated with Alaska’s AMP contractor, the Achievement & Assessment Institute. Petrie also reviewed the role of Alaska educators in developing and vetting AMP, the stages of adaptive tests, and the timeline for making available Technology Practice Tests, classroom “testlets,” and benchmark tests. The board discussed informing the public about the AMP tests.

**Agenda Item 9A. Charter Schools.** Dr. McCauley reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 278 regarding charter schools.

**Agenda Item 9B. Correspondence Study Programs.** Dr. McCauley reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 278 regarding correspondence study programs. Board members discussed what constitutes sufficient teacher monitoring of students and asked about the criteria for tutors. The board wanted the proposed regulations to specify that in 4 AAC 33.426(c) the subject areas are English language arts and mathematics.

**Agenda Item 9C. Accountability Updates.** Erik McCormick, director of Assessment, Accountability & Information Management, reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 278 regarding assessment, accountability, jury service, and data about military families. Mr. McCormick noted that alternative high schools scored better under the Alaska School Performance Index after the board approved changes in calculating their index scores.

**Agenda Item 9D. Residential Schools.** Elizabeth Nudelman, director of School Finance, reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 278 regarding residential schools.

**Agenda Item 9E. Assessment Updates.** Mr. McCormick reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 278 regarding waivers from requirements that 11th-graders take a career-ready or college-ready assessment as a condition of receiving a high school diploma.

**Agenda Item 9F. Natural and Cultural History Repositories.** Linda Thibodeau, director of Libraries, Archives & Museums, reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 144 regarding the state’s designation of natural and cultural history repositories.

**Agenda Item 9G. Math Credits.** Dr. McCauley reviewed the proposed regulation to require students to have three credits of math as a condition of receiving a high school diploma. Dr. McCauley noted that 47 Alaska districts already require at least three credits, as do 42 states. Kobe Rizk asked why the department is not proposing a requirement of three science credits, as well. Dr. McCauley said many districts require only two science credits now, and districts have a lot of work to do on other issues.
Agenda Item 9H. Restraint and Seclusion. Dr. McCauley reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 210 regarding the restraint and seclusion of students.

Agenda Item 9I. Common Core Standards. Commissioner Hanley reviewed the proposed regulations to implement HB 278 regarding the Common Core Standards. The Commissioner said the legislature did not intend to prohibit spending to implement Alaska’s standards or prohibit the department from working with districts that adopted the Common Core as their district standards.

The board recessed at 5 p.m.

Friday, September 19

Work Session, Continued

Agenda Item 10A. HSGQE Elimination. Mr. McCormick reviewed regulations to adopt that would implement HB 278 regarding the exit exam and career-ready and college-ready assessments, as well as state accommodations for WorkKeys assessments. The regulations also set the 2014-2015 school year as the first year of the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) assessments. Jim Merriner asked about the issues Rep. Reinbold raised in public comment and a letter. Commissioner Hanley said the public notice for this regulation specified that it related to regulations from 4 AAC 06.701-.790, which include the AMP date. The change cleaned up regulatory language to match the date that Alaska agreed to in its waiver from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which was approved in May 2013. Districts have been preparing for the 2015 test date for a year and a half. Results from the 2015 AMP will not have consequences for schools in the Alaska School Performance Index and will not be used in teacher evaluations. The waiver allows Alaska to be exempt from the Adequate Yearly Progress system of NCLB and to institute its own accountability system, one that includes a measure of student growth.

Agenda Item 10B. Challenging Courses. Legislative Liaison Marcy Herman reviewed regulations to adopt that would implement HB 278 regarding challenging courses. Board members discussed whether districts would set a high bar for testing out of a course; whether districts had enough time to prepare for the effective date of July 1, 2015; subjects that can be challenged; districts’ costs to assess students’ mastery of course material; and a provision that would not let students test out of courses if they have completed or challenged a more advanced course.

The board added a provision that districts can charge a fee to cover their costs to develop and give assessments to test out of courses. The board removed the provision related to advanced courses.

Business Meeting

Agenda Item 11A. Charter Schools. Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 27.057 Charter school transportation policy; 4 AAC 33.110 Charter school application and review procedure;
and 4 AAC 33.113 through 4 AAC 33.119 Regarding charter schools. Jim Merriner seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item 11B. Correspondence Programs.** Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 09.160 Fund balance; and 4 AAC 33.421 through 4 AAC 33.426 Regarding correspondence study programs. Kenneth Gallahorn seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously. The version sent out for public comment clarifies that in 4 AAC 33.426(c) the subject areas are English language arts and mathematics.

**Agenda Item 11C. Accountability.** Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 06.812, Alaska school performance index; 4 AAC 06.883, Jury service exemption; 4 AAC 06.895, Report card to the public; 4 AAC 06.899, Definitions. Jim Merriner seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item 11D. Residential Schools.** Sue Hull moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 33.090(c); and 4 AAC 33.090 (h) Regarding district-operated statewide residential educational programs. James Fields seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item 11E. Assessments.** Sue Hull moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 06.775, Statewide assessment program for students with disabilities; 4 AAC 06.721, College and career readiness assessment waivers; 4 AAC 06.722, Waiver for entering the public school system late; 4 AAC 06.723, Rare or unusual circumstances; 4 AAC 06.724 Procedures for appeal from a denial of a waiver from college and career readiness assessments. Jim Merriner seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

In the version that went out for public comment, the board deleted from 4 AAC 06.722 (a): “A student who resides in the state but attends a private school or is home schooled as provided in AS 14.30.010 and transfers to a public school after the completion of all scheduled administrations in the student’s year of intended graduation is not eligible for a waiver.”

**Agenda Item 11F. Natural and Cultural History Repositories.** Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 58.300 through 4 AAC 58.320 Designation of Natural and Cultural History Repositories. James Fields seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item 11G. Math Credit.** Jim Merriner moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 06.075(b) Increasing the units of credit required for high school graduation. Kenneth Gallahorn seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item 11H. Restraint and Seclusion.** Barbara Thompson moved; I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 06.175
Reporting restraint and seclusion incidents and expulsions; and 4 AAC 06.177 Crisis intervention training programs. Jim Merriner seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

The board changed the proposed regulations to correct unclear wording in 4 AAC 06.177(b)(6). The passage now reads: “forbids the use of seclusion in a manner that restricts a student’s breathing or otherwise harms the student.”

**Agenda Item 11I. Standards.** James Fields moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development open a period of public comment on 4 AAC 04.145 Common Core Standards Initiative restrictions. Jim Merriner seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

**Agenda Item 12A. HSGQE Elimination.** Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt the amended proposed amendments to 4 AAC 06.710 Statewide student assessment system, 4 AAC 06.715 Work ready/college ready transitional skills curriculum and benchmark assessments, 4 AAC 06.717 College and career readiness assessments, 4 AAC 06.720 Program evaluation, 4 AAC 06.737 Standards-based test, 4 AAC 06.755 High school graduation qualifying examination, 4 AAC 06.758 High school graduation qualifying examination results, 4 AAC 06.759 High school graduation qualifying examination: remediation, 4 AAC 06.771 High school graduation qualifying examination reexamination, 4 AAC 06.772 High school graduation qualifying examination waivers, 4 AAC 06.773 Waiver for entering the public school system late, 4 AAC 06.774 Rare or unusual circumstances, 4 AAC 06.775 Statewide assessment program for students with disabilities, 4 AAC 06.777 Students that have passed another state's competency examination, 4 AAC 06.780 Procedures for appeal from a denial of a waiver from the high school graduation qualifying exam, 4 AAC 06.789 Requests by parents for high school graduation qualifying examination waivers, exemptions, and appeals, 4 AAC 06.790 Definitions. Jim Merriner seconded the motion. The board members present approved the motion unanimously. The amendment changed “testing materials” to “test materials.”

**Agenda Item 12B. Challenging Courses.** James Fields moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development adopt amended proposed regulation 4 AAC 06.065 Challenging Courses. Jim Merriner seconded. Board members present approved the motion by a 4-2. The amendment inserted as the last sentence in 4 AAC 06.065(a): “Districts may charge a fee to cover the costs of development and administration of the assessment.” The amendment deleted from 4 AAC 06.065(b) the sentence: “Students may not challenge courses when they have either completed or challenged a more advanced course of study.”

**Agenda Item 13. June Board Meeting Dates.** The board set June 3, 4, and 5 as the dates for its June meeting in Fairbanks, to include a board retreat and meeting with the University of Alaska’s Board of Regents.

**Agenda Item 14. Teaching and Learning Support Report.** Dr. McCauley reviewed her written report. Sue Hull said that 2,600 educators have been served by Teaching & Learning Support events. Barbara Thompson asked how the mentoring program was affected by reduced
funds. Dr. McCauley said the program no longer serves superintendents. Dr. Parady said the Alaska Council of School Administrators and the Southeast Regional Resource Center are offering monthly webinars to superintendents.

**Agenda Item 15. Assessment and Accountability Report.** Mr. McCormick reviewed this year’s designations under the Alaska School Performance Index. The department will publicize the Technology Practice Tests for the Alaska Measures of Progress.

**Agenda Item 16. Rural Education Report.** Rural Education Coordinator Chris Simon reviewed his written report.

**Agenda Item 17. Mt. Edgecumbe High School Report.** Superintendent Troy “J” Thayne reviewed his written report. He said the school’s system for evaluating educators will be presented to the board in June.

**Agenda Item 18. Libraries, Archives and Museums Report.** Division Director Linda Thibodeau reviewed her written report.

**Agenda Item 19. Department of Law Report.** Assistant Attorney General Luann Weyhrauch, speaking by telephone, reviewed her written report and updated the board on work at a contaminated site in Aniak.

**Agenda Item 20. Commissioner’s Report.** The Commissioner said the department is working on implementing the new standards, assessments, and teacher evaluation requirements. He reviewed events he has attended and new middle school STEM grants and Digital Teaching Initiative grants.

**Agenda Item 21. Consent Agenda.** The board unanimously approved corrected minutes of the June 5-6, 2014, meeting and minutes of the July 30, 2014, meeting.

**Board Comments**

Barbara Thompson thanked Lisa Miller, the Anchorage School District, department staff, board members, and the people who made public comments.

Jim Merriner agreed and welcomed Mr. Thayne. Mr. Merriner said he was impressed with Mr. Rizk’s insightful comments. He thanked the board.

Sue Hull agreed with the above comments and said she appreciated the quality of the department’s work. She said she wants a discussion of the future of education in Alaska. She praised Ms. Cox’s work as chair.

Kobe Rizk agreed with the above comments and noted that the Alaska Association of Student Government will meet on October 29 through November 1 in Wasilla.

Kenneth Gallahorn said that simple is better and helps districts statewide.

James Fields said he was impressed by the use of Alaska teachers in developing and vetting the new assessments. He said the state is opening ways of getting an education.
Esther Cox reported on the Military Youth Academy’s graduation. She thanked the department for referring to state statutes in the board packet’s cover memos. She was pleased with the discussion of superintendent regulations. She thanked Sondra Meredith for her research on the topic. Ms. Cox asked when the board will discuss term limits for the capital improvement grant review committee.

The meeting adjourned at 2 p.m.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner

December 5, 2014

Agenda Item: 23B

♦ ISSUE
The board is being asked to approve the minutes of its October 29, 2014, meeting.

♦ BACKGROUND
  • Behind this cover memo are the proposed minutes of the board’s October 29, 2014, meeting.

♦ OPTIONS
Approve the minutes of the board’s October 29, 2014, meeting.
Amend the proposed minutes and approve the amended minutes of the October 29, 2014, meeting.
Seek additional information.

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION
Approve the minutes of the October 29, 2014, meeting as presented.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development approve the minutes of the October 29, 2014, meeting.
First Vice Chair James Fields called the meeting to order at noon via tele/videoconference. Esther Cox, Kenny Gallahorn, and Kobe Rzik were absent. Attendees recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Fields cited a conflict of interest with the Copper River School District’s request for a waiver from the board. Mr. Fields is a member of the district’s school board. Mr. Fields said the district’s request should be handled as a separate agenda item from that of the other 22 districts requesting a waiver. Mr. Fields said he would not participate in the discussion of, or vote on, the Copper River agenda item. The board approved the agenda.

There was no public comment.

**Business meeting**

**Agenda Item 5. School District Budget Waiver Requests.** Commissioner Hanley introduced the topic and said the department works with districts to increase the percentage of their budget that goes toward instruction.

Sue Hull asked if the same seven school districts with budgets under $3 million apply for waivers each year. Elizabeth Nudelman, the department’s director of School Finance, said they are, citing a lack of economies of scale. The board packet contains a chart of districts’ operating funds budgeted for instruction covering the past 10 years.

Sue Hull asked why $3 million is a significant threshold. Elizabeth Nudelman said that historical data since the law took effect 16 years ago supports the department’s conclusion that districts with budgets under $3 million find it hard to budget 70 percent of their operating funds for instruction.

Sue Hull said it is important for the department to review the budgets of districts seeking a waiver because some districts have moved closer to the 70 percent target. James Fields said the board’s action on waivers is not a rubber stamp, given the department’s efforts with affected districts.

James Fields pulled Copper River from the agenda item.

Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development approve the district waiver requests for 70% minimum expenditure for instruction requirement for Fiscal Year 2015 for the following school districts: Alaska Gateway, Aleutian Region, Bristol Bay Borough, Chatham, Hoonah City, Hydaburg City, Iditarod Area, Kake City, Kashunamuit,
Barbara Thompson moved: I move the State Board of Education & Early Development approve the district waiver requests for 70% minimum expenditure for instruction requirement for Fiscal Year 2015 for the Copper River School District. Sue Hull seconded. The board members present approved the motion unanimously.

Board comments

Barbara Thompson said she will report in December on the department’s assessment technical advisory committee.

Jim Merriner asked for prayers for Esther Cox, who is ill.

Sue Hull said she was told that a state regulation forbids local school boards from influencing ballot measures (such as through resolutions). She asked the department to confirm this and, if true, to explain the rationale.

James Fields said Esther Cox is in his thoughts and he thanked the department staff.

The board adjourned at 12:25 p.m.
ISSUE
The board is being asked to approve its annual report to the legislature.

BACKGROUND
- During the 2011 legislative session, Senate Bill 1 was introduced. It requires the State Board of Education & Early Development to provide an annual report to the legislature. The second part of the bill addresses the formation of a joint legislative task force and is not the topic of this discussion. The bill was signed by the Governor on June 24, 2011, and became effective on August 25, 2011.

- The bill set out requirements for a report to the legislature to be made no later than the 30th legislative day of each regular session and it must be presented in person.

- The bill further set out that the report must describe efforts of the board to develop, maintain and continuously improve a comprehensive quality public education system, as provided for under the bylaws of the board.

- The legislature added intent language that requested inclusion of the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress data in the written report.

- The first presentation to the legislature took place in January 2012.

- The draft report and a copy of Senate Bill 1 are behind Cover Memo 7.

- Eric Fry, Information Officer, and Marcy Herman, Legislative Liaison, will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
Accept the draft legislative report as presented.
Accept the draft legislative report and direct the department to add amendments.
Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION
Accept the draft legislative report and direct the department to add amendments.

SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development accept the draft legislative report and direct the department to add the amendments as necessary prior to its submission.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  

From: Michael Hanley, Commissioner  

Agenda Item: 23D

December 5, 2014

♦ ISSUE

The board is being asked to reappoint a member to the Alaska State Museum Collections Advisory Committee (MCAC).

♦ BACKGROUND

- The Museum Collections Advisory Committee, established by AS 14.57.020, is a five-member committee appointed by the board for staggered three-year terms. Under MCAC bylaws, members may serve for two terms.

- The MCAC represents the public's interest in preserving the human, cultural, natural, archaeological and anthropological history of Alaska. The MCAC acts in an advisory capacity with regard to the general acquisition policies of the Alaska State Museum in Juneau and the Sheldon Jackson Museum in Sitka. The MCAC must approve all purchases and donations valued at or over $5,000, and must approve all deaccessions of the museums' permanent collection.

- Dr. Erica Hill is completing her first term and is eligible to serve a second term.

- The MCAC, Alaska State Museums Chief Curator Addison Field, and Director of Libraries, Archives & Museums Linda Thibodeau recommend that Dr. Hill be appointed to serve a second three-year term.

- Behind this cover memo are: 1) the current list of Museum Collections Advisory Committee members; 2) the statutory authority for the Museum Collections Advisory Committee; 3) a letter from Chris Houlette, Vice-Chair of the MCAC, with the MCAC recommendation; and 4) Dr. Hill’s vita and her letter of interest in continuing to serve.

- Linda Thibodeau, Director of the Libraries, Archives & Museums Division, will be present to brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS

Approve the appointments
Reject the appointments
Seek more information

♦ ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION

Approve the appointments

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION

I move the State Board of Education & Early Development reappoint Dr. Erica Hill to serve a second three-year term on the Museum Collections Advisory Committee beginning January 1, 2015.
MUSEUM COLLECTIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
2014 MEMBERS

Dr. Erica Hill     (Chair)                        1st Term ends 12/2014
University of Alaska Southeast
11120 Glacier Highway
Juneau, AK 99801
907-796-6017
erica.hill@uas.alaska.edu

Chris Houlette (Vice Chair)                        1st Term ends 12/2013
Museum Curator
Yukon Charley Rivers National Preserve
4175 Geist Road
Fairbanks, AK 99709
907-455-0633
Christopher_Houlette@nps.gov

J. David McMahand  1st Term ends 12/2015
446 East 23rd Ave
Anchorage, AK 99503
907-230-8880
ugruk@hotmail.com

Bruce D. Merrell  1st Term ends 12/2015
Historical Research Consultant
3301 Madison Way
Anchorage, AK 99508
907-720-8421
merrellbruce@gmail.com

Jeremy M. Kane     1st Term ends 12/2017
2177 Fritz Cove Rd.
Juneau, AK 99801
907-957-1181
jrjeremykane@yahoo.com

Robert Banghart, Ex-Officio
Deputy Director Libraries, Archives and Museums
Chief Curator Alaska State Museums
Alaska State Museums
(907) 465-4866
bob.banghart@alaska.gov
Statutory Authority
For the
Museum Collections Advisory Committee


(a) There is created in the department the State Museum Collections Advisory Committee consisting of five members appointed by the board to serve at the board's pleasure for staggered three-year terms. The appointees shall be broadly representative of the public's interest in the preservation of the human, cultural, natural, archeological, and anthropological history of Alaska. When possible, some of the committee members shall be known for, or possess, special expertise or a culturally relevant background in these aspects of the art and history of the state.

(b) A member appointed to fill a vacancy serves for the unexpired term of the member succeeded.

Sec. 14.57.030. Officers; meetings, rules of procedure, quorum.

(a) The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) The committee shall meet at least once every six months and at the call of its chair, on petition of a majority of its members, or at the call of the commissioner, or the director of the museum, at a mutually convenient time and place both for the members of the committee and for interested members of the public. A meeting of the committee may be held by teleconference.

(c) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure to govern its meetings. A majority of the members of the committee constitutes a quorum.

Sec. 14.57.040. Compensation; per diem, travel expenses. The members of the committee serve without compensation, but they are entitled to per diem and travel expenses as authorized by law for boards and commissions.

Sec. 14.57.050. Collections management; acquisitions and dispositions.

(a) On recommendation of the committee, the department shall adopt regulations governing the museum’s in-house acquisitions committee, and the management and disposition of artifacts, natural history specimens, art objects, collections or other items, materials, or properties that are owned by, in the custody of, or are proposed for acquisition by, the state museum. The regulations must be consistent with AS 14.57.200 - 14.57.290.
(b) Artifacts, natural history specimens, art objects, collections, or other items, materials, or properties that relate to the history of Alaska and are appropriate for preservation in the state museum of a value of $5,000 or more may not be acquired by purchase, gift, or exchange, or otherwise nor may any item owned by, or in the custody of, the state museum be disposed of by sale, gift, exchange, or otherwise, without the written approval of the committee. In recommending the acquisition or disposal of an item under this subsection for the state museum, the committee shall evaluate the need for the item or collection proposed for acquisition or disposal with reference to the scope of collections of the state museums.

(c) The committee may obtain an independent, professional appraisal of the value of each item to be acquired or disposed of by or for the state museum.

Sec. 14.57.060. Advisory duties.

The committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the board as to the general acquisition and deaccession policies and programs of the state museum.

Sec. 14.57.070. Conflict of interest.

(a) A member of the committee may not act on a matter relating to the state museum in which the member's relationship with another person or with respect to the acquisition or disposition of an item owned by, in custody of, or proposed to be acquired by or for the state museum creates a conflict of interest. A committee member may not

1. have a pecuniary or property interest in an item that is proposed to be acquired or disposed of by or for the state museum;

2. have a pecuniary or property interest, directly or indirectly, in a contract to which the museum, or the state on behalf of the museum, is a party; or

3. receive compensation for services rendered to the state museum as a consultant, expert, appraiser, or otherwise, except as provided in AS 14.57.040.

(b) Notwithstanding (a) of this section, a committee member may bequeath or donate an item to the state museum.

Sec. 14.57.080. Definition.

In AS 14.57.020 - 14.57.080, "committee" means the state Museum Collections Advisory Committee.
November 6, 2014

Addison E. Field
Chief Curator
Alaska State Museums
395 Whittier Street
Juneau, AK 99801

Dear Addison,

The Museum Collections Advisory Committee reviewed the nominations for one committee opening beginning in 2015. We assessed the nominees based on a series of criteria that we believe will benefit the Alaska State Museum and the Sheldon Jackson Museum.

It is our recommendation to the Board of Education that Dr. Erica Hill be reappointed to the committee for a second three-year term.

Thank you,

[Signature]

Chris Houlette
Vice Chair, Museums Collections Advisory Committee
4175 Geist Road
Fairbanks, AK 99709
CURRICULUM VITAE

_____________________________

ERICA HILL

11120 Glacier Highway work: 907.796.6017
Department of Social Science e-mail: erica.hill@uas.alaska.edu
University of Alaska Southeast
Juneau, AK 99801

PRESENT POSITION  Associate Professor of Anthropology, Department of Social Science, University of Alaska Southeast

EDUCATION

1999  Ph.D. with distinction, Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico.  Dissertation title: The Art of Political Discourse: Ideology and Sacrificial Ritual among the Moche.

1995  M.A., Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico.

1992–1993  Graduate work in Historical Archaeology and Zooarchaeology, University of Florida.

1992  B.A., University of Florida; Interdisciplinary Studies in Medieval History and Archaeology.

PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES


2002 Comment on ‘The Role of Shamanism in Mesoamerican Art,’ *Current Anthropology* 43(3):407–408.


**PEER-REVIEWED BOOK CHAPTERS**


EDITED VOLUMES


EDITED SITE REPORT


PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

2012–present Associate Professor of Anthropology, Department of Social Science, University of Alaska Southeast.

2007–2012 Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Department of Social Science, University of Alaska Southeast.

2003–present Research Associate, Department of Archaeology, University of Alaska Museum.

2003–2007 Senior Editor, Anthropology and Native Studies, University of Alaska Press.

2005–2006 Adjunct Instructor, University of Alaska, Tanana Valley Campus.

2002–2005 Adjunct Instructor, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

2000–2002 Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

1999–2000 Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Iowa.

1998–1999 Research Assistant, Office of Evaluation, Department of Community and Family Medicine, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center.

1998 Teaching Associate, Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico.

BOOK REVIEWS


**GRANTS**


2011 NSF–EPSCoR travel grant for conference presentation at the Seventh International Congress of Arctic Social Sciences (ICASS VII), Akureyri, Iceland ($1500).

2010 International Arctic Research Center (IARC, UAF) travel grant for conference presentation at the International Polar Year Oslo Science Conference ($2000).

2008 NSF–EPSCoR travel grant for collections research at the American Museum of Natural History.

2008 NSF–EPSCoR travel grant for conference presentation at the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology.


2004 Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, National Park Service; editing and project management of volume entitled “A Historic Resources Study for Gates of the Arctic”; amount: $12,925.


1995 Travel grant funded by the Latin American Institute, University of New Mexico for collections research in Lima, Peru.

1995 Travel grant funded by the Student Research Allocations Committee, University of New Mexico for collections research in Lima, Peru.

1994 Research and travel grant funded by the Department of Anthropology, University of New Mexico for excavation in northern Mexico.

1991 Research and travel grant funded by the Tropical Conservation and Development Program, University of Florida for fieldwork in agricultural anthropology in association with the Escuela Agricola Panamericana, El Zamorano, Honduras.

1990 Study and travel grant funded by the Center for International Student and Faculty Exchanges, University of Florida for work in history and archaeology in Pecs, Hungary.
SYMPOSIUM ORGANIZED

2007  Ancient Ancestors in Global Perspective, organized for the 2007 annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Austin, Texas. Finalist for the Amerind Symposium Award.

PRESENTED PAPERS

2015  Thinking through Dogs. Invited paper to be presented at the Society for American Archaeology annual meeting, San Francisco, CA.

2013  Personhood and Agency in Eskimo Interactions with the Other-than-Human World. Invited paper presented at the Society for American Archaeology annual meeting, Honolulu, HI.


2012  Relational Ontologies and Social Landscapes among the Yupiit of Alaska. Invited paper presented at the Theoretical Archaeology Group U.S. meetings, Buffalo, NY.

2012  Sex and Sacrifice: Moche Women in Biocultural Perspective. Invited paper presented at the Society for American Archaeology annual meeting, Memphis, TN.


2010  Processes of Prehistoric Community Formation on the Bering Sea Coast, poster presented at the International Polar Year Oslo Science Conference, Oslo, Norway, June.


2009  Distribution of Walrus Remains on the Bering Sea Coast, paper presented at the meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), Arctic Division, Juneau, Alaska, September.


2009  The Abject Warrior: Defeated Bodies of Moche and Beyond. Invited paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology, Atlanta, Georgia.
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2000  The Disciplined Body in Moche Art, paper presented at the 33rd Annual Chacmool Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
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3 November 2014

To: Bob Banghart, Director, ASM
   Museum Collections Advisory Committee

I'm writing to express my interest in serving a second term on the ASM Collections Advisory Committee. I am an archaeologist with twelve years experience in Alaska and an extensive background in collections research (vita attached).

I'm currently Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Alaska Southeast, where I teach courses on both archaeology and anthropology. Prior to coming to Juneau, I spent five years in Fairbanks where I taught at UAF and was a research associate at the University of Alaska Museum.

My archaeological research has been primarily museum-based, so I am very familiar with museum policies and procedures. I have conducted research at museums throughout the US (e.g., Florida Museum of Natural History; Museum of Southwestern Biology; Maxwell Museum of Anthropology; Smithsonian Institution, NMNH; American Museum of Natural History) as well as in Peru, where my dissertation research occurred. I have worked primarily with archaeology and mammalogy collections, but I also have experience with ethnology and ornithology collections.

Since coming to Alaska, I have focused my research on arctic coastal adaptations, working with archaeological materials from St. Lawrence Island, the Y-K delta, and Northwest Alaska. My Alaska expertise lies primarily in zooarchaeology and prehistoric bone and ivory materials from the Bering Sea region. I work on archaeological ceramics and iconography of the Andean region, with a focus on the Moche culture.

As a side note, I'm very interested in contemporary textile and fiber arts, though I have no special expertise in the area.

I'm committed to museum research and to the development and expansion of museum collections, and I would welcome the opportunity to continue to serve on the committee.

Sincerely,

Erica Hill, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Anthropology

erica.hill@uas.alaska.edu
907.796.6017
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development  
From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner  

December 5, 2014  

Agenda Item: 23E

♦ ISSUE
  - The Board is being asked to approve the application of the Birchtree Charter School for a period of ten years, terminating on March 28, 2025. The initial charter was approved in 2010 for five years.

♦ BACKGROUND
  - On September 17, 2014, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough School Board approved Birchtree Charter School’s reapplication for a period of ten years.

  - The attached Overview and Charter School Rating Template provide the standard information provided to the State Board during charter school reapplication requests.

  - Additional information of relevance is related to communication between Birchtree and the department related to the early literacy screening assessment requirements of state statute and regulation
    - Over the past 6 months, the department has responded to multiple requests from Birchtree to be exempted from administering the early literacy screening assessments required by AS 14.03.244(c) and 4 AAC 06.713.
    - Birchtree cited a waiver provided in their original charter exempting them from the local district requirement to conduct early literacy screening assessments.
    - The department explained that a waiver written in a charter or a contract between the charter school and a school district may not supersede a state statute, and neither a local school board nor the department has the authority to waive state law.
    - State statute 14.03.255(c) prescribes that “a charter school is subject to tests required by the department.”
    - State regulation 06.713 requires a district to administer an approved early literacy screening assessment to all students in kindergarten, first, and second grade, and to third-grade students identified as experiencing delays during second grade.
    - Birchtree administered the required early literacy screening assessment. However, upon receiving the screening data from Birchtree, no data was provided for 11 of its 49 kindergarten students who were exempted by parent request from the literacy screening assessment.
    - The department notified Birchtree and the Mat-Su Borough School District that there is no language in 4 AAC 06.713 that allows for a waiver from early literacy screening for students enrolled in the
applicable grades. Birchtree was informed that compliance with 4 AAC 06.713 required that all students be assessed.
  - Birchtree submitted all of the required data on November 5, 2014.

- The Birchtree Overview Document and the Birchtree Rating Template can be found behind agenda item 8A.

- Les Morse, Deputy Commissioner, will brief the board.

♦ OPTIONS
  - Approve the Birchtree Charter application for a period of ten years or any period up to ten years.
  - Seek more information.
  - Deny the application.

♦ ADMINISTRATION'S RECOMMENDATION
  - Approve the Birchtree Charter application for a period up to ten years.

♦ SUGGESTED MOTION
  - I move the State Board of Education & Early Development approve the Birchtree Charter application for a period of ___ years.
To: Members of the State Board of Education & Early Development
From: Mike Hanley, Commissioner

November 14, 2014
Agenda Item: 23F

ISSUE
The board is being asked to consider a resolution supporting a name for the new State Libraries, Archives & Museums building now under construction in Juneau.

BACKGROUND
- In 2016 the Division of Libraries, Archives & Museums is scheduled to open a building in Juneau to house, protect and exhibit its collections.
- Under state law, the legislature has the authority to name state buildings.
- The division recommends that the new building be named after the Most Reverend Andrew P. Kashevaroff, who was the state museum’s first curator and the state library’s first historical librarian, serving from 1919 until his death in 1940.
- Fr. Kashevaroff was a descendent of Russian explorers and the Alutiiq people of the Kodiak region. He acquired for the library and museum hundreds of Russian objects and publications and thousands of Alaska Native artifacts.
- The division requests that the board approve a resolution in support of naming the new State Library, Archives & Museums building the Father Andrew P. Kashevaroff Library, Archives & Museum.
- A copy of the proposed resolution is behind Cover Memo 1.
- Division Director Linda Thibodeau will be present to brief the board.

OPTIONS
Approve the proposed resolution
Amend the proposed resolution and approve the amended resolution.
Seek more information.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION
Approve the proposed resolution.

SUGGESTED MOTION
I move the State Board of Education & Early Development (approve) the proposed resolution (amend the proposed resolution as discussed) in support of naming the new SLAM building the Father Andrew P. Kashevaroff Library, Archives & Museum.