

## **Questions for Resolution by SAGE Committee Regarding Draft WLC: 0027/2**

### **1. Opting Grade Levels In/Out Each Year.**

***Does the committee want to allow ANY grade level (K-3) to Opt-In or Opt-Out of the program each year?***

- a. This is different from SAGE, which *requires* participation at Kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade.
- b. Schools would only receive funding for low-income students in grades that actually participate in a given year.

***Should a participating school be required to report to DPI the particular grade levels that will be participating in the AGR program each year before a specified date (i.e. October 1<sup>st</sup>)?***

- c. Would require a school to inform DPI at the beginning of each school year about which grade levels in the school will be participating in the AGR program.
- d. Required reporting will help DPI determine early in the school year how much AGR funding a particular school is eligible to receive.
- e. Makes schools commit at the outset of the school year to doing interventions, rather than waiting until the end of the year to see whether the school was able to implement the interventions in each grade level.

***If schools are required to report participating grades to DPI early in the year, should the deadline for reporting the interventions a school intends to use be changed to correspond (reporting deadline for intended interventions is November 1<sup>st</sup> in current draft)?***

### **2. Specified Interventions.**

***Does the committee want to specify that at least one intervention must be used in each classroom?***

- a. This would require that every classroom receives some type of intervention, rather than requiring only that an intervention be used in each grade level.
- b. Classroom requirement would ensure that every low income student would be impacted by at least one intervention.

***Does the committee have comments or changes related to the 3 specified interventions?***

- c. Small class sizes and professional development on small group instruction.
- d. Instructional coaching by licensed teachers with content knowledge regarding instruction in math or reading and expertise in reducing the achievement gap.
- e. One-to-One tutoring for students at risk of difficulty with reading or math provided by a licensed teacher using a program found effective by the What Works Clearinghouse.

3. Performance Objectives.

***Does the committee have comments or changes related to the performance goals a school must set?***

- a. Schools must set performance objectives for academic achievement.
- b. Schools must specify the formative assessments they will use to measure success in achieving their objectives.
- c. Goals must be “specific, measurable, and achievable” and must include reducing the achievement gap in math and reading for low income students.

4. Annual Performance Update for School Board.

***Does the committee have comments or changes related to the requirement for annual reporting to the School Board?***

- a. An AGR school must present to its school board on an annual basis.
- b. Each school must present its performance objectives and note its success in achieving them.

5. DPI Ability to Non-Renew an AGR Contract.

***Does the committee wish to forbid DPI from renewing a contract if DPI becomes aware that the school failed to do any of the following?***

- a. Fails to use at least 1 of the 3 specified interventions in participating grades.
- b. Fails to do annual reporting to DPI regarding intended and implemented interventions.
- c. Fails to set objectives and identify assessments in its AGR contract.
- d. Fails to present objectives and progress to the school board each year.

***Or, in the alternative, does the committee wish to give DPI discretion to decide whether to non-renew a contract if a school fails to meet the items above?***

6. Sum Sufficient Funding.

***Does the committee wish to make the AGR appropriation sum sufficient?***

- a. Making the appropriation sum sufficient will mean recommending an increase in funding (approximately \$12 million based on 2012-13 pupil numbers).
- b. A participating school would receive \$2,250 in funding for each low income student and there would not be any prorating of funds.