

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
Chandler Unified District
James Perry Administration Center
1525 W. Frye Road
Chandler, AZ
January 09, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

COP MEMBERS

David Baker
Christine Bejarano
Pam Bergstrom
Steve Chambers
Kaye Dean
Analizabeth Doan
Shelly Duran
Robert Edgar
Tonya Ford
Diane Fox
Tim Frey
Allan Grell
Connie Heath
Bruce Iverson
Joan Johnson
Mary Anne Kapp
Bob Klee
Jean Lewis

Leticia Lujan
Norma Malamud
Patricia Marsh
Mary McIntyre
Lynn Monson
Ron Neil
Joe O'Reilly
Patricia Osborne
Ronda Owens
Lucille Schonbrun
Catherine Steele
Julie Thayer
Lynn Thompson
Barbara U'Ren
Maureen Ward
Maureen West
Charlotte Wing

ADE

Margaret Garcia-Dugan
Karen Butterfield
Janet Chin
Nadine Groenig
Ildi Laczko-Kerr
Tee Lambert
Carrie Larson
Muriel Rosmann
Janice Smith
Nancy Stahl

GUESTS

Michelle Bailey
Dr. James Murlless
Janet Sullivan

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

COP co-chair, Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:07 am. Tim Frey, Chandler Unified Federal Programs Director, welcomed members and guests to the James Perry Administration Center. Mr. Frey introduced Susan Eissinger, Assistant Superintendent of Chandler Unified. Ms. Eissinger welcomed everyone and expressed her appreciation of the committee member's commitment. Norma then proceeded to have members introduce themselves.

DISTRICT AYP/ACCOUNTABILITY ISSUES - Ildi Laczko-Kerr and Garrett Holm

Ildi Laczko-Kerr described the appeal process. Ildi explained that all districts can appeal their AYP rating regardless of data verification. The deadline for appeals is January 16th at 5:00 pm. January 30th districts will receive final AYP designation. There is an embargo on the AYP designations; members were warned not to share at this time. Districts can find more detail on how to file an AYP appeal process on the common log at the ADE web site.

I:\ACAD_ACH\COP\COP Archive\COP Jan 2004 Minutes.doc

An explanation of how a LEA can fail to make AYP even when their individual schools do was given.

- ❑ LEAs are scored in a similar manner as individual schools
- ❑ LEAs include mobile students within their district as well as new and exiting students
- ❑ There is a 1% cap on AIMS A for LEAs but there was not a cap for individual schools (NCLB mandated 1% of grade level enrollment)
- ❑ A very liberal appeal process exists for individual schools – however the data still holds for LEAs
- ❑ The n-count for disaggregated students is still 30 for LEAs

It was then explained on what happens if the LEA doesn't make AYP.

- ❑ ADE is in the process of making policy decisions about existing LEAs on improvement under the old "extracted items" system
- ❑ LEAs that do not make AYP for 2 years will have to write an LEA improvement plan similar to a school improvement plan
- ❑ LEAs that do not make AYP for 4 years will be identified for corrective action

The concern that Arizona, as well as a majority of the states, will not make their State AYP was expressed.

ADE will notify LEAs on AYP status on January 30, 2004. It was suggested that ADE hold in depth training on the appeal process.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy introduced Karen Butterfield the new Deputy Associate Superintendent of Innovative and Exemplary Programs. Karen explained some of the issues that she is working on:

- ❑ Identifying criteria and indicators for best practices for school effectiveness
- ❑ Developing recognition awards for examples of best practices, envisioning using Gold – Silver – Bronze levels
- ❑ Hiring a Stay in School Program Specialist, Rhonda St. Louis

ADE has extended the deadline for filing the NCLB Final Consolidated Plan to March 30, 2004. In order to address the concerns of LEAs, a rubric has been developed that will be shared with the LEAs to assist in filling out their plans. LEAs that have already turned in their plans can leave them and we will evaluate or they can notify ADE and stop the evaluation, review their plan using the rubric as a guide and resubmit. It will be their choice. Workshops will be held, around the state, where ADE will go over the NCLB Consolidated Plan and how to use the rubric. The dates for the workshops along with the rubric can be found on the ADE web site.

ADE will be piloting a joint monitoring with Exceptional Student Services (ESS) this spring where a team will go out to 8 LEAs and monitor both ESS and NCLB programs. Program specialists will be using the On Site Review Protocol for NCLB. LEAs will be notified that they will be involved in the joint monitoring. There will be an assessment on how joint monitoring worked for LEAs as well as for ADE.

NCLB monitoring is evolving into a 6-year cycle, with specific steps being handled each year between LEAs and their ADE program specialist. This will help provide consistency between LEAs and ADE in evaluating the creation, implementing, reviewing and updating of the LEAs NCLB Final Consolidated Plans and eliminate the confusion in understanding federal expectations.

TECHNOLOGY/ DATA – Nancy Konitzer

Superintendent Horne is developing newsletters to be sent via e-mail, one for the public and one for educators. ADE will be sending out newsletters to stakeholders, including the current e-mail groups and anyone who requests to be added to the circulation list. The COP members agreed to be included in the distribution of the newsletter. ADE departments will be contributing articles to educators.

There is a letter going out to LEAs asking them to place Program Director's names and email addresses in the LEA Core Data in the Common Logon on the ADE Web site.

Nancy distributed a letter going out to LEAs outlining the policy decisions made regarding data collections and reporting for both LEAs and the ADE. It explains why ADE requires all this information. ADE is attempting to alleviate the reporting burden of the LEAs. ADE will handle federal requests for information. LEAs need to keep the data current and not wait for a stated deadline when the data is due. State statute indicates that data needs to be updated once every 20 days, guidance suggests once every 10 days. It is important that data is current as it is used to determine allocations as well as for AYP, AZ LEARNS and the NCLB Consolidated Final Plan. As a point of interest, it was pointed out all NCLB letters that are sent to LEAs are numbered for identification. You can retrieve them from the web site. The letter also talks about the LEA's responsibility to keep up-to-date e-mail addresses with ADE. LEAs can update e-mail addresses by accessing the LEA Core Data application in the Common Logon menu.

A question was asked about the best software system that matches ADE's SAIS system. Nancy explained that ADE cannot recommend software but can provide a list of vendors who qualify. She also encouraged LEAs to fill out an online survey at the ADE web site.

COMMITTEE OF PRACTITIONERS' ROLE - Discussion

In light of the questions surrounding AYP and other issues, it was suggested that the COP give ADE direction on providing more training statewide. This brought on a discussion of the role of the Committee of Practitioners. According to NCLB, Section 1903 – the COP's role is to advise the State in carrying out its federal responsibilities. This includes providing input and making recommendations on NCLB issues.

SOLUTIONS TEAMS – Dale Parcell

Carrie Larson introduced Associate Superintendent of the School Effectiveness Division Phyllis Schwartz and the Deputy Associate Superintendent of School Improvement, Dale Parcell. Phyllis talked

about the different areas that work towards providing assistance to Arizona's schools. Standards-Based Teaching and Learning, headed by Deputy Associate Superintendent Marie Mancuso; Best Practices, headed by Deputy Associate Superintendent Cheryl Lebo; and School Improvement, headed by Deputy Associate Superintendent Dale Parcell. She explained that Solution Teams would be working with schools that will be eligible for intervention for the first time in Arizona.

Phyllis turned the presentation over to Dale who took COP through a PowerPoint presentation explaining how schools are identified for Solutions Team to work with. LEAs have a fear that the ADE will take over their schools. It was explained that ADE's approach is more of an intervention.

Solution Teams are comprised of master teachers, fiscal analysts, and curriculum/assessment experts who are certified by the State Board of Education as Arizona Academic Standards Technicians.

As of October 2003 there were 82 schools that had their second year of receiving an underperforming rating. An ADE Solutions Team will visit the schools. The Solutions Team will do a 3-day site visit to review and analyze achievement data. They will conduct interviews, classroom observation and focus group discussions. They will work from the Standard and Rubrics for School Improvement, which can be found at www.ade.az.gov/schooleffectiveness. The team will then produce a "Statement of Findings" that will validate or redirect the school's improvement efforts and offer specific recommendations for moving forward. The "Statement of Findings" establishes a framework for support. ADE will be asking LEAs to submit a plan of how they will support their school.

It was suggested that when Solution Teams found positive strides they would inform the COP Committee who would like to add their voice in acknowledging LEA's successes. It was also recommended that ADE create a web page posting successful strategies to share with other LEAs.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICE PROVIDERS – Nancy Konitzer

Concerns were addressed trying to contact supplemental providers. Is ADE updating the list of providers and standardizing contract for supplemental providers? Nancy shared that Kim Strehlow is currently recruiting providers and will be keeping the list updated on the ADE web site. If you are having problems with any supplemental providers contact Kim at 602-542-2014 and let her know, she may be able to help you address your concerns. She is also working on creating a standardized contract. Community and Faith-based organizations are encouraged to become providers. This outreach is coming from the federal government.

MegaConference – Norma Malamud

COP members wanted to provide input to ADE on the MegaConference. There was concern expressed about who the conference is for; is it for administrators, Title I coordinators or teachers? Rural LEAs were concerned about the length of the conference; 3 days is hard to be away from their sites. Having to travel so far was a hardship also. Everyone had comments on facility issues: they felt the facilities were not big enough to handle all the participants during the breakout sessions. Participants had to sit on the floor and there were not enough handout materials for everyone.

There were recommendations made to hold more “Mini Conferences” – maybe in the summer for teachers and a separate conference for ELL teachers. A suggestion was made to target breakout sessions on experience level. A recommendation was made to have County Superintendents provide services for their areas. Technology may be a good way to disseminate information for those who may have travel issues; i.e., videotapes or the use of interactive television.

RECOGNITION OF TITLE I DISTINGUISHED SCHOOL MADISON ROSE LANE – Principal Dr. Linda Califano

Nancy Stahl introduced her fellow team members from the Recognition subcommittee; Kaye Dean, Shelly Duran, Mary McIntyre, Charlotte Wing and Marjorie Carrithers assisted on the site visits. They reviewed 18 applications and participated in 3 site visits. Nancy was pleased to announce the selection of the Title I Distinguished School is Madison Rose Lane. Principal Dr. Linda Califano and her Assistant Principal Patricia Jones were asked to share. Dr. Califano gave a PowerPoint presentation on the components of their application and some of their teaching strategies that have made them successful. Nancy Konitzer then presented Dr. Califano a plaque acknowledging Madison Rose Lane as the 2004 Title I Distinguished School with a promise of a \$1,000 check for her school. Nancy announced to COP that Dr. Califano would be going to the National Title I Conference in February where Madison Rose Lane will be recognized nationally.

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM GRANT – Janice Smith

Norma Malamud introduced Comprehensive School Reform Coordinator, Janice Smith. Janice explained to COP members that the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Grant is a Federal Grant under Title I. Arizona has 88 schools that are eligible to receive the grant. The deadline is January 30th. Janice handed out to all members a CSR Grant Application and a listing of all 88 schools that were eligible. The LEAs must be in compliance to be awarded the grant. The grant is to be used on school improvement plans. It cannot supplant existing programs. Janice explained that with the grant being awarded so late in the school year LEAs will be able to roll the money over to the next year or use it this summer if it supports their school improvement plan.

Norma concluded the meeting with a reminder that at the next meeting will be March 5, 2004 at Paradise Valley Unified District. The subcommittees would meet from 9:00 am to 10:00 am and the general meeting would start at 10:00 am. Carrie Larson informed COP members that the External Facilitator application can be found on the ADE web site and the deadline is February 27, 2004. The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 pm

NCLB
Committee of Practitioners
Paradise Valley Unified District
District Administrative Center
15002 N. 32nd Street
Phoenix, AZ
March 5, 2004

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

COP MEMBERS

Julia Ayres	Joan Johnson
Christine Bejarano	Lucille Lang
Steve Chambers	Jean Lewis
Kaye Dean	Leticia Lujan
Analizabeth Doan	Norma Malamud
Shelly Duran	Patricia Marsh
Robert Edgar	Mary McIntyre
Diane Fox	Joe O'Reilly
Lannie Gillespie	Catherine Steele
Allan Grell	Julie Thayer
Connie Heath	Maureen Ward
Maureen Irr	Charlotte Wing
Marion Jewell	

ADE

Sherry Barclay
Debbie Francis
Nancy Konitzer
Tee Lambert
Carrie Larson
Cheryl Lebo
Bobbie Orlando
Muriel Rosmann
Nancy Stahl

GUESTS

Michael Pospisil

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

COP co-chairs, Maureen Irr and Norma Malamud, called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Mary McIntyre welcomed COP members to the District Administrative Center of Paradise Valley Unified School District. Ms. McIntyre introduced Dr. Skip Brown, Assistant Superintendent for support services and planning. Dr. Brown welcomed everyone to Paradise Valley "where everyday is a day in Paradise". Dr. Brown thanked everyone for coming out in the rain, which speaks to COP member's commitment to education. Maureen then proceeded to have members introduce themselves.

MONITORING – Bobbie Orlando

Bobbie Orlando, Monitoring Manager, explained a new approach to monitoring LEAs for NCLB. A 6-year cycle is being developed to match monitoring efforts with Exceptional Student Services (ESS). Superintendent Horne wants to consolidate monitoring with other ADE departments to lessen the visits to the LEAs. ESS currently uses a 6-year cycle monitoring program and Academic Achievement is

creating a similar monitoring system. During each year different requirements will be evaluated for compliance. This will take the burden off of the LEAs trying to do everything in one year and encourage them to do annual self-assessment. Bobbie explained how each year of the 6-year monitoring cycle the LEA would address specific components of NCLB requirements. Bobbie broke the members up into small work groups and passed out a work sheet and a listing of requirements that are listed in the NCLB statutes. Their charge was to use the list and discuss which components should be addressed during specific years in the cycle. Members worked in small groups for about 10 minutes. When members finished they shared their recommendations on the NCLB 6-year cycle monitoring program. They also discussed concerns as well as suggestions. Their results are shown in *Appendix A*.

Nancy Konitzer shared that states, nation wide, are going to an integrated monitoring of federal projects. ADE is looking at how other states are addressing the same issue. Nancy also explained the training needed for new specialists to help balancing monitoring responsibilities as well as duties as a program coordinator.

IMPLICATIONS OF ALTERNATIVE GOVERNANCE – Carrie Larson

Carrie handed out an article from Education Week with an article discussing how Michigan is now dealing with 112 schools that have not met AYP for 5 years and are making plans for changes for next year for Alternative Governance. Michigan is opting to either replace school staff or other major reforms, not state take over. Pennsylvania is also in the 5th year. She then explained the timeline for schools that do not meet AYP.

Actions For Schools That Do Not Make AYP

Spring	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year	6th Year
Fall	No Consequences	School Improvement Plan 10% of Title I funding goes towards Professional Development Public School Choice	Add Supplemental Services	Corrective Action <i>(Choosing from a list of options)</i>	Restructuring Planning Year	Restructuring <i>Alternative Governance</i>

Carrie explained that schools in corrective action must report monthly. Schools must choose one corrective action from an approved listing. Under the law it is the District’s responsibility to offer technical assistance and professional development opportunities to the schools.

Carrie had the members break into 5 small groups to discuss several issues of restructuring/alternative governance. The groups were given a worksheet and legal definitions of Restructuring and Alternative Governance and given a specific issue to address of the 5 different arrangements listed in the law. What are the implications? What would it look like? Would there be difference if it were a rural school vs. an urban school? They spent 20 minutes in small group and then were reconvened to share a few highlights from the issue they were assigned.

Highlights from the group discussions:

Group A. Reopening the school as a public charter school.

- In rural schools there is not a lot of choice for personnel for a charter school.
- Does governance change affect site councils?
- Composition of students might change because regulation changes would cause high mobility.
- What happens if the “new” charter school makes AYP for a couple of years? Can they rejoin their District?
- Would the school become a District charter school?
- Can this new charter school cap their enrollment?
- What if a LEA is only one school, do they just change their name?

Group B. Replacing all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) that are relevant to the failure to make AYP.

- Who should go first? Remove the principal first and change the leadership.
- Data should be used to choose who should be replaced. Which data?

Group C. Entering into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the public school.

- The schools M&O dollars would follow the charter and have negative impact to the LEA.
- ADE should recommend private management companies. Schools would not know whom they should choose.
- How would you handle the community who would not want to change, but the law says yes?

Group D. Turning the operation of the school over to the State educational agency, if permitted under State law and agreed to by the State.

- If the state took over would they work through district or local school?
- Who would handle the funding?
- Who would address the concerns about individual school’s label affecting kids and their neighborhoods?
- When dismissing personnel would the state honor the LEA contracts?
- What happens if the school still fails while under state direction?

- Group E. Any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms, such as significant changes in the school's staffing and governance, to improve student academic achievement in the school and that has substantial promise of enabling the school to make AYP as defined in the State plan under section 1111(b)(2). In case of a rural local educational agency with a total of less than 600 students in average daily attendance at the schools that are served by the agency and all of whose schools have a School Locale Code of 7 or 8, as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall, at such agency's request, provide technical assistance to such agency for the purpose of implementing this clause.**
- There should be separate plans to work with schools, other than the LEA – County might be a better option instead of the State.
 - County could help work locally to bring in more resources, support and technical assistance.

SEI ENDORSEMENT – Debby Francis

Nancy Konitzer introduced Debby Francis, Title III program specialist. Debby came to share information on Structured English Immersion (SEI) endorsement requirements and to tell members that the State School Board voted to adopt rule proposal designated option 2 concerning SEI. The notice of proposed rule making is filed with the Secretary of State with opportunity for public comment, which will be on May 12, 2004 at 1:30.

Debby then explained the SEI endorsement requirements. All new K-12 who graduate August 31, 2006 or later shall be required to pass 3-credit SEI methods course, within their course of study. All state universities in Arizona and other accredited teacher preparatory programs shall offer the course.

Existing certified teachers, administrators and ELL Coordinators/Directors shall be required to obtain 1 credit hour or 15 clock hours of professional development in SEI methods by August 31, 2006. If they have an English as Second Language/Bilingual Education K-12 endorsement, they are exempt from this requirement.

By August 31, 2010 all certified teachers, administrators and ELL coordinators/directors, regardless of having an English as Second Language/Bilingual Education K-12 endorsement are required to obtain 3-credit hours or 45 clock hour of professional development to maintain their SEI endorsement.

ADE will have a task force who will develop curriculum criteria, which later will be presented to the State Board for approval. ADE is submitting a five-year grant for professional development with the Arizona K-12 Center; if the grant is awarded, the task force will be working over the summer. Their product will be presented to the State School Board for approval. If members had questions they could contact Irene Moreno, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Title III at 602-364-2345. When the task force is formed and dates have been set, members will be notified through the list serve. This will be their chance to add input on curriculum criteria for SEI endorsement.

MEGA CONFERENCE – Nancy Konitzer

Nancy thanked the members for their input at January's COP meeting on the Mega Conference. Along with members comments and comments from the surveys from the conference ADE has decided to hold 4 separate conferences in the future. The 2004 Structured English Immersion Conference will be held at The Wigwam Resort in Litchfield Park, May 19-20, 2004. The focus will be English Immersion Strategies. June 10-11, 2004, The First Annual Quality Teaching and Learning Conference will be held at The Wigwam Resort in Litchfield Park. The topic will be: "The Highly Qualified Educator: Building a Professional Learning Community" this conference is recommended for Principals and Teachers. In the fall or early second semester will be a conference focused on Best Practices. The Mega Conference will be held in November. This conference will be for directors and program directors that will be administering NCLB programs. If members have suggestions on presenters call Nancy Konitzer at 602-542-7470.

ADE is applying for grant with the Wallace Foundation. This grant is for leadership development for leadership at the school level. To be able to develop leadership roles for teachers that want to do more but not necessarily become a principal or be part of administration. The Certification task force is also working on a tiered certification system for teachers; they are working on defining Master Teacher.

There will be a training held for NCLB in Coordinators in August after the 12th. This will be a time for LEA NCLB coordinators to get questions answered, network with each other and to gain a better understanding of the appeal process. Nancy will be forwarding items to members of NCLB issues that come from federal decisions.

A discussion took place on a change from the feds on how to count LEP students. Meeting AYP is based on success of the ELL subgroup. LEAs can appeal if there are students that have not been in a program less than 3 years. ADE is looking at changing the rule on how Arizona counts ELL students that would allow LEAs to count FEP students as ELL for 2 years after making FEP.

Nancy then informed members about business rules for SAIS being on the web for easier access. Click on SAIS, then to go to MIS Bulletin Board. www.ade.az.gov/sais/saisdbdocs.asp The SAIS changes for 2005 are also on the SAIS web page.

STATE SYSTEM OF SCHOOL SUPPORT – Nancy Konitzer

Under NCLB the ADE need to create School Support Teams. This is different than the Solution Teams that work with underperforming school under Arizona Learns. School Support Teams meet the requirements of NCLB Statute - Sec. 1117 which indicates a system for support for all Title I schools, not just schools that are in school improvement.

Nancy asked members to participate in some brainstorming ideas of what kind of areas that could be addressed with School Support Teams. The members identified the following areas that could be addressed with School Support Teams:

- Prevention (SIP)
- SW plan development
- Resource allocations; school and LEA
- Data Management- data driven instructions
- SBR models (similar demographics)
- Needs assessment
- Parent involvement strategies
- Long-term intervention
- Leadership

The creation of School Support Teams allows ADE and LEAs to be proactive in helping schools improve. To align schools stated needs with monitoring procedures with technical assistance in areas that there are deficiencies. There could a coordination effort between Solutions Team and School Support Teams.

BEST PRACTICES – Cheryl Lebo

Nancy Konitzer introduced Cheryl Lebo, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Best Practices, School Effectiveness Division. Cheryl described her background of teaching and being a Principal in the Paradise Valley District before joining ADE. She introduced Eugene Judson, Research Assistant, working with Cheryl's division. Cheryl then talked about some of the projects that the School Effectiveness Division is currently working on: Best Practices and how it applies to Arizona Schools and setting up a School Resource Guide, an online site that schools and LEAs can find resources relating to leadership, curriculum and strategies and models that other LEAs and schools have implemented that have been successful.

In effort to define Best Practice, Karen Butterfield, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Innovative and Exemplary Practices, is working with the team from School Effectiveness Division. They are looking at research that will establish criteria, strategies and services that define Best Practices.

Currently, School Effectiveness Division is working on reviewing the statement of findings from the Solution Teams that have been out working with schools. Cheryl shared that there have been some common issues that the Solutions Teams are finding: principals do not know their school improvement plan, when created by an external facilitator; there is a lack of professional development; schools are not using data to drive instruction; there is a lack of regular visits to the classroom with feedback on effective strategies. These issues have created a "disconnect" from the school leadership to successful teacher effectiveness.

There has been a positive feedback on Solutions Teams being comprised of Arizona educators who have a strong background in Arizona unique needs. School Effectiveness Division will be contacting those principals of those schools that have worked with their Solution Teams. These schools will receive ongoing support from ADE, monthly contacts and quarterly contacts after second year.

Cheryl answered questions concerning Scientific Based Research standards. She explained that ADE is working on being able to define SBR standards and connecting them with demographic needs to provide easier resource information for schools and LEAs.

Maureen thanked all the members for coming to the COP Meeting in adverse weather conditions. She reminded everyone that the next meeting will be held at ASU West on May 7, 2004. Carrie Larson reminded members that membership time is coming up and that she would be contacting members if their membership term is expiring and giving them a chance to renew. The meeting was called to adjournment at 3:20 p.m.

***Committee Of Practioners Input On the
ESS and NCLB Joint Monitoring - 6 year Cycle***

General comments:

- ❑ A compromise schedule for monitoring, perhaps there could be a “modified” system to accommodate this difference.
 - ❖ Divide districts into separate groupings:
 - Large schools districts where each department usually has it’s own director - they can handle monitoring both programs at the same time.
 - Small school districts where one person wears “many hats” - they cannot handle monitoring both programs at the same time

- ❑ Provide all monitoring questions electronically to each school – they would respond electronically and the answers would be collated into a self-study at DOE for each school. Monitoring visits would then become observations to determine if the school practicing what it said it was doing. (Accreditation style self-study process)
 - ❖ Electronically Submitted
 - Title I LEA Parent Policy
 - Title I School Parent Policy
 - Parent - School Compact
 - Standards Affidavits
 - Parent Request policy re: HQ teachers
 - 4 week notice – teacher is currently not HQ
 - Homeless students policies
 - ELL parent notices (1112(g))
 - School improvement notices
 - Choice options
 - Supplemental services
 - Principal’s attestation of HQ teachers
 - Private school services
 - Poverty criteria – rank ordering
 - TA schools – criteria for services
 - SW – supplementary programs
 - Comparability
 - School prayer policy
 - Set asides (1113(c))

