

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Survey to Hawaii School Principals

DISCLAIMER NOTICE:

Comments and suggestions have been duplicated to the best of our ability to decipher the respondent's handwriting. Areas of uncertain word/ phrases or areas where the fax machine cut off have been left blank.

Comments and suggestions have been categorized by the following categories:

(Overall) Comments & Suggestions

I. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Reform & Flexibility

II. Testing

III. Funding

IV. Students With Disabilities

V. Students with Limited English Proficiency

COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS

- 1) Every large community has a normal bell-shaped curve of intelligence scores. This curve needs to inform expectations. It is ridiculous to expect that our 80 IQ kids will all meet high expectations set for kids with 100IQs. a) SPED & ESLL, in particular are groups whose goals need to be examined & revised in order to be realistic and statistically sound. ESLL kids as a group have normal IQ curves, but language acquisition is a challenge. b) Poverty is strongly correlated with educational challenges but as this group of kids has a normal curve, expectations must be high. 2) NCLB, to achieve 100% competency goals, drives a minimum competency test scenario in order to avoid consequences. Hawaii's HSA is a high expectation test designed to achieve excellence. a) Schools are caught in the conflict and we are blamed needlessly. b) The challenge is to BOTH keep high expectations and establish minimum competencies that will allow the appropriate %s of kids above some minimum level to be counted as making AYP. c) Perhaps the new test can be constructed to have 2 cut scores- one for minimum and one for high expectations.
- Hawaii can be proud that we have the 6th most difficult test in the nation. However, the public does not read the fine lines and only the headlines, that we have a large number of schools in restructuring. Our public (and public officials) does not consider the fact that other states administer standards based test that are considered easy, only the fact that those states have a few schools in restructuring. There is a need to create one standardized test for every state so comparisons can be made. We also need modify our plan by increasing the number of students to 40, in any one sub group for proficiency levels. For many elementary schools, there will be three or four grade levels in each school. It will be very easy to reach the 30 benchmark. Special education and ESLL students are also a concern. SPED students are eligible for services because of handicapping condition and ESLL students with no formal schooling are expected to take the test after being in Hawaii for a very short period of time. I don't want Hawaii to become like Secretary Spellings' home state of Texas, where they lower their standards in order to pass. However, we should all be playing on the same level field.
- Positives: NCLB in some aspects have been a positive mandate in terms of students achieving to standards. It has forced schools to really look at data and make critical decisions about programs and teaching. Schools have become more focused in the implementation of scientific research based programs and utilization of funds. Teacher development has become a priority. Challenges: The Hawaii Department of Education continually sets the bar higher than other states in terms of meeting AYP benchmarks. We have done it for Title I AYP requirements prior to NCLB and now we have done it again with our current NCLB AYP benchmarks. Why do we set the bar so high? Our students are progressing. Not all students progress at the same rate. To have 100% of our students meeting the benchmarks by 2014 is unrealistic. I was speaking to an educator from another state recently. Their requirements are not as rigid as ours. They have zero schools in restructuring. Suggestions: Revisit our current plan and make it less rigid.

- The amount of time is spent on testing seems excessive. This takes away from valuable instructional time. When we examine best practices in assessment, statewide testing is one indicator of a student's performance at a given time, on a certain day. Although this information has statewide use, it should not be the sole measure of how a school is performing. How is the accreditation process taken into consideration here? Perhaps all schools need to go through an accreditation process – currently, only middle and high schools are required to do this.
- Personally, I believe the intent of NCLB & meeting AYP is a good idea. However, to have even the "good" schools continuously increase their students' performances is going to be very unrealistic. Today, too much time, money & effort are spent on making AYP. Students are going to be tested each year and will have to take more time focus on those tests. What happened to innovative, real-life hands-on learning? I believe we are missing the point of education!! Students, especially older ones, are going to stop taking the test seriously. They will get bored and disillusioned! We need to remind ourselves of what education & teaching is all about. And teaching to the test shouldn't be the main goal!
- A well educated populace helps to assure the well-being of our democracy. I urge the legislature to invest in our state's future by providing the best possible educational opportunities for students today. Students need interventions to succeed with caring, committed, high-quality teachers and strong leadership. We need excellent and adequate staffing to carry out compliance issues, engage in breakthrough actions, provide support and monitoring – the essential ingredients needed for any leader to succeed. Money does matter. Help us regain management rights and give us the tools to succeed. I have been waiting an entire year for a job description of the Student Activities Coordinator since they were made 12 month employees. Have been told that the legislators gave them the raise because they were already overworked and cannot take on any responsibilities. Please clarify with the unions and administrators. I truly hope that the responses will be taken into consideration and we see results of specific actions taken.
- NCLB is negatively affecting schools with high Hawaiian enrollments. OHA has publicly expressed concerns about this matter. Especially negatively impacted are Hawaiian language immersion schools. For example, English is first taught as an academic subject in the 5th grade. However, Hawaiian immersion students are required to take the English version of the tests. This means that Hawaiian immersion students who had had five months of formal English are held to the same standards as the regular students who have had five years of English. Of course, these students and their schools cannot meet AYP. This is totally unfair.
- Thank you for taking the time to gather responses. There's no easy answer, yet student achievement deserves everyone's attention and focus! Everyone must be involved including students, parents, educators, legislators, and community/business members. Your leadership will benefit all our keiki.
- Funding continues to be the biggest barrier for small, non-title I schools. There never seems to be enough funding for new textbooks (many times we need to purchase a few grade levels at a time), personnel to address safety issues (there are not security personnel at small elementary school, many times there is no VP either) and WSF will be taking money away from school like mine.
- 1. Modify the DOE HSA requirements to make it more reasonable and attainable. When more and more schools fall into the depths of the NCLB triage, it becomes obvious that the requirements are too difficult to achieve. E.g. modify requirements for the SPED, ESLL, and disadvantaged students, based on their unique needs and abilities instead of penalizing them for the same.
2. Providing funding specifically for mandatory tutoring provided by qualified instructors during after school and intersession hours. Allocate (per pupil) Fed. funding designated for Supplemental Educational Services, tutoring.
- Hawaii needs to be realistic in goal setting. Yes, set high goals – that are real-can be attained. Hawaii masks its goals on making it too high, sending our message to the nation that we are ahead of everyone and no support or insufficient support is given. Instead, we need to make education successful for all students, setting realistic goals, and then moving higher as time goes on (only if data shows it is realistic). Hawaii seems to want to look good, and yet fails in support of schools, lack of personnel, lost of touch with all that is happening on the school level. Reports mandates bombard the schools from all divisions of the state level. A center for all school information should be kept. _____ information that was already sent to 3 divisions in the state. Requests for testing should be kept to a minimal as schools tend to statewide testing procedures and most of all – "teaching". With all the down saying, the school level is being bombarded. The gap as to what is happening between states and school level is widening, as well as requests, mandates that are getting to be out of touch with reality on the school level. There is input given, but school level concerns are not deeply addressed in final decisions. It could be that politics and union issues may bring

education to a halt here. I don't know the correct response to this. Note: Some states are more realistic in goal setting and testing procedures. We need to look at how other states are functioning.

- I believe that the intent of NCLB is worthy as the law sets high expectations for all students and establishes a sense of urgency to support all students to meet rigorous academic standards. To support all students to achieve at high levels, schools need more support in areas of reading, staff development, data analysis, and programs for students who need more time and additional instruction to meet standards.
- We need to start looking at how and why more schools will not meet AYP. Then plan for either more funding/staffing/training/support or take a hard look at our benchmarks/proficiency standards/assessments. I am hoping staffing and teacher schedules will change to support the high student performance wanted. Thank you for all of your support.
- Thomas Jefferson reminded us, "Every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle." It is in that spirit that I respond to your survey. I embrace the widely held belief that education should focus on challenging every student to meet their potential and support that effort. However, the process as detailed in NCLB is where I take issue. Rather than spending time trying to "fix" this flawed legislation, we should reject federal intrusion in education as a state right and refocus our attention on what happens between children and teachers in the classroom.
"Nobody grew taller by being measured" (Phillip Gammage) and precious instructional time is being lost to the burden of testing as required in NCLB. Speak to the teachers and hear about the impact this is having on children, learning and the balanced curriculum. Ask the children how it feels to sit for hours feeling anxious and plowing through what seems like endless items. And then notice how committed the teachers are to trying to make this work and how sincere the children are trying to perform at their best level of proficiency.
I appreciate your wanting to hear from administrators and giving us the opportunity to share our concerns regarding NCLB. I cannot respond to the specific questions because a response would imply that I agree that some changes in the "problem areas" would make this law acceptable. This reminds me of the time my daughter wanted to surprise us by baking cookies as a treat. In the baking process, she used a tablespoon instead of a teaspoon and substituted baking soda for salt. I am sure you can imagine our reaction to the first bite! It was impossible to separate out the mistakes that she made or isolate the problem areas. Instead, we thanked her for her effort and the cookies discretely disappeared. The task of making NCLB right for children and schools is akin to those cookies. There was no way of saving them nor is there hope for improving this law. Thank you for this opportunity to give input to the process and for your continued commitment to the children and schools of Hawaii.
- Students with disabilities have a very difficult time with the HSA test. Allowing extended time is not the answer. They need to be exempt from taking the test based on their severity. Some reason applies for ESL students. The HSA test should not be the only criteria used to determine a school's progress. Schools should be evaluated on longitudinal performance criteria. NCLB will only widen the gap between the have and the have nots and if followed on its present course, will destroy the public school system.
- Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. My school is high performing. Approximately 95% of our non-IDEA students are meeting HAP standards. Our reflect scores reflect that IDEA and 504 students can not meet HAP standards. We too will join the ranks of status schools in a few years. 13% of our students are IDEA, of which 5% are autistic. If we agree that IDEA students are 2 standard deviations below their typical peers, to no fault of education, but due to their disability, then they will never meet HAP, which are assumed set for the non-disabled. Using this logic, then our "100% is actually 86%. As NCLB students transfer into this school, and as schools do "discipline transfers" during HAP grades immediately prior to testing, the AYP scores do not reflect my school's efforts over time. In fact, it is demoralizing to our faculty who are extremely motivated, but can't control these things.
- As has been noted by OHA, many of the restructuring schools have large Native Hawaiian populations. In the weighted student formula from Act 51, many of these schools will lose \$. This makes no sense to me. There needs to be developed a multi-pronged assessment/funding. One size does not fit all.
- Funding is important to meet the needs of all children. Students with IEP's and ESL children shouldn't keep a school from making AYP. If testing doesn't change in Hawaii then many schools will suffer. Tests have to measure what is being taught at that grade level.
- Mahalo for anything done in the direction that we suggest! Aloha!

I. ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS (AYP) REFORM & FLEXIBILITY

- Revise the AYP scores to be consistent with other states. Our benchmarks are unrealistic. Do not include the special education and English as a Second Language in the AYP requirements. Support the No Child Left Behind Fairness Act (H.R. 4605/S.2542), which would allow principals to submit new evidence on whether their schools made AYP for the school year, based on new regulations passed in earlier years. NAESP and NASSP oppose the use of a single high stakes test. NCLB currently measures the progress of last year's class of students: True student improvement must be assessed by measuring individual student performance from year to year. Fully fund NCLB requirements. Schools cannot meet the objectives of NCLB without adequate resources. Make further improvements to special education requirements, assuring that NCLB is appropriately aligned with IDEA.
- Amend AYP provisions so that there is flexibility to reward schools for any continuous improvement in achievement. Currently, schools that do not meet AYP are penalized even if student achievement is improving in the subgroups that previously did not meet AYP. Make further improvements to special education requirements, assuring that NCLB is appropriately aligned with IDEA. Require all recipients of public funds to comply with NCLB requirements.
I am not asking to deflate the rigor of the tests. The cut scores should be realistic and attainable and should measure what is being taught. The scores should serve as an instructional tool for the teacher in helping students learn. We need instructionally sensitive tests. (Reference: W. James Popham, Alfie Kohn, Deborah Meir, Robert Marzano, Mike Schomaker, Art Costa, Simon Lizotte, Robert Eaker, Breaking Ranks). Need to consider demonstrated mastery in assessing students' learning and a multitude of tests and assessments, e.g. standards based grading, Advanced Placement Test Scores, Scholastic Aptitude Test (ACT), PSAT, EXPLORE, American College Test (ACT), Gates McGinnite Reading Test (GMRT), California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), and others.
- Change subgroups and SPED requirements so that children are tested at their level and show yearly gains as appropriate (pre and posting testing). We want to measure the level of improvement and not their level of deficiency. Right now we are **not** measuring what students can do, we are measuring what students cannot do. That is not fair to the student, their families, the school nor a fair representation on our state educational system.
I do not think that any Principal in Hawaii has a problem with NCLB, we all want what is best for our children, we all want to have successful schools, we all want to make a difference in our communities. The problem that we have is that we do not feel valued as Principals in that we are not asked what we need in our unique areas to increase our rate of success. Our Waialua Complex support positions often go unfilled. We did not have a complex psychologist this past year, and the high school did not have a School Based Mental Health person last year, yet we are required to do well on our Internal Reviews and we pass, but that means others pick up the slack for the unfilled positions leaving them less time to concentrate on their own duties at the schools. Furthermore, with the new Weighted Student Formula, I will lose \$900,000, that is not much compared to the losses of other schools, but for a small school on the North Shore that means the loss of part time tutors. I strongly believe that we do so well out here because we use our Title 1 funds for tutors, and write grants to offer our students one-on-one supports.
We need to look at our benchmarks realistically. Are we setting ourselves up for failure? Even the May 2005 Time Magazine edition stated that, "It's true that the No Child law has problems. It prescribes one treatment for schools with wildly different ailments. And it does not reward improvement. While Margaret Spellings, the new Secretary of Education, said last month that she will allow for more flexibility, she has yet to clarify what she means. But whatever happens, states will seem to have significant autonomy. Each can choose its own test – and set its own passing score." If we are allowed to set our own passing score, why are so many schools failing?
- Currently, attaining AYP is a convoluted process that is beyond comprehension and needs to be streamlined and designed to be realistic and achievable.
It makes much more sense to follow the same students over a period of time, i.e., assessing them from grades 3-10, to actually measure growth and determine whether they are achieving proficiency of the standards. As it is now, students in grades 3-10 are tested and that group's scores are expected to increase incrementally to eventually reach 100% proficiency. Yet, without tracking the progress of each group, it will be random.
There are numerous provisions within the NCLB law which support the status of Native Hawaiians (Title VII) and provide for the flexibility and accountability (Title IV) to effectively address the unique needs of States and localities, involving developing multiple measures of student academic achievement and eliminating barriers to implementing effective State and local educational reform. Additionally, Title VII, Sec 7202, Part 13(F) and 21(B) reaffirms and recognizes the Hawaiian language as an official language of the State of Hawaii which may be used as the language of instruction for all subjects and grades in the public school system. Additionally, this past State legislative session passed Act 133, providing for the development and assessment of Hawaiian Language Medium Education (HLME) students and programs. As such, it behooves the State to fully support and implement

HLME programs, inclusive of public charter schools and the DOE Hawaiian Language Immersion Program. By collaborating with UH Hilo and other entities, a comprehensive academic assessment program needs to be developed which is aligned with the HLME curriculum Hawaiian culture as a valid and reliable measurement for HLME programs attaining AYP.

- Need to relook at Hawaii's proficiency set at 300 on the HSA for RDG & Math. This is really high we are shooting ourselves in the foot. While I support setting High Expectations considering our population of immigrants and that the majority of our children have Pidgin as a first language this seems just to high to indicate proficiency.
- 100% meeting AYP in the current set of criteria is impossible. It may be possible if the State revises the criteria to allow ALL students to meet AYP; attainable goals based on ongoing evidence of increased achievement.
- The DOE leadership culture has always had very high expectations ; often "setting the bar higher" than the Feds. Perhaps it's because "outsiders" may label the DOE as 2nd class "behind" the mainland schools. For whatever reason, in this particular situation (High DOE AYP criteria) we are proving that we are failures. Now that the HSA test developer, Harcourt, will not be retained, the DOE has the opportunity to modify the HSA to make meeting AYP more reasonable and attainable. When administering any test, if the majority of the test takers fail the test, what are some of the possible reasons? 1) The test is not testing what is being taught or what is being tested is not being taught; the test is too difficult or items are not appropriate. Having experienced both the grades 3 & 5 HSA, I know that test is very challenging and especially frustrating for the SPED, ESLL and disadvantaged students; the particular group of students that the NCLB law intended not be left behind. In such a high stake test requirement, schools will focus on meeting the required percentages to meet AYP. Do you think their initial focus will be on ALL students? The priority will be to focus on those in each category/group that can will meet AYP the others on the bottom levels will certainly be left behind, until the percentages required to meet AYP increase.
- The goal is honorable, but measuring progress is inconsistent from state to state. How can they compare states when each state's yardstick is at different lengths? The assessment of standards is still a struggle for educators, let alone the general public. Common understanding and expectations are required by educators, students, parents and _____. Flexibility would help the schools achieve their goals. With experience gained, I believe a better plan can be developed.
- Use a bell-shaped curve to define the % of students realistically capable of meeting the standards. Larger % of SPED and ESLL kids need to be allowed to take alternative assessments. Why can't the tests measure BOTH minimum competency and high expectations? A passing score and an exceeding score? The passing score would meet NCLB expectations and the exceeding score would continue to push high standards.
- How realistic is for 100% SPED, 100% ESL students and 100% of all student meeting the academic standards? Track students for progress. Student should be progressing over the years. Any help and flexibility will help the schools.
- Too much emphasis has been placed only on academic proficiency although standards are important.
- The HSA has proven to be a difficult test. Standards-based testing should be standardized across the nation. Change to 40 the number of students needed in a subgroup for proficiency levels.
- The key word in the above-statement is ALL! We should focus on individual student progress rather than the whole system. There are many obstacles to a student's learning which the system has no control over. The common denominator here is preparing individual students to become productive citizens.
- Analogy: Should we all have a 10 handicap in golf by our 16th lesson?
- Students who receive special education services and English as Second Language Learner services require those services to help them achieve a level of proficiency where they can return to the regular education program. Is it reasonable to expect them to attain the same levels of performance on statewide tests? The AYP targets needs to be reviewed. This relates to question 1. It is difficult to show an accurate rate if a school is looking at the cohort's 9th through 12th grade year to determine graduation rate. Many schools have a high transiency rate, so that should be taken into consideration. The school choice requirement that has a higher priority than other GE program reasons could jeopardize successful programs in high schools.

- AYP does not allow for cultural changes to take place re: reading and attendance for immersion children.
- Use of portfolios – student sample shows more clearly what students know and are able to do rather than limited one shot test. Seems as if transfers under NCLB, which mean the most needy priority first, will effect new school AYP – so allowances should be made for AYP calculations. Our plan is well focused on standards – it's the benchmarks scores based on an acknowledged difficult test is a problem. Modify the test and use other means such as student portfolios or exit performances to determine how standards are being met.
- With our world changing, our standards will have to change to keep up. So are we really preparing our students, in the best way possible, for our future world?
With student data from their daily performance and assessments, could these be used or given some value towards NCLB and AYP?
Being what our political climate is, I don't know if we should aggressively seek to amend our plan?
- As teachers honor students' learning styles, the State needs to tap in on students' strengths by using alternative assessments. Graduation rate will give a better indication of system success.
- SpEd students, *by definition*, are 2 standard deviations below typical peers. They will not be able to meet "at grade level" standards. We modify their curriculum ("IEP Goals"), instruction, and assessment.
- Achievement cannot "be" adequately measured through the examination of standardized test scores only. The reading and math tests should be reviewed. The reading tests need to be shortened. Math tests should be relevant to skills needed in real life.
- We are becoming a state/nation of tests. One size does not fit all. Remember a test is a snapshot. The federal government has allowed 29 states to have more latitude in NCLB implementation in various areas i.e. size of the subgroups, SPED alternative testing. "50% of states must know something."
- The goals are achievable but we need the resources: tutoring, intervention, extended time funded. Give ESLL kids more than 1 year prior to testing. This is not a reasonable expectation. Secondary schools do not have the resources or support to address subgroups adequately.
- America's schooling seems to be placing undue emphasis on students going on for college degrees and not valuing the talents of students who can do well in other areas of life.
- Do not let a small subgroup like Special Education or ESL keep a small school from making AYP. State assessment does not test what is taught at 10th grade level.
- For small schools, 95% of a subgroup sometimes means one or two students can affect that 95% requirement.

II. TESTING

- The cut scores are unrealistic and were determined before NCLB.
- I don't not feel it is set too high, as much as I feel that they are inappropriate and not measuring what they are designed to do. It was designed as a snapshot to see where a person is at that time in their life. It was not designed to measure learning, there is no movement from point A to B, it is static. If you are truly measuring learning then their needs to be an A test and a B test for the same group of students in the same year.
- Different proficiency and levels of standards has led to confusion and misconceptions of student performance, state by state.
- Goals and expectations should be set high. However, the 100% expectation is not obtainable.

- Hawaii's HSA test is rated 6th most difficult across the nation.
- Let's not "set the bar" lower so more students can achieve. Students are capable of learning if the curriculum is interesting, engaging, and relevant. How about merit pay for teachers whose students make individual yearly progress?
- Again, SPED goals are unachievable. I have 8th graders reading at 2nd grade level because of their disabilities.
- There is no regard for making testing simple and geared to student success. Procedures already aim at student failure, because it is so much in denial of student needs especially ESL populations as well as poverty populations.
- Definitely need to modify the test.
- I believe that the degree of difficulty is appropriate, but the state needs to factor in our SPED population and develop a plan so as not to hold those students unable to meet the individual benchmarks to affect the school overall rank(s).
- Is it realistic to hold all students to the same performance standards when we see that all students do not perform at the same rate/level all the time?
- 10th graders are expected to do problems in Trigonometry/Geometry on state assessments!!
- I think that the HSA is not developmentally appropriate – and therefore unfairly sets a standard that is too high. Including SPED students in test results also unfairly penalizes schools with small populations.
- We all want high standards however there should be equity amongst States especially if they intend to compare them e.g. Hawaii having the largest % of restructured schools.
- The HSA should be rigorous, however there should be some criteria set by the Federal Government to "level" the playing field on state tests.
- Actually – 1st editions of HSA in math were not appropriate (too hard) for grade levels tested. This affected how our students performed, percentage wise on the state HSA.
- Alternative assessments should be considered. Alternative means of rating progress/achievement should be considered.

III. FUNDING

- Earmark the increased revenue only for education not placed in a general fund. Hawaii's taxes are much lower than any major cities in the United States. Also, developers should donate a percentage of their revenue to schools in the district/complex of their projects. This is done in other states such as Washington. Schools cannot meet the objectives of NCLB without adequate resources. Give high-speed districts a better chance to recruit and retain high-quality personnel. Support literacy and technology programs by providing additional funding.
- I am not sure how to answer this question. I can only tell you that reducing the class size with teachers or trained tutors is the best teaching method. One-on-one teaching with trained personnel produce the best results. Adding money or bodies without proper training will not work. Such is the case of removing my tutors who have been trained but do not meet NCLB requirements will crush me. You will be replacing years of trained tutors, with nothing, because no one will drive out to the North Shore for these small-paying jobs. No one with a degree will want to work for only a few hours a day at eleven dollars an hour.
- Has a cost analysis been done to determine the costs of implementing NCLB?
- The State needs to provide the Feds. the data necessary to prove that the federal funds are being expended prudently to meet AYP requirements. Further, if the Feds. do not provide additional necessary funding, the State will take appropriate actions.

- I know there will be opposition in raising taxes however, our property taxes in Hawaii is much lower than other states where these taxes help support education.
- Taxes raised for this purpose should be used exclusively for education.
- Need to raise taxes to fund program appropriately.
- More funding does not guarantee better student achievement. Pre-service training of teachers may help.
- I don't believe that more money would increase my students' performances. I believe using money to find alternative assessments to meeting AYP is a better solution.
- The state level DOE is trying to provide schools with services with very limited personnel resources.
- Classrooms can become very uncomfortable with the heat, dust and outside noise. I have been a teacher at a school without air conditioning for students, and one with air conditioning and have noticed a significant difference in student motivation and performance, especially after recess and lunch. As adults, I think very few of us would be productive working in a classroom environment without air conditioning in the afternoons.
- Some states are refusing fed funds since they cannot afford to implement NCLB – where do we stand in relation to this idea?!
- The DOE needs to look at reducing the bureaucracy it has created. There are too many highly qualified teachers in non-teaching positions (e.g. resource teachers). A suggestion is to have resource teachers teach 1 semester and serve as an R.T. for the other semester. This may be a partial solution to the teacher shortage as well as to have our highly qualified teachers in the classroom where they are most needed to teach basic skills.
- Our performance targets set up too many schools for failure. Many schools have made great improvement but are "punished" because they did not hit the bull's eye. State needs to be reasonable or provide all schools needs to keep improving.
- Change from deficit funding model – where more resources are provided for more problems. When schools improve, they lose resources.
- If additional funding is necessary, we may need to raise the tax. I know this is a controversial subject especially for legislator's longevity. I also have concerns with the Weighted Student Formula (Act 51). With our proposed cuts (over \$278,000 or approximately 25% of our existing budget), we will not have a librarian, counselor, student services coordinator (SSC), SSC clerk, and custodians. Basically, we will have a principal, SASA, 4 teachers, cafeteria manager and helper, adult supervisor in three years. I have concerns with providing appropriate services e.g. counseling services required by law (IDEA and 504), custodial services, etc. With the teacher's contractual rights (not required to clean classrooms let alone restrooms and grounds), who will be responsible? I do not see the equity in one school not having these services and 10 or 16 miles from the same school, other schools having these services. Given this probability, I would consider our school not having minimum requirements to operate. Although money is not the entire answer, it does provide opportunities for remediation, acceleration, etc. As stated above, with the WSF cuts, we will not be able to provide the minimum needs for our students.
- The State should push/coerce/sue the Feds (like Maine) to provide adequate funding.
- Currently, all we can do is shift funds from other curriculum areas or other needed programs to provide the student support needed, especially for non-title 1 schools.
- Funding always a problem. Identify needs and target money to help schools meet AYP. Require students not meeting standards to take special classes to raise their competency levels. Graduation requirements should include an assessment of mastery of standards.

- Currently, textbook replacement occurs sporadically, when there is funding available or when a grant is received. Often it is a choice of what to do without when considering funding. For example the national reading panel advocates for smaller reading groups for the teaching of reading in the primary grades. In order to do so effectively, additional Part Time Teachers must be hired to supplement the existing staff. That takes money that could be used to purchase textbooks.

IV. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

- Other assessments should be used.
- It is not that all students with IEPs should be exempt. Teachers and schools need to be held accountable for learning, however; hold us accountable for exactly that, for the learning that took place that year. Not for the comparison of their scores to peers without learning disabilities, that makes no sense. They have INDIVIDUALIZED educational plans tailored to their specific unique need, how do you measure them against peers without learning difficulties?
- It is important to provide alternative assessments that are realistic for severely disabled students to achieve. It is pathetic to insist that students be put in test situations that sets them up for failure.
- The DOE will implement Alternative Assessments during the next HSA administration in spring 2006, which may reduce the number of disabled students not meeting AYP.
- Rather, than % exempted, I would hope that very clear criteria can be developed for exemption of disabled students.
- Change should to could be exempted by IEP team.
- It's hard to say. Not all with IEPs. Without more information about what research says, I cannot quote a number.
- Except for the severely disabled students, all students with an IEP should be given three years to meet AYP. Most SPED students become eligible because they are significantly delayed developmentally or academically. Three years is really minimal time to expect them to perform at a proficient level.
- SPED students are eligible for services due to a handicapping condition. They should be expected to work up to this potential.
- If a student's IQ score is below the norm, I think that student should be exempt.
- I think all severely disabled students should be exempt – this will be a different percentage for each school.
- Not sure how Fed reg NCLB is able to impose Fed IDEA
- If a student is identified with a disability, subjecting that student to the rigor of the Hawaii State Assessment seems to be defeating the purpose of the assessment. I proctored the sixth grade pilot for math at our school. The special ed. Students taking the test were so overwhelmed by the test. After the test session was over, I spoke to a student who was having difficulty during the test. The student could not answer a particular test question, but when the task was explained to him, he was able to draw his response.
- Student's IEP's have been determined to have special needs affecting their educational progress. Students who overcome these needs will be rescinded from SPED @ which time they will need to be held accountable.
- For schools with large SPED populations 10% is reasonable.
- Schools that are accessible are penalized because they have more severely handicapped kids.

- Presently, we do not have exemptions but we are anticipating one student coming in another year. Percentages at our school is difficult, with 69 students last year, one percent is less than one student (.6). This means no student can be exempt. Waiver could be necessary in cases like ours.
- Depends on the handicapping conditions of students – students with severe handicaps should be exempt and often schools who are "centers" for these program that service these types of children are negatively impacted.

V. STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

- It takes years for an ESL student to become somewhat comfortable in the use of English. Should look at the progress each student is making.
- I am so very happy to see this question here, thank you. This is so difficult for our ESL students, allow them to be exempt from taking the reading and math tests until their ESL teacher deems them capable or a state translator deems them fluent enough to take the tests. It would be beneficial to ESL students to have a team of translators in each complex to help these children adjust upon arrival and to accurately assess their academic levels when they arrive. They could also be assessed on academic gains for the year through a test given at the beginning of the year and the end in their own language and in English.
- In addition to C, a clear definition of "appropriate time" should be established.
- Elementary students may tend to make quicker progress when compared to high school students who have a much wider gap to close academically. Brain research also indicates that the younger students are able to grasp a new language quicker and more easily (window of opportunity is greater for younger students).
- It takes 2 to 3 years to acquire the language, 5-6 years to acquire it on an exceedingly well level.
- Test students in their native language and English and then work to determine how to educate them. With this information determine when would be the appropriate time to count their scores.
- Literature and professional discourse seem to indicate that ESL students can pick up a language after 3 years of immersion.
- It is beyond me why NCLB/States tests 2nd language students so early. We should be testing using their language assessments to determine improvements.
- Currently, we have no ESLL students. Research should be done to consider alternatives. What's occurring in other States?
- Once again, acquisition of the English language is dependent on many factors but statistics have shown that acquisition of the English language takes approximately (minimum) of 7 years – depending on age of child and other factors.