

SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

June 5, 2000
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

#	Agenda Items	Presenters
1.	Meeting Minutes	Benny Lile
2.	Validation and Research Scope of Work (Staff Note)	Linda Frazer
3.	Student Performance Standards on the Kentucky Core Content Test and CTBS/5 (Staff Note)	Beverly Klecker
4.	Longitudinal Assessment Model 1 (Staff Note)	Scott Trimble
5.	Requirements for School and District Report Cards (Final Action Staff Note)	Scott Trimble
6.	Interim Accountability Recommendations (Staff Note)	Scott Trimble
7.	Student Motivation and Accountability on State Required Assessments (Staff Note)	Scott Trimble
8.	Minority Student Achievement Task Force (Packet)	Gene Wilhoit
9.	Audio Tape Testing from CD	Scott Trimble
10.	Testing Windows	Scott Trimble
11.	Writing Portfolios Audit	Scott Trimble
12.	Item Pool Expansion Options	Scott Trimble
13.	Virtual High School	Linda Pittenger
Adjournment		

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2000

Chairman Benny Lile called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. EST. The roll was called.

Members Present:

Kay Freeland	Roger Pankratz	Maynard Thomas
Suzanne Guyer	Bob Sexton	Sharon Whitworth
Benny Lile	Linda Sheffield	Robert Young
Gary Mielcarek	John Stephens	

Helen Mountjoy, Chair, Kentucky Board of Education, attended the council meeting. Before the business meeting, she thanked the members of the council for their work over the past two years. She stated that the assessment and accountability system is much better than it would have been without the dedicated work of this committee.

1. Meeting Minutes

Benny Lile

March 28, 2000 minutes approved with following changes:

- Robert Young was present but was not listed as present.
- John Stephens was absent but was listed as present.
- Suzanne Guyer: page 3 "loose" should be "lose"
- Page 4. "Advise" should be "advice" and "stud" should be changed to "student."

2. Validation and Research Scope of Work (Staff Note)

Linda Frazer

Linda H. Frazer, Director of the Division of Validation and Research, presented the Scope of Work for this Division. She explained that the document was a living document. The National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) guides the work of the division. After presenting the Scope of Work she introduced other members of the staff of the Division of Validation and Research who were present: Beverly Klecker, Dollena Hawkins, Robert Wetter, and Joanmarie McGuire. Linda invited comments from the committee. Scott Trimble reiterated that the Scope of Work was a living document and that NTAPAA would review it on a regular basis.

3. Student Performance Standards on the Kentucky Core Content Test and CTBS/5 (Staff Note)

Beverly Klecker

Beverly Klecker reviewed the standard setting process to date and previewed components scheduled for 2000 and 2001 -- contrasting groups procedures, Jaeger-Mills, and CTB bookmark. She referenced timeframes provided in the staff note included in the council packet. She stated that more details of these studies would be presented as the process moves forward.

SCAAC Questions:

Will school indices change as a result of new cut scores?

KDE Response:

While the department cannot confirm that yet, the interim indices to be published September 15, 2000 will likely be adjusted based on the new standards to be finalized by spring 2001. It is not known if the cut scores will change. The final draft of the performance standards for baseline growth studies will not be ready until the summer of 2001. The Interim Accountability model is based on Standards as they currently are. The new standards set in 2001 will carry over to 2014. In addition, it should be emphasized that these standards will be applied to the spring 1999 and spring 2000 data.

SCAAC Comments:

Teachers always want to know if there will be different expectations from last year. This is a Teacher's question. The department should be planning to get information out to teachers. Teachers are trying to figure out how CATS is moving.

KDE Response:

The department hopes that it is moving in the right direction. The draft versions of the content area/grade level performance level descriptors that you have with your materials are on the department website. These do not fully answer the question of the direction in which the department is moving because they are in draft form and are just starting points for the standard setting process. After the standard process is completed, teachers can look at the descriptors for guidance in what they should teach and have more information on what it means to be "proficient" in each grade level/content area.

SCAAC Questions:

Why are you not re-addressing the Writing standards?

KDE Response:

The department met with a group of Writing people. They were brought together during Step 1 of the standard setting process in November/December 1999 and January 2000. After reviewing the Writing standards, it was decided that the Writing standards would not be changed. The advice of the Writing Advisory Committee, a committee that

predates KERA, also stated that the standards should not be changed. They suggested this mainly because they felt the standards were where they needed to be. The Writing Advisory Committee has spent a lot of time and energy over the years examining and revising the standards.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Are you comfortable that 43% of male students in 10th grade are at Novice level in writing? This seems that we are sending people out unprepared.

KDE Response:

The department is comfortable that the writing standards are where they should be. Need to focus on how to teach male students to focus on proficiency. The writing standards have received more attention over time than have the other content areas. It could be argued that if we had the same visiting of the other content standards like what was done in the writing content area, that the other content areas might not have to be going through the standard setting procedures now.

SCAAC Comments:

Anytime that you revise your standards you need to have a massive public relations campaign to let everyone know as much as possible about the procedures. The department cannot afford credibility questions.

KDE Response:

You are right; the department needs to pay attention to public relations. Information about standard setting and the draft versions of the standards are on the department website.

SCAAC Questions:

Who will be involved in standard setting groups besides teachers?

KDE Response:

At the present time, there are no plans to include university staff on these committees. However, on the synthesis step, could bring university people, parents, and other teachers together.

SCAAC Discussion:

Discussion followed about the importance of including university faculty and the qualifications of faculty that might be involved in the standard setting process. There was further discussion on the usefulness of the ACT and possible use of the Kentucky Core Content Test to provide information to universities as they plan programs.

KDE Response:

Is there a consensus that we should involve university people in the Jaeger-Mills and Bookmark procedures?

SCAAC Concerns:

The department should also include newly formed technical colleges. Students in these colleges should be taking a rigorous curriculum.

KDE Response:

Your recommendations will go to National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability. I cannot think of any problem they would have. Committees are not set yet. The committee will consist of 18 elementary teachers, 18 middle school teachers, and 18 high school teachers. The department will look over options to involve university and technical college people.

SCAAC Questions:

How are efforts to get teachers for the standard setting procedures proceeding?

KDE Response:

So far the following has been done (1) put a request on the department Website, (2) placed an add in the Kentucky Teacher, (3) worked with Kentucky Educational Association, and (4) sent e-mails. Have not been able to get many responses to these. Spring is early to get commitments from teachers for fall so we do not know. May send a notice to District Assessment Coordinators to let them know that the request is coming in August. Have heard some comments about the difficulty of finding substitutes.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Do all of the meetings have to take place in Lexington? You might get better response if you moved this to a different part of the state. People in some parts of the state feel that there is an I64/I75 bias.

KDE Response:

It was difficult to find facilities that were large enough to host meetings of more than 400 teachers at a time. We called Louisville, Ashland, Bowling Green, and Covington. The selection was made on the facility that had the lowest bid and who was able to furnish the accommodations. The department is sensitive to the issues of location of meetings throughout the state, but this is not the place to resolve this.

4. Longitudinal Assessment Model 1 (Staff Note)

Scott Trimble

Scott Trimble presented the Staff Note on the Longitudinal Assessment—Model 1. He stated that the data came from primary and grade 4, rather than grade 3. The data came from spring 1998 CTBS at the end of primary correlated with 1999 KCCT reading scores. Combining all three levels (elementary, middle, and high school), the researchers were able to match records for about 71% of the students). The correlation between end of primary and grade 4 reading is .63; the correlation between end of grade 6 and grade 7 reading is .66; the correlation between end of grade 9 and grade 10 reading is .66. Using a much smaller sample of students, correlations between end

of primary CTBS/5 and grade 4 CTBS/5 reading, between grade 6 and grade 7, and between grade 9 and grade 10 were calculated. These correlations were .47, .57, and .59 respectively. (These were based on an analysis of data from schools that voluntarily administer CTBS/5 at grades 4, 7, and 10.)

SCAAC Questions:

Why would you expect these two tests to be correlated?

KDE Response:

Right now, the percent of matched students may not be sufficient. Should the department expect a high correlation, because both are measures of reading, or expect a low correlation because they measure reading in different ways? The department would expect the correlations to be positive. These things are also affected by reliability; we would expect correlations to be higher as a function of reliability.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Why is the department doing this? This is to build a longitudinal model. Remind me of the longitudinal model concept.

KDE Response:

The law simply states that there will be a technically sound longitudinal assessment based on measurement of students at two points in time. There are two initiatives underway. Since there was already CTBS/5 data it made sense to take advantage of that data. CTBS/5 correlated with cut points should contribute information about whether a student is on track or not on track. This is done for two reasons—maybe three (1) teachers resented being held accountable with two different cohorts of students because of the differences in students, (2) people believe that you can gain a lot of information by measuring the same student at two points in time. Maybe the Department can adjust scores just for cohort groups. Perhaps the department could add vertical scaling to the KCCT but that adds to the budget. Longitudinal Model 2 was advised by National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability. This model tests reading at the 4th grade level. If student does not reach a certain score level, the school should monitor the student and re-test in the 5th grade. Model 1 had technical difficulties; Model 2 reduces the technical difficulties—administering the same 4th grade test at two points in time. Model 2 presented fewer serious issues and allows us to review what has been done for students in a year of schooling. This is only part of the picture.

SCAAC Concerns:

A discussion followed concerning the problem of matching students, the difficulties in longitudinal studies, and the lack of a strong correlation between CTBS/5 and KCCT. The department described the longitudinal pilot study with 6,000 students. There are some concerns, one of which is why students think they are being re-tested.

5. Requirements for School and District Report Cards (Final Action Staff Note)

Scott Trimble

Scott Trimble presented the staff note and highlighted points of discussion and recommended changes. Section 1 lines 12, 13, and 14 of the regulation discuss teacher in-service and the need to have it delivered by certain kinds of people. Basically, it is all right to continue to focus on the content of in-service, but not to focus on the restriction of delivery. A pilot of the school report found that the recording of the academic background of the middle school teachers is controversial. Interpretation from the field was that less than 100% of the teachers were certified at the middle school level. The department reaction was to add cells that included the percent of teachers certified with a cell with whether or not the teacher had a major or minor in the field that he or she taught. Adding the new field still did not address all of the questions. The point was made, "Where is the research that says content trained middle school teachers were better teachers than teachers with middle school background." What impact should a major or minor in the field have or not have on certification? Another question is "How do you report financial data?" Should it be expenditures at the school level or expenditures at the district level? The department added an area on the School Report Card so that it can be explain to people why they are different. An example offered was the coding of transportation costs to either the district or the school. The regulation could have mandated that schools use MUNIS the same way, but this seemed to be an unreasonable mandate.

The parental involvement section of the School Report Card also received significant comment from the field and from parents representing state parent organizations. It was felt that the attempt to distinguish between volunteer hours supporting instruction and those supporting extracurricular activities would be difficult to measure. The PTAs suggested that parent volunteering should be collected as one data point.

Another difficulty was the requirement that all districts "shall" place the School Report Card information on a Website. We learned that not all districts have website capabilities. The word "shall" has been changed to "may."

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Have you thought about using MUNIS data to look at expenditures versus achievement scores?

MUNIS codes are not used the same way across the state.

KDE Response:

Staff here is planning to pull together a group to recommend standard reporting of data. This raises all kinds of other questions.

SCAAC Comments/Discussion:

A discussion followed centered on the School Report Card data point "class size." The point was made that pupil/teacher ratio and class size are different measures. It was

suggested that the School Report Card Report, “average class size” to be calculated by averaging the number of students with each teacher in the classroom.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

Need to find out what kind of data makes a difference in student learning? A secretary could spend a lot of time on data collection and if it is not collected and reported uniformly, will not be able to look at the larger question.

Helen Mountjoy: We need to ask, “What is the purpose of the School Report Card?” It is a starting place not an ending place. It is a way of getting out some information and beginning conversations.

SCAAC Discussion:

There was discussion regarding the importance of middle school and high school teachers having a major or minor in the field that they taught. It was pointed out that while there is no body of research indicating that a teacher’s major or minor has an effect on student learning, neither is there research in the other direction. Kentucky is one of a few states that have middle school certification in place for a long time.

SCAAC Questions:

It was stated that the expanded School Report Card has been made smaller. How have they been made smaller?

KDE Response:

The Expanded School Report Card has been made smaller because data elements are better defined and more specific. Regulations and calculation procedure documentation are available.

SCAAC Discussion/Questions:

Is there an equity component to the School Report Card, that is, a place to indicate what the school has done to address equity issues?

Discussion followed on the requirement for schools and districts to address equity issues in consolidated planning, structures in place to assure compliance with addressing equity, and documentation of the process. The suggestion was made that help for addressing equity issues in the schools (these include looking at teaching and curriculum planning for subgroup populations such as gender, race, and socioeconomic status), could come from the newly formed Minority Student Achievement Task Force.

KDE Response:

What should the Department do on the School Report Card? In future years, this will show the performance of all subgroups of the school’s populations as disaggregated data points. Some of the tools to address the question are in the School Report Card. The department worries about putting data on the School Report Card that could be misinterpreted. If the report shows that schools are in compliance with the equity plan, but the data indicates that there are still gaps, what will that mean? By this fall should

have recommendations coming out of the Minority Student Achievement Task Force that will help identify and address these issues. Should we wait for September for these recommendations? The department does not want to back away from this question.

SCAAC Comments/Questions:

A part of this issue is whether Advanced Placement classes are offered in the schools, how many students are taking the Advanced Placement examinations, and whether the Commonwealth Diploma is available. Should data be looked at by subgroup populations? Should information about the students who are in gifted and talented programs be added as well? This would give an indication of whether students in subgroup populations are included in these programs. Do not need to wait for test results to see what courses schools are offering. This subject is so broad that it should go into the expanded version of the School Report Card. This discussion was followed by the passage of three motions:

SCAAC Motion:

The Expanded School Report Card shall contain the following information:

1. The number of Advanced Placement courses offered at the school (Broken down by subject and grade level)
2. The number of students enrolled in Advanced Placement courses: by gender, race, and (when statistics are available) socio-economic status.
3. The number of students who take the Advanced Placement tests (by demographic categories).
4. The average Advanced Placement examination scores (by demographic categories).
5. The number of Commonwealth Diplomas awarded (by demographic categories)

This motion was seconded, no discussion, motion passed.

SCAAC Motion:

The Expanded School Report Card shall contain the following information:

Identification of the number of students identified as gifted and talented in each of five areas:

- (a) General intellectual,
- (b) Specific academic,
- (c) Creativity,
- (d) Leadership, or
- (e) Creative and performing arts, receiving services within elementary, middle schools or high schools. The number of participating students should be identified by gender, race, and (when statistics are available) socio-economic status.

This motion was seconded, no discussion, motion passed.

SCAAC Motion:

An open-ended question shall be included in the Expanded School Report Card that asks how the school has addressed equity issues.

This motion was seconded, no discussion, motion passed.

Following the lunch break, there was a brief discussion about membership on the Committee and potential new appointees. Benny Lile stated that the current members whose terms have expired would serve until they are notified that a replacement has been named.

6. Interim Accountability Recommendations (Staff Note)

Scott Trimble

Scott Trimble presented the staff note on Interim Accountability Recommendations that outlined five issues. The first issue was one of fairness for schools caught between old and new cycles. The complexity and timing of the interim process made it cleaner to simply treat all reconfigured schools the same and to choose an alternative that met the needs of most reconfigured school. The appeals process would still be applicable to any school considered to be treated unfairly.

- Issue #2 concerned accountability labels applied to schools. In the interim, the label “maintaining” should be applied to schools scoring below their predicted point and within one standard error of estimate below their predicted point. The department recommends that the Kentucky Board of Education also apply a label of “maintaining” to high scoring schools scoring above 80 on the accountability index and who have scored one standard error of estimate or below their predicted score.
- Issue #3 concerned the department’s recommendations to continue SBDM Council exemptions through the interim period.
- Issue #4 concerned the Interim Accountability Cycle Scholastic Audit. The department recommends that the interim scholastic audit apply to the lowest one-third of the schools scoring one standard error of estimate or more below their predicted performance.
- Issue #5 concerned the Interim Accountability Cycle reward shares. During the interim, there will be one reward amount calculated by dividing the total reward amount by the total number of teacher in schools earning rewards in the interim cycle.

SCAAC Discussion:

Discussion followed to clarify the interim accountability regression lines and the number of schools that might fall in the categories that would make them eligible for scholastic audit team visits.

KDE Response:

Robyn Oatley joined the meeting and Scott Trimble announced that Robyn was leaving her position at the Department to take a principalship at Mill Creek Elementary School in Lexington.

7. Student Motivation and Accountability on State Required Assessments (Staff Note) Scott Trimble

Scott Trimble presented an update for this agenda item. This issue has been an agenda item for previous council meetings. It has been much discussed. The question that raised this issue was one of student motivation and what measures might be taken at the state level to increase student motivation. Scott Trimble thanked Beverly Klecker for putting the paper together. The National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) reviewed recommendations presented in this paper. The advisory panel felt strongly that the Department should pull this paper together, but they shape and guide the recommendations that appear in the paper. This is a brief review of the alternatives found in the Staff Note (alternatives are in italics).

1. High School Transcript – A high school student transcript will contain indicators of performance on all or parts of the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System. NTAPAA tells us that this is a bad idea at this point in time. Assessments designed to be valid and reliable at the school level may not have the technical qualities required for student level accountability. NTAPAA recommended that this not be pursued at the state level, however, we are not sure that we can tell the districts what to do.
2. KEES Scholarship—KEES Scholarship amounts, in part, will be based on student performance on the Kentucky Core Content Tests (a graduated scale resulting in greater rewards for higher performance). It was recommended that KCCT become an added component to the KEES criteria already in place (i.e., teacher grades and ACT). It is probable that the use of KCCT scores would not be any more difficult to defend than the criteria now being used. The department does not want to present the idea that NTAPAA strongly endorses the use of KCCT for KEES Scholarships; it is one option that has been reserved for further discussion.
3. Gateway Skills – Students will be required to pass locally developed gateway skills evaluations in at least mathematics and reading to participate in middle school and high school curricula. The NTAPAA panel feels that mandating the passing of KCCT or any other test for this purpose should be avoided. Discussions are continuing about identifying multiple criteria for this purpose.
4. Compulsory Evaluation and Assistance to Low Scoring Students – Students scoring low on the Kentucky Core Content Tests in reading or mathematics will

be evaluated in a holistic manner to determine the most appropriate instructional interventions and support. This suggestion is to take everything we know about a child, with the KCCT score added as a data point, to make decisions about how to best help each child. Mandating the use of a single test score for use in this manner was not recommended. It should be mandatory that schools carefully evaluate low scoring students using multiple criteria.

5. Local District Options for Scoring the Kentucky Core Content Test – Schools may score students on the Kentucky Core Content Tests and apply results to course grades. NTAPAA felt that this was something that the state should not pursue.
6. Good Faith Effort – Local schools or districts may establish “good faith effort” requirements for students responding to the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System. These policies allow or require local school staff to review the work of students as they complete the state required assessments against locally established checklists. These check lists may include such items as: (1) completed all portions of assessment, (2) responded to all or most items, and (3) did not include sarcastic or inappropriate language in responses. Consequences are established locally and may range from a variety of disciplinary actions to retention. NTAPAA felt that this option addressed student motivation most directly. NTAPAA suggested that this and other direct motivational strategies would be recommended.

This paper now goes to the Kentucky Board of Education for review at the June meeting.

NTAPAA conducted a survey of 10th grade students taking the reading assessment and 11th grade students taking the mathematics assessment. This survey was done, using a random sample of students with a 75-80% return rate, during the 2000 CATS assessment. Some of the questions on the NTAPAA survey were the same ones we were interested in (the NTAPAA survey is in the Appendix of the Staff Note). Preliminary data from the NTAPAA survey will be presented to the Kentucky Board of Education tomorrow. The question of motivation should be explored further with student interviews. Additionally, the scoring contractor will code for us responses that indicate that students may not have taken the assessment seriously.

SCAAC Discussion:

The discussion focused on student motivation and student knowledge and included observations on the need for schools to align curriculum with the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment.

8. Minority Student Achievement Task Force (Packet)

Gene Wilhoit

Gene Wilhoit presented a summary of the work of the department sponsored Minority Student Achievement Task Force. This Task Force was formed because, although all students have grown, looking at data from the 1992-1998 KIRIS tests and 1999 CATS tests, some subgroups of the student population have consistently higher scores than other groups. Generally, from the highest to lowest the groups are (1) White females, (2) White males, (3) African American females, and (4) African American males. When we took these data to the Kentucky Board of Education, they said that they wanted some real recommendations not just more data that showed the differences. It is the charge of the Minority Student Achievement Task Force to come up with recommendations. The Task Force will hold monthly meetings with a report coming in the fall.

The packet for today's meeting contains figures and background data. At the first meeting in Lexington, Gene Wilhoit presented disaggregated Kentucky student achievement data, Kati Haycock from the Education Trust presented disaggregated national student data, and two students presented their ideas and experiences. Members of the Task Force met in small groups and identified barriers to minority student achievement. The Task Force will meet in June to develop goals, objectives, and strategies for improving minority student achievement.

SCAAC Questions:

Have you been able to identify schools where the gap is small?

KDE Response:

Yes, there are a few that have been identified. There are some schools in which the achievement of African American students is greater than that of White students. One or two of these schools is represented on the Task Force. This shows that it can be done, is being done, and takes away the argument that there are some children who cannot learn.

Discussion followed that included the inclusion of equity issues in the Scholastic Audits, looking at Socio-Economic Status differences as well as gender and race, validating the Scholastic Audit indicators.

SCAAC Comments:

One student who presented at the Minority School Achievement Task Force, Zack Webb, has created a video for a school assignment. This video has received national recognition. I would suggest that asking him to present his video to this committee would be worthwhile.

KDE Response:

Yes, Zack Webb's video is very powerful.

9. Audio Tape Testing from CD

Scott Trimble

One form of the test has been placed on audiotape for use with visually impaired students and others with disabilities needing oral presentation of the tests. This is a standardization of presentation of the assessment. There is a group at the department that is looking into putting the test on CD Roms for computerized presentation.

10. Testing Windows

Scott Trimble

The Department has identified the testing windows out to the year 2003. Basically, the test will be given one week after spring break, except in schools with alternative calendars. Identifying the testing window well in advance helps us to be more up front about conflicts with religious holidays. We need to be more public about the department's policy regarding testing and religious holidays.

11. Writing Portfolios Audit

Scott Trimble

The writing portfolio audit is underway. There are roughly 50 schools that were randomly selected and 50 schools that were purposefully selected involved in the audit. The portfolios are sent to Minneapolis for the audit. If there is a disagreement in scoring, the scores are changed. The improvement of portfolio scoring makes trend data harder to interpret.

12. Item Pool Expansion Options

Scott Trimble

The department is currently discussing with contractors some options for increasing the item pool. As you know, this year the department did not release test items. An annotated CD Rom was released with previously released test items and ideas for teacher's use of these items. We want this committee to be aware that these discussions are going on.

13. Virtual High School

Linda Pittenger

Linda Pittenger presented a brief overview of the Virtual High School (no Staff Note). The Virtual High School opened in January by offering courses over the Internet. All teachers in the program are certified at the secondary level. Classes are open to 8th graders as well. The Virtual High School classes are small, 25-30 students. Students may earn ½ credit per semester or one full credit over two semesters. The Virtual High School classes are modeled on classroom model. Students do group work, participate in peer review, and participate in dialogue with school personnel. The classes are fee-based. There is an online course syllabus. Most classes do not have textbooks. The student logs on to a Website and is able to post work and interact in class discussions.

The department has found that students like the Internet courses because there is no “back row.” The students do not come with labels. The Latin, German, and Physics courses are migrating to the Web from KET. Not every high school has a Kentucky Tele-Linking Network site, but all high schools have access to the Internet. We are looking for federal grants to pay student fees for Advanced Placement courses. We are looking at retired faculty who are certified as teachers for the Virtual High School. Assessment is handled with a lot of required written work and journaling. The final examinations for the courses are proctored on site.

SCAAC Discussion/Questions:

Discussion of the future of the Virtual High School and policy issues followed. The student fee for the Virtual High School was discussed (e.g., should the school pay the fee if the course is required but not offered). Another question is, “How many Virtual High School courses constitute enrollment sufficient enough to plan on the team or to play in the band?” This is a question of what it takes to be able to consider a student as an official enrollee in a high school. Extended School Service funds cannot be used for the Virtual High School. There was a brief discussion of enrollment of home-schooled students in the virtual high school classes.

Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned.