

Board of Education Agenda Item

Item: _____ F. _____

Date: September 17, 2009

Topic: First Review of a Report on the Investigation of a Testing Irregularity and Resulting Non-compliance with 8 VAC 20-131-30 of the Standards for Accrediting Schools at A.P. Hill Elementary School in Petersburg City for the 2008-2009 School Year

Presenter: Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement

Telephone Number: 804-225-2102 **E-Mail Address:** Shelley.Loving-Ryder@doe.virginia.gov

Origin:

Topic presented for information only (no board action required)

Board review required by

State or federal law or regulation

Board of Education regulation

Other: Previous Board Resolution _____

Action requested at this meeting

Previous Review/Action:

No previous board review/action

Previous review/action

date:

action:

Background Information:

On June 4, 2009, Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) staff received a report of possible Standards of Learning (SOL) testing irregularities at A. P. Hill Elementary School in Petersburg, Virginia during the spring 2009 test administration. The report alleged that 8 to 12 students at A. P. Hill Elementary School who were potentially at risk of failing the SOL tests were removed from the testing environment by the principal and did not participate in one or more of their grade level SOL assessments. The report also

alleged that concerns about testing procedures at this school had been reported to the Petersburg City Public Schools and that no action had been taken.

Based on its authority under *Code of Virginia*, § 22.1-253.13:3 D which states, “*the Virginia Department of Education may initiate or cause to be initiated, on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education, an investigation of any alleged breach in security, unauthorized alteration, or improper administration of tests by local school board employees responsible for the distribution or administration of the tests,*” Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) staff initiated an investigation to determine the validity of the allegations at A.P. Hill Elementary.

While most testing irregularities are investigated by the Division’s Director of Testing (DDOT) under the guidance of the Virginia Department of Education’s Office of Test Administration, Scoring and Reporting, in some cases VDOE staff conduct the investigation. For example, if the reported irregularity suggests that staff from the school division’s central office are involved, then an investigation by the Virginia Department of Education on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education may be warranted. Because the initial report of the irregularity at A.P. Hill alleged that the central office had been informed of the testing issues at this school and had not taken action, the VDOE staff investigated the irregularity on behalf of the board.

The report prepared by VDOE staff concluded that at least twelve students at A. P. Hill Elementary School did not take one or more SOL tests, but according to attendance records, should have had time to take these tests either in a regular testing session or make-up testing session. The report further determined that there was no evidence that central office staff was involved in the testing irregularity.

The report describing the investigation of the testing irregularity was provided to Dr. James Victory, superintendent of Petersburg City Schools and Mr. Kenneth Pritchett on July 22, 2009. A copy of the full report may be found in Attachment A. The report required Petersburg City Schools to submit a corrective action plan within 30 days. Petersburg has submitted its corrective action plan, included as Attachment B.

Petersburg City Public Schools has been in division level review status since 2004 and has reported to the Virginia Board of Education regularly on the status of implementing its corrective action plan and the terms of its Memorandum of Understanding.

Summary of Major Elements:

The Standards for Accrediting Schools at 8 VAC 20-131-30 Part III B states “*in kindergarten through eighth grade, where the administration of Virginia assessment program tests are required by the Board of Education, each student shall be expected to take the tests....*” Further, according to the *No Child Left Behind* regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 200.6 (a)(1), “*a state’s academic assessment system must provide for the participation of all students in the grades assessed.*” The Board of Education is asked to review the results of the investigation of the testing irregularity and the actions taken by the school

division in response to the report to determine whether action regarding the accreditation of A.P. Hill Elementary School is required.

According to the Standards for Accrediting Schools, 8VAC 20-131-340. Special Provisions and Sanctions:

A. Any school in violation of these regulations shall be subject to Appropriate action by the Board of Education including, but not limited to, the withholding or denial of a school's accreditation.

B. A school's accreditation rating may be withheld by action of the Board of Education for any school found to be in violation of test security procedures pursuant to § 22.1-19.1 of the Code of Virginia. Withholding of a school's accreditation rating shall not be considered an interruption of the three-consecutive-year period for purposes of receiving an Accreditation Denied status pursuant to 8 VAC 20-131-300.

C. The Board of Education may exercise its authority to seek school division compliance with school laws pursuant to relevant provisions of the Code of Virginia when any school within a division is rated Accreditation Denied.

The existing accreditation procedures exclude students who were not tested from the calculations. However, to assist the board in determining the Appropriate actions regarding the accreditation ratings for A.P. Hill, the board will be presented with 1) pass rates and accreditation ratings calculated using the existing procedure in which these students were not counted and 2) pass rates and accreditation ratings calculated with these students counted as **failing**.

Superintendent's Recommendation:

The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education waive first review and determine Petersburg City Schools' compliance with the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA). In 8 VAC 20-131-30 Part III B, the SOA states, "In kindergarten through eighth grade, where the administration of Virginia assessment program tests are required by the Board of Education, each student shall be expected to take the tests..." According to the *Standards for Accrediting Schools, 8VAC 20-131-340 Special Provisions and Sanctions*, any school in violation of these regulations shall be subject to Appropriate action by the Board of Education including, but not limited to, the withholding or denial of a school's accreditation.

Impact on Resources: N/A

Timetable for Further Review/Action: N/A

**Virginia Department of Education
Report to Petersburg City Public Schools
on the Investigation of
Standards of Learning Testing Irregularities
At A.P. Hill Elementary School
July 22, 2009**

PURPOSE

The purpose of this investigation was to inquire into alleged Standards of Learning (SOL) testing irregularities at A. P. Hill Elementary School, to determine the extent to which state testing procedures were violated, and to determine whether any such irregularities or violations affected school and/or student performance.

BACKGROUND

On June 4, 2009, Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) staff received a report of possible SOL testing irregularities at A.P. Hill Elementary School in Petersburg, Virginia during the spring 2009 Non-Writing test administration. The report alleged that 8 to 12 students at A.P. Hill Elementary School who were potentially at risk of failing the SOL tests were removed from the testing environment by the principal and did not participate in one or more of their grade level SOL assessments. The report also alleged that concerns about testing procedures at this school had been reported to the Petersburg City Public Schools and that no action had been taken.

Petersburg City Public Schools has been in division level review status since 2004 and has reported to the Virginia Board of Education regularly on the status of implementing its corrective action plan and the terms of its Memorandum of Understanding.

REQUIREMENT FOR STUDENTS TO BE TESTED

The Standards for Accrediting Schools at 8 VAC 20-131-30 Part III B states “in kindergarten through eighth grade, where the administration of Virginia assessment program tests are required by the Board of Education, each student shall be expected to take the tests....” Further, according to the No *Child Left Behind* regulations, 34 C.F.R. § 200.6 (a)(1), “a state’s academic assessment system must provide for the participation of all students in the grades assessed.”

AUTHORITY FOR A STATE-DIRECTED INVESTIGATION

Based on its authority under *Code of Virginia*, § 22.1-253.13:3 D which states, “the Virginia Department of Education may initiate or cause to be initiated, on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education, an investigation of any alleged breach in security, unauthorized alteration, or improper administration of tests by local school board employees responsible for the distribution or administration of the tests,” VDOE initiated an investigation to determine the validity of the allegations at A.P. Hill Elementary.

While most testing irregularities are investigated by the Division’s Director of Testing (DDOT) under the guidance of the Virginia Department of Education’s Office of Test Administration, Scoring and Reporting, in some cases VDOE staff conduct the investigation. For example, if the reported irregularity suggests that staff from the school division’s central office are involved, then an investigation by the Virginia Department of Education on behalf of the Virginia Board of Education may be warranted. Because the initial report of the irregularity at A.P. Hill alleged that the central office had been informed of the testing issues at this school and had not take action, the VDOE staff investigated the irregularity on behalf of the board.

METHODOLOGY

On June 11, 2009, VDOE personnel obtained the SOL answer documents, enrollment data, and student attendance reports for A.P. Hill Elementary School. SOL answer documents were examined to determine which students participated in each assessment, and a list was compiled identifying those students who submitted blank answer documents. This list was then compared to the student attendance reports to determine whether the students who submitted blank answer documents were absent throughout the testing window (including make-up testing).

Additionally, the student answer documents were compared to the enrollment data to determine whether all students in grades 3 through 5 participated in statewide assessments. A second list was compiled identifying students who were enrolled at A. P. Hill Elementary School but did not submit answer documents. The students on this list were compared to the students listed in Pearson Access as participating in alternate or alternative assessments. Pearson Access is the Web-based test administration system used by all Virginia school divisions to manage the tests that comprise the Virginia Assessment Program.

VDOE personnel determined that interviews regarding the alleged irregularity should be conducted with students and staff members at A.P. Hill Elementary School. Students chosen for interview had missed one or more SOL assessments but were listed as present for some portion of the testing window. Petersburg City Public School personnel contacted the students’ parents to obtain permission for the students to participate in the interviews. Of the eight students who were identified, four students were available for interviews. Staff members chosen for interviews included teachers of the students who

missed one or more tests, examiners identified as administering the test to students who needed a small group administration (small group examiners), examiners administering the tests to students who were absent on the regular test days (make-up examiners), the School Testing Coordinator (STC)/assistant principal, and principal. The interviews were conducted on June 12 and June 15, 2009.

On June 12, VDOE personnel obtained SOL test booklets from Petersburg City Public Schools DDOT for A.P. Hill Elementary School. Test booklets and answer documents were compared to determine if the answers in the test booklets matched the answers coded on the corresponding answer documents. All answer documents and test booklets were maintained in a secure location throughout the investigation.

INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STUDENT INTERVIEWS

Interviews conducted with students at A.P. Hill Elementary School revealed that all four students thought they had taken all four SOL assessments (mathematics, reading, science, and history). All students indicated that they marked answers in the test booklet first and then on the answer document.

- Student “A” was able to recall the number of questions on the mathematics, reading, and history tests. She indicated that she did best on the science test, but she couldn’t recall any details of this test. Student “A” submitted completed answer documents for mathematics, reading, and history. Student “A’s” science answer document was marked with testing status “1” (absent). Attendance records show that Student “A” was marked as absent on the date the science test was first administered, but was present during the make-up testing window, June 4 – June 5, 2009.
- Student “B” said she took her tests in a room with one other student and the teacher read the tests aloud and recorded the session on a tape recorder. She indicated that she liked the reading test, “did okay” on the science test, and thought the math test was “a little harder.” Student “B” submitted completed answer documents for mathematics and history. Student “B’s” reading and science answer documents were marked with testing status “1” (absent). Attendance records show that Student “B” was marked as absent on the dates the reading and science tests were administered, but was present for make-up testing, June 4 – June 5, 2009.
- Student “C” first said he took the mathematics test and then later said he took all of the tests. He was unable to recall when or where he was tested or who administered the reading, science, or history tests to him. Student “C” submitted a completed answer document for mathematics. Student “C’s” reading, science, and history answer documents were marked with testing status “1” (absent). Attendance records show that Student “C” was marked as present on the dates the reading and history tests were administered, and absent on the date the science test was administered. He was listed as present for make-up testing, June 4 – June 5, 2009.
- Student “D” said he took his tests in a different room than he normally would because he had been suspended. He said he took three tests (mathematics,

science, and history) in one day. He then said he took his reading test the next day and described a reading passage about “cleaning your room.” This passage is actually on a released reading test. Student “D” submitted completed answer documents for mathematics, science, and history. Student “D’s” reading answer document was marked with testing status “1” (absent). Attendance records show that Student “D” was marked as absent on the day that the reading test was administered. He was listed as present for make-up testing, June 4 – June 5, 2009.

It is of note that students at A.P. Hill Elementary School had been using SOL released test items as benchmark tests during the second semester as a means to prepare for actual SOL testing. The interviewers believe that since students had been assessed using multiple released tests and had marked their answers on Scantron bubble sheets, students might not have been able to differentiate between the actual SOL test and the practice tests they had taken. The recollection of one reading passage by Student “D” is indicative of the type of confusion the students may have regarding actual SOL testing versus benchmark testing.

EXAMINATION OF ENROLLMENT DATA, ATTENDANCE RECORDS, SOL ANSWER DOCUMENTS, AND SOL TEST BOOKLETS

VDOE staff reviewed enrollment data, attendance records, answer documents, and test booklets of students who were tested in grades three, four, and five. The inspection of enrollment data, attendance records, test booklets and answer documents was conducted to determine which students were tested, which students were absent for one or more tests, and if discrepancies existed between answers recorded by students in the test booklets and the answers recorded on the answer documents. The results of the examination revealed that seventeen students missed one or more SOL tests and were marked absent in the testing status on the answer document. Of these seventeen students:

- Five students missed one or more SOL tests but were not listed as absent on their attendance records on the dates those tests were administered.
- Twelve students were present on the days of make-up testing, but did not make-up missed tests. (Note: there may be overlap between these students and the five students who were not listed as absent but missed a test on the original testing dates.)
- Two students were present for one of the make-up testing dates, but it is not possible to determine whether they may have made up another test on this day.
- Three students were absent throughout the testing and make-up dates.

A comparison of answer documents with student enrollment revealed that fifteen students did not have any answer documents. Further examination of these students’ records revealed:

- Four of these students participated in the Virginia Alternate Assessment Program (VAA.P.) for all subjects.
- Ten of these students participated in the Virginia Grade Level Alternative (VGLA) for reading and mathematics. These students did not participate in any assessments for science or history.

- One student enrolled at A.P. Hill Elementary on June 5, 2009.

The discrepancies found between answers in test booklets and answers on answer documents were minor and may have been related to students' difficulty in transcribing the answers from the test booklets to the answer documents.

INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM STAFF INTERVIEWS

VDOE staff interviewed ten teachers, the assistant principal/STC, and the principal of A. P. Hill Elementary School. Results of the interviews are as follows:

Training

- The STC participated in training for administering SOL tests conducted by the Division Director of Testing.
- All teachers stated they participated in training provided by the STC prior to SOL testing.
- The principal said she did not participate in training and "was not an integral part of the testing process."
- All teachers, small group examiners, and make-up examiners interviewed agreed that the STC provided training. During the training the following materials were provided: a testing schedule (including make-up dates), lists of students who were to be tested in a small group setting, a schedule for bathroom breaks, a materials check-out schedule, a proctor assignment schedule, and an examiner's manual. Examiners were to review the manual and ask the STC questions if necessary.

Testing

- All teachers and the STC described procedures for checking materials in and out and for maintaining security of the testing materials.
- Teachers said students were identified to be removed for small group testing according to Individualized Education Plans (IEP) or 504 plans, or based on teacher recommendation for particular students. Students were picked up from the classroom by the small group examiner, along with their testing materials, and taken to an alternate testing location.
- All teachers, small group examiners, and make-up examiners said they were informed by the STC, in advance, which students to remove from their classrooms for testing in an alternate location.
- The principal did not know the proper procedures or processes established by the STC for the administration of SOL tests at A.P. Hill Elementary School. The principal removed some students from class for disciplinary reasons; however, she did not communicate to the teacher to mark those students as absent from testing on the provided Student Absence Form nor did she report the removal to the STC herself to ensure the student would be provided a make-up testing opportunity. Also, in some cases the principal withheld, or removed, students from class prior to the small group examiner arriving to pick them up. As a

result of poor accounting for student attendance during testing, there was confusion regarding which students had been tested.

Make-up Testing

- All teachers indicated that the procedure for reporting a student who was absent from testing was to put his/her name on the Student Absence Form provided by the STC and turn the form in with their testing materials at the end of testing session. The STC used Student Absence Forms to create the student rosters for make-up testing.
- Make-up testing dates were established for June 4 and June 5, 2009, as part of the school testing calendar. According to the STC, she continued make-up testing on June 8 and June 9, 2009, in order to make sure that all students were tested.
- Teachers were not sure whether all students completed tests they missed due to absence. Teachers did not administer make-up tests to their own students. All of the teachers interviewed believed that all students in their class had completed their SOL tests.
- There was a discrepancy between the responses of teachers regarding who was responsible for completing testing status and accommodation fields on the answer documents. One teacher said teachers met with the STC after testing to check answer documents for erasure marks and to complete testing status and accommodation fields. All other teachers said they assumed the STC completed these fields because they did not do this. Several teachers did indicate that they had completed these fields in previous years, but not this year. The STC said she completed these fields this year.
- At the conclusion of make-up testing, according to the STC, the Student Absence Forms were destroyed and therefore an accurate record of student absences from initial testing does not exist. An incomplete list of make-up testing rosters exists on the STC's computer, according to the STC.

Accountability

- The STC stated that, to her knowledge, all test booklets, used answer documents, and pre-ID labels were returned to the DDOT at the conclusion of testing.
- Unused answer documents containing pre-ID labels with student identifiable information were discovered in a trash can in the room used for interviewing staff members.
- Both the principal and assistant principal said it was possible that some students did not participate in one or more tests, but it was not intentional. The principal did state that if students were the least bit disruptive they were removed from the testing environment to ensure that the rest of the class was not interrupted during testing. The principal stated, "it is not improbable that we may have missed some students tests."
- According to the teachers and the STC all students were to participate in testing and take all of the required tests. The principal was acting outside of the process established by the STC, and understood by the teachers, for reporting students that had not tested and therefore created confusion regarding which students had actually been in attendance to test or were in need of a make-up test. This

confusion led to the potential omission of certain students from the make-up test administration and subsequent marking of those students as absent on the answer documents.

- The teachers and examiners interviewed, as well as the STC, felt as though every student that should have been tested was tested.
- When the principal was questioned during the initial interview about the students that had not completed a test, the answers varied from “Yes, I removed that student for” to “I don’t know I’ll have to check on that one.” The principal did provide additional information during two separate phone calls explaining some student absences and or disciplinary action taken causing the student’s missing test attempts. In regards to student absences being reported incorrectly, the principal mentioned that her normal attendance secretary had missed a couple of days during testing which may account for some of the errors. The discipline referrals had been handled by the principal; however, they were not entered into the school discipline system for accurate accounting of the student’s incident.
- Regarding students in special education having submitted VGLA collections for reading and mathematics but not participating in any science or history assessments, when told of a superintendent’s memo describing the tests these students should take, the principal stated, “I am sure we got the memo. I don’t stop and read them all, no; I should probably read them a little better.”

CONCLUSIONS

- The principal was not a participant in the training for the administration of SOL tests at A.P. Hill Elementary School. As a result, the principal did not have an understanding of the processes and procedures required for accounting for each student’s attendance during SOL testing.
- Lack of communication between the principal and the STC led to confusion regarding which students had been removed from class, the bus ramp, or hallway for disciplinary reasons and would need to have a make-up test administered to them.
- At least twelve students did not take one or more SOL tests, but according to attendance records, these students should have had time to take these tests either in a regular testing session or make-up testing session.
- Even though the STC reported that she reviewed answer documents to determine which students needed to participate in make-up testing, procedures for reporting students absent from test sessions were not adequate for maintaining accurate lists for make-up testing. As well, the STC did not check the answer documents against the attendance records to ensure that all students marked absent were indeed absent throughout the entire testing window.
- Documentation submitted by teachers containing lists of students that were absent and in need of a make-up test were not maintained beyond the end of the testing window.
- Procedures for disposing of unused testing materials were inadequate for maintaining confidentiality of student identifying information.

- Students who participated in VGLA for reading and mathematics did not complete any assessments in science or history.
- Interviews with school staff indicated that Petersburg central office staff were not involved in the irregularity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The principal needs to become an integral part of the testing process, involved in the training of staff, and to be fully aware of all testing procedures at A. P. Hill Elementary School.
- The principal and STC need to establish an effective process for communicating all attendance and disciplinary actions during testing, therefore increasing the ability for all students to be tested and accounted for. This should include students removed from the sidewalk, bus ramp, school hallway, etc., prior to the start of testing on any given day.
- The STC needs to develop a procedure for retaining all materials associated with testing until all testing is complete and scores have been accurately reported for all students. This includes items such as, Student Absence forms, materials check-out schedule, bell schedule, bathroom schedule, small group examiner schedule, make-up testing schedule, make-up testing roster, etc.

ACTIONS

- The principal and STC at A.P. Hill Elementary School shall work with Petersburg City Public Schools central office staff to develop a corrective action plan that establishes
 - ◆ effective procedures for accounting for all students and ensuring that all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments in all subjects Applicable to the students' grade levels. The procedures should address accounting for students who participate in VGLA or VAAP. and for ensuring that students who are absent on the test day are scheduled for make-up testing.
 - ◆ procedures for accounting for all testing materials, including unused pre-id labels and any other testing materials to ensure the protection of student identifiable information in a manner that is consistent with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

This corrective action plan shall be submitted to the Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement at the VDOE by Petersburg's Division Director of Testing within 30 days of receiving this report.

- The Division Director of Testing shall provide direct training and support to the principal and STC of A.P. Hill Elementary School on proper testing procedures, the marking of testing status and special accommodations on answer documents, and the proper handling and disposition of secure and nonsecure test materials.

- VDOE special education staff will work with Petersburg City Public Schools' staff to ensure that the IEPs of the students who participated in VGLA for reading and mathematics but not in science and history/social science are consistent with the requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), as referenced in Testing Memo No. 733.
- Assessment staff from the VDOE shall audit and monitor the administration of SOL tests at A. P. Hill Elementary School during the 2009-2010 school year.
- This report will be presented to the Virginia Board of Education's Committee on School and Division Accountability on September 16, 2009, for possible action by the full board at its September 17, 2009, meeting regarding the Petersburg City Schools' compliance with the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA). In 8 VAC 20-131-30 Part III B, the SOA states, "In kindergarten through eighth grade, where the administration of Virginia assessment program tests are required by the Board of Education, each student shall be expected to take the tests..."

According to the SOA, 8VAC 20-131-340. Special provisions and sanctions

A. Any school in violation of these regulations shall be subject to Appropriate action by the Board of Education including, but not limited to, the withholding or denial of a school's accreditation.

B. A school's accreditation rating may be withheld by action of the Board of Education for any school found to be in violation of test security procedures pursuant to § 22.1-19.1 of the Code of Virginia. Withholding of a school's accreditation rating shall not be considered an interruption of the three-consecutive-year period for purposes of receiving an Accreditation Denied status pursuant to 8 VAC 20-131-300.

C. The Board of Education may exercise its authority to seek school division compliance with school laws pursuant to relevant provisions of the Code of Virginia when any school within a division is rated Accreditation Denied.

Petersburg City Schools
 Corrective Action Plan for A.P. Hill Elementary School
 August, 2009

Goal: To ensure an effective accountability system for administering Standards of Learning Assessments

Objective: To ensure all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments in all subjects Applicable to the students' grade level

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
Establish effective procedures for accounting for all students ensuring that all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments	Student data for all students eligible for SOL assessments or alternate assessments will be up-loaded via Pearson Access.	Four/five weeks prior to testing	DDOT Project Manager	Student data files
	<p>The Division Director of Testing (DDOT) will provide training to the Principal and School Test Coordinator (STC) on the procedures and processes for administering the Standard of Learning Assessments in two sessions.</p> <p>Session I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DDOT will provide training on the procedures for accounting for all students. <p>Session II</p> <p>The DDOT will provide training on the procedure for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marking testing status and special accommodations on answer documents • Proper handling and disposition of secure and nonsecure test materials 	<p>October 2009</p> <p>April 2010</p>	DDOT	<p>Training materials, handouts, and forms Approved by VDOE</p> <p>Agenda and sign-in sheet</p>
	The school will compare the Starbase class enrollment rosters with the Pearson student data file (group rosters) to ensure that all students have been registered for SOL assessments or alternate assessments.	At least two weeks prior to testing	STC, Principal, Classroom Teacher	Pearson group roster verifying all students are registered compared to the Starbase class enrollment rosters

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
<p>Establish effective procedures for accounting for all students ensuring that all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments</p>	<p>The school will provide the DDOT with a list of students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if any are missing from the student data up-load file when compared to the Starbase class enrollment roster and the Pearson group roster • who transferred into the school after the initial student data up-load and need to be added to the student data up-load file compared to the Starbase transfer report • who transferred out of the school after the initial student data up-load and need to be removed from the student data file compared to the Starbase transfer report 	<p>At least two weeks prior to testing</p>	<p>STC Principal</p>	<p>Pearson group roster verifying all students are registered compared to the Starbase class enrollment rosters</p> <p>Starbase transfer report</p>
	<p>The Special Education Coordinator will provide a list to the STC, Principal and DDOT of Special Education students scheduled to participate in the VAA.P., VGLA, or SOL Assessments by subject and Appropriate grade level.</p>	<p>October 2009</p>	<p>Special Education Coordinator, STC, Principal</p>	<p>List of Special Education students participating in VAA.P./VGLA/SOL</p>
	<p>The STC and the Lead Limited English Proficiency (LEP) teacher will provide a list to the DDOT of LEP students who will participate in the Reading VGLA.</p>	<p>October 2009</p>	<p>STC Lead LEP Teacher Title III Coordinator</p>	<p>List of LEP students participating in the Reading VGLA</p>
	<p>The Special Education Coordinator will monitor the progress of the student collection of evidence to ensure all students are on target to complete the VAA.P. or VGLA by subject/grade level.</p> <p>The Lead LEP teacher will monitor the progress of the LEP students scheduled to participate in the Reading VGLA collection of evidence to ensure all LEP students participating in the Reading VGLA are on target to complete the Reading VGLA</p>	<p>Each nine weeks</p>	<p>DDOT, Special Education Coordinator Principal STC Lead LEP Teacher Title III Coordinator</p>	<p>VDOE VAA.P./VGLA monitoring sheet</p>

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
Establish effective procedures for accounting for all students ensuring that all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments	Pupil Personnel will provide the DDOT, the Principal, and other Appropriate personnel with monthly updates on externally placed, homebound, home based students to ensure all students are accounted for during SOL testing.	Monthly	Pupil Personnel Coordinator, Director Special Education/Pupil Personnel, Principal	List of externally placed, homebound, & home based students
	A special mandatory training will be provided to all building level attendance secretaries and at least one alternate person to ensure reliable attendance documentation procedures are implemented.	Quarterly	DDOT Student Data Management Specialist	Agenda and sign-in sheet
	<p>Attendance will be taken twice during SOL testing. The first attendance will be taken in homeroom before the start of testing and the attendance sheet will be submitted to the attendance secretary. The attendance secretary <u>must</u> enter the attendance in Starbase.</p> <p>The STC will provide the test examiner a SOL testing attendance roster of students assigned to each testing location. The second attendance will be taken by the test examiner identifying students who are absent and do not test.</p>	<p>Daily</p> <p>Daily during testing</p>	Homeroom/classroom teacher, Test Examiner STC Principal, Attendance secretary	<p>Homeroom attendance sheet</p> <p>Starbase print out of daily attendance</p> <p>SOL testing attendance roster</p>

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
<p>Establish effective procedures for accounting for all students ensuring that all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments</p>	<p>The principal, STC, and attendance secretary will compare the daily homeroom attendance sheets, the starbase daily attendance reports, and the SOL testing attendance roster to verify any students missing the SOL assessment scheduled for that day and listing them on the Division Daily Absentee Report (excluding Special Education Students who completed a VAA.P./VGLA and LEP students who completed a Reading VGLA).</p>	<p>Daily during testing</p>	<p>STC Principal Attendance Secretary</p>	<p>Division Daily Absentee Report, Homeroom attendance sheet, Starbase print out of daily attendance, SOL testing attendance roster, The List of Special Education students participating in VAA.P./VGLA/SOL The list of LEP students participating in Reading VGLA</p>
	<p>The Division Daily Absentee Report <u>must</u> be submitted to the DDOT</p>	<p>Daily during testing</p>	<p>STC Principals</p>	<p>Division Daily Absentee Report</p>
	<p>The STC will schedule make-up testing dates for all students that miss a SOL assessment by subject/grade level.</p>	<p>Until close of Division testing window</p>	<p>STC Principal</p>	<p>Make-up schedule by student/subject/grade level</p>

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
<p>Establish effective procedures for accounting for all students ensuring that all students participate in SOL assessments or alternate assessments</p>	<p>The STC will submit an answer document for each student who did not test with the Appropriate testing status code along with the Division Test Code Verification Report indicating why the student(s) did not take a SOL.</p> <p>The STC will complete the Appropriate testing status code in PearsonAccess for students testing online who missed a SOL and submit documentation indicating why the student(s) did not take a SOL.</p> <p>The Special Education Coordinator will complete the Appropriate coding in PearsonAccess for students scheduled to complete a VAA.P. or VGLA but did not submit a collection. The Special Education Coordinator will submit documentation indicating why the student(s) did not complete the VAA.P. or VGLA</p> <p>The Lead LEP teacher will submit to the DDOT documentation indicating why LEP students scheduled to complete a Reading VGLA did not complete the Reading VGLA. The Special Education Coordinator will complete the Appropriate coding in PearsonAccess for LEP students scheduled to complete a Reading VGLA but did not submit a collection.</p>	<p>Close of the division testing window</p>	<p>STC</p> <p>Principal</p> <p>Special Education Coordinator</p> <p>Lead LEP Teacher</p> <p>DDOT</p>	<p>Division Test Code Verification Report</p>

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
<p>Establish effective procedures for accounting for all testing materials, including unused pre-id labels and any other testing materials to ensure the protection of student identifiable information</p>	<p>The STC will keep all secure testing materials to include all test booklets, answer sheets containing student identifiable information, and all unused pre-id labels stored in a locked location with access by the STC and Principal only. All materials checked-out to the examiners during testing must be returned to the STC at the end of testing each day.</p>	<p>During Testing</p>	<p>STC Principal</p>	<p>Signed affidavit by STC and Principal stating the storage location is secure</p>
	<p>The STC shall retain a copy (and submit a copy to the DDOT) of all testing materials associated with testing to include but not limited to the following: Student absence forms, materials check-out form, bell schedule, bathroom schedule, small group examiner schedule, list of students tested in small groups, make-up testing schedule, make-up testing roster, test booklet assembly ID sheets, school packing list/transmittal forms, school test security agreements, school affidavit</p>	<p>For a period of time not to exceed one year</p>	<p>STC Principal</p>	<p>Document file</p>

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
<p>Establish effective procedures for accounting for all testing materials, including unused pre-id labels and any other testing materials to ensure the protection of student identifiable information</p>	<p>The STC shall submit to the DDOT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test booklets • Used scratch paper • Unused pre-ID labels—must list why the label was not used • Damaged answer documents marked VOID (this includes any answer documents that contain student information that will not be submitted for scoring to Pearson) • Documentation for small group (names of students and reason for small groups) • Test authorization tickets (if Appropriate) 	<p>Close of the division testing window</p>	<p>STC Principal</p>	<p>Signed affidavit by DDOT of receipt of materials</p>

Action	Strategy	Projected Time Frame	Person(s) Responsible	Evidence of Implementation of Strategy
Central Office Staff will monitor the administration of SOL Testing	Central Office Staff will be assigned to the school to monitor the administration of SOL Assessments	During the scheduled SOL assessments and make-up	Assistant Superintendent of Instruction DDOT Elementary Director of Instruction Secondary Director of Instruction	Schedule of school assignment

This corrective action plan was developed in collaboration with:

- Dr. J. Victory, Superintendent of Schools
- Dr. A. Parrish, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction
- Ms. G. Price, Division Director of Testing
- Dr. B. Petteway, Director of Secondary Instruction
- Mrs. N. Wingfield, Director of Elementary Instruction
- Principals & Assistant Principals of all schools
- Other division Directors, Coordinators, and Supervisors