

DIVISION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
RULES GOVERNING MATH INTERVENTION

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Public Comment Period: June 14, 2024 to July 14, 2024

Commenter Name: APSRC

Comments:

- 1.) Section 3.02.2, Page 2: 1.) Wouldn't a teacher with highly-effective rates have a qualifying value-added model score? If not, the assessor is rating the teachers too high.; 2.) Can this highly-effective teacher be from any subject? It needs to be a teacher that can teach Math.; 3.) Wouldn't a teacher with Master designation have a qualifying value-added model score? , and 4.) What about some of these small districts that do not have any of teachers listed in Section 3.02.2.1 a and b?

Division Response:

- 1:1: Not necessarily. There could be a teacher that has a value-added model score in the top quartile, but not for the previous three (3) years. A highly effective rating is a separate measure for teacher effectiveness that has different qualifying criteria separate from the value-added model score criteria.
- 1:2: Yes, the teacher can be from any subject. Best practice would be for the teacher assigned to math intervention plans to provide evidence based high quality instruction that meets the needs of the student noted in the student's math intervention plan, but that decision is at the school district or charter school's discretion.
- 1:3: Not necessarily. There could be a teacher that has a value-added model score in the top quartile, but not for the previous three (3) years. Master designation is a separate measure for teacher effectiveness that has different qualifying criteria separate from the value-added model score criteria.
- 1:4: Assigning math intervention plans to a teacher that meets the designations in Sections 3.02.2.1.a and 3.02.2.1.b is not required. These sections are suggestions for school districts and open-enrollment charter schools when creating math intervention plans. Best practice would be for the teacher assigned to math intervention plans to provide evidence based high quality instruction that meets the needs of the student noted in the student's math intervention plan, but that decision is at the school district or charter school's discretion.

No changes made.

Commenter Name: APSRC

Comments:

- 2.) Section 3.02, Page 2: Are the items listed under 3.02.1; 3.02.2, and 3.02.3 just options, given that the language says “may”?

Division Response:

Correct. The options listed at sections 3.02.1, 3.02.2, and 3.02.3 are recommendations from Arkansas Code § 6-17-431(a)(1)(B)(i), (ii), and (iii) that school districts and open-enrollment charter schools can chose to include in math intervention plans, but they are not required to do so.

No changes made.

Commenter Name: APSRC

Comments:

- 3.) Section 3.02.2.1.a, Page 2: 1.) Is the highly-effective rating based upon any one (1) component of any observation, or on a summative? It is very rare for a teacher to get an overall rating of highly-effective if you go by the rubric.; 2.) As the math intervention plan is required for students in Grades 3-8 who are performing below grade level on the state assessment, is the K-2 assessment the one that will be considered for the third-graders? and 3.) Why is there nothing on progress monitoring or when to exit a student?

Division Response:

- 3:1: A highly-effective rating is based upon a summative evaluation score. This is set out in the Rules Governing Educator Support and Development, Section 6.0, and Arkansas Code §6-17-2805.
- 3:2: Yes, any of the four (4) state approved assessments for K-2 students will be used to measure 3rd graders performance levels.
- 3:3: Progress monitoring and when a student has achieved the goals set out in the math intervention plan will be at the discretion of the school district or open-enrollment charter school because such measurements are based on each individual student’s needs.

No changes made.

Commenter Name: APSRC

Comments:

4.) Section 3.02.3, Page 3: The language should state “Provision of each student with extended time on math instruction during or after school.” to comply with Ark. Code Ann. §6-17-431 (a)(1)(B)(iii).

Division Response:

The language in section 3.02.3 was changed to “a provision” to better conform to law.

Commenter Name: Lucas Harder, ARSBA

Comments:

3.01.2: A parenthetical Arabic numeral “two” is missing.

Division Response:

The numbering appears to be correct and in line with the two sections above. Sections 3.01.1 and 3.01.2 are subsections of section 3.01.

No changes made.