

Actions Needed for ESEA Flexibility

PRINICPLE 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

- 1. Show evidence that shows our standards are CCR
- 2. Show evidence that statewide assessments align with CCR standards

PRINCIPLE 2: State-Developed System of Accountability and Support

- 1. Set ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)
- 2. Develop a methodology for identifying Reward Schools, which can be the highest-performing and the highest-progress Title I schools.
- 3. Develop a methodology for identifying Priority Schools, the 5 percent lowest-performing Title I schools in the state.
- 4. Develop a methodology for identifying Focus Schools, the 10 percent that have major achievement gaps, low-performing subgroups or graduation rates of less than 60 percent.
- 5. Identify the interventions that would be required for Priority Schools. These interventions must be aligned with the "turnaround principles" and must be implemented by the Priority School's LEA.
- 6. Identify a process for working with LEAs with one or more Focus Schools to implement interventions that close achievement gaps, improve the performance of identified subgroups or improve the graduation rate. This will include identifying potential interventions.
- 7. Develop a system for providing incentives and supports to Title I schools not identified as Reward, Priority or Focus Schools.
- 8. Explain how we will build SEA, LEA and school capacity to improve student learning.

PRINCIPLE 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

1. Develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems.

PRINCIPLE 4: Reducing Administrative Burden

1. Show how the SEA is working to reduce duplicative and unnecessary reporting requirements for districts.

OTHER AREAS OF FLEXIBILITY

- 1. An LEA would have the flexibility to operate a schoolwide program at any Priority or Focus School implementing interventions consistent with the turnaround principles even if that school does not meet the 40 percent poverty threshold.
- 2. An SEA would have the flexibility to allocate SIG funds (under ESEA 1003(a)) in order to serve any Priority or Focus School, if we determines such schools are most in need of additional support.
- 3. An SEA and LEAs would have flexibility to transfer up to 100 percent of the funds received under the authorized programs designated in ESEA section 6123 among those programs and Title I, Part A.

Questions for the NCLB Waiver Workgroup

- 1. How will we build SEA, LEA and school capacity to improve student learning?
- 2. What interventions should be used in Priority Schools? These interventions must be aligned with the "turnaround principles" and must be implemented by the Priority School's LEA.
- 3. What interventions should be considered for Focus Schools? How should the state work with LEAs to implement these interventions? These interventions must address achievement gap issues, low-performing subgroups and low graduation rates.
- 4. Which of the three options provided by the federal government should we use in setting our Annual Measurable Objectives?

Option A: Set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. Must use proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2010-11 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs. This option is commonly referred to as the Achievement Gap Option because it has the effect of cutting the achievement gap at least in half in most cases by setting goals for bigger improvements in subgroups that are farther behind.

Option B: Move the 100% proficiency goal from 2014 to 2020 and move AMOs up incrementally. The starting point must be the statewide averages.

Option C: Use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for LEAs, schools and subgroups.

- 5. How should we identify Reward Schools? Half of the Reward Schools must be those that had the highest levels of proficiency while the other half must be those that exhibited the most impressive growth.
- 6. How should we identify the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I and Title I-eligible schools, which will make up the list of Priority Schools?
- 7. How should we identify Focus Schools, those schools with the biggest achievement gaps, the lowest-performing subgroups and graduation rates below 60 percent?
- 8. How do we continue to provide incentives and supports to Title I schools not identified as Reward, Priority or Focus Schools?
- 9. How do we treat non-Title I schools in this system?