ESEA FLEXIBILITY: AN OVERVIEW

As presented by the Oklahoma State Department of Education
INTRODUCTION

STATES LEADING REFORM

• States and districts have initiated groundbreaking reforms and innovations to increase the quality of instruction and improve academic achievement for all students.

• NCLB requirements have unintentionally become barriers to State and local implementation of forward-looking reforms.
INTRODUCTION

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OFFERS FLEXIBILITY

• ESEA flexibility offers the opportunity to request flexibility on behalf of the State, the LEAs, and the schools in order to better focus on improving educational outcomes, closing achievement gaps, and increasing the quality of instruction.

• This flexibility will build on and support the significant State and local reform efforts already underway.
FLEXIBILITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND INCREASE THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

• Replace AYP Requirements and Consequences for Not Meeting Them
  – LEA would no longer be required to comply with the requirements in ESEA section 1116(b)
FLEXIBILITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND INCREASE THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

- Provide Flexibility in Allocation, Pooling, and Usage of Federal Funds (Title I Schoolwide, School Improvement, School Improvement Grant [SIG], 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant, Transferability)
  - Flexibility to use rural, low-income schools (RLIS) funds for any authorized purpose
  - Flexibility to use 1003(a) funds to serve any Priority or Focus School
  - Flexibility to operate a Schoolwide program
  - Flexibility regarding HQT improvement plan
  - Flexibility to transfer certain funds
FLEXIBILITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND INCREASE THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

• Remove Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements in Order to Focus on Development of Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Evaluation Systems
PRINCIPLES FOR IMPROVING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND INCREASING THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

1. College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

2. State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

3. Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

4. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden
Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

To support States in continuing the work of transitioning students, teachers, and schools to higher standards

- Adopt college- and career-ready (CCR) standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics
- Transition to and implement CCR standards
- Develop and administer Statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth
- Adopt ELP standards corresponding to the State’s new CCR standards and develop aligned assessments
Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

- Oklahoma C³ Standards, including Common Core
- PARCC Assessments
- Pre-AP/AP and AVID Professional Development
- 60 REAC³H Coaches
- Focus on IEP, ELL, and Struggling Learners
- State Longitudinal Data System/Student Information System
Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

To support states’ efforts to move forward with next-generation accountability systems

- Set ambitious but achievable AMOs
- **Reward schools**: Provide incentives and recognition for high-progress and highest-performing Title I schools
- **Priority schools**: Identify lowest-performing schools and implement interventions aligned with the **turnaround principles**
- **Focus schools**: Close achievement gaps by identifying and implementing interventions in schools with the greatest achievement gaps or low graduation rates
- Provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools
- Build SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools
Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

• A-F School Grading System

• Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and Other Metrics contribute to +’s and –’s

• Reward, Priority, Focus, and Targeted Intervention Schools include both Title I and non-Title I schools
A-F GRADING

• Thirty-three percent based on student test scores on all Oklahoma School Testing Program assessments.
• Seventeen percent based on total school growth in Reading and Mathematics.
• Seventeen percent based on bottom 25% student growth in Reading and Mathematics.
• Thirty-three percent based on whole school improvement.
ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

• Provide reading and mathematics achievement for all students and subgroups of students as is currently reported for Adequate Yearly Progress.

• Include percent of students assessed.

• Include graduation and attendance targets.

• Will determine whether a school or district receives a plus or minus grade on the A-F Grading system.
Reward Schools

All Other Schools

Targeted Intervention Schools

Priority Schools $C^3$
Reward Schools

Reward schools are high achieving in all state assessments or have high progress in reading and mathematics.
Reward Schools

• **Reward schools:** Provide incentives and recognition for **high-progress and highest-performing** (top 10%) Title I schools and non-Title I schools
  - Highest-Performing Schools
  - High-Progress Schools
Targeted Intervention Schools are in the bottom 25% of student achievement in reading and mathematics.
Targeted Intervention Schools

• **Targeted Intervention School** is a school that is in the bottom 25% of the State in student achievement
  – Complete comprehensive needs assessment
  – Utilize *Menu of Interventions and Supports for School Improvement*
Menu of Interventions and Supports

1. Schoolwide Interventions & Supports
2. Leadership Interventions & Supports
3. Teacher Interventions & Supports
4. Classroom Interventions & Supports
5. Parent and Community Interventions & Supports
Funding: Targeted Intervention Schools

• LEAs with Title I schools that are Targeted Intervention Schools or schools that are required to implement interventions because of a School Grade of C+, C, or C- must provide assurances that a sufficient amount of Title I, Part A funding is used at that school site to implement interventions that are likely to produce significant student achievement. The LEA may choose to set aside a percentage of the LEA’s Title I, Part A allocation, not to exceed 10%, to serve these schools directly, or the LEA may choose to spend site allocations on these targeted interventions. When LEAs are making this decision, they should take into consideration the number of schools in the LEA that are identified as Priority Schools and Focus Schools as well as the number of schools in the LEA required to implement interventions because they are Targeted Intervention Schools or because of a School Grade of C+, C, or C-. 
Priority Schools are in the bottom 5% of achievement in reading and mathematics, have a graduation rate below 60% for at least three years, or have received a School Improvement Grant (SIG).
Priority Schools

• **Priority Schools**- lowest performing schools in the state.
  – Any Title I school in the bottom 5% of Title I schools as well as any school in the bottom 5% of all schools (Title I and non Title I.)
  – Each Title I-participating high school, Title I-eligible high school, and non-Title I high school in the State with a graduation rate below 60% for 3 consecutive years.
  – All Tier I schools receiving School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to implement a school intervention model.

• **Priority Schools** must implement Turnaround principles.
Turnaround Principles

- Providing strong Leadership
- Ensuring teachers are effective and able to improve instruction
- Redesigning the school day, week, or year
- Strengthening the school’s instructional program
- Using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data
- Establishing a school environment that improves school safety
- Providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement
Funding Requirements: Priority

- Each LEA with at least one Title I Priority School will be required to set-aside a percentage of its Title I, Part A allocation, not to exceed 20%, which is reasonable and necessary to implement the Turnaround Principles in the Priority Schools and to provide school choice options for parents/guardians of students in the school, in consultation with the SEA.
Funding Requirements: Priority

• The percentage will be determined on a sliding scale and will take the following into consideration:
  – The number of schools in the LEA that are identified as Priority Schools
  – The number of schools in the LEA that did not make AMOs or otherwise are in need of intervention as defined by the State's Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support System
  – The percentage of the student population that is performing below grade level or at risk of not graduating
Priority

- In order to exit Priority School status, a school must earn an A, B, or C on the State’s A-F Grading System.
C³ Schools are Priority Schools that will enter into a partnership of shared leadership with the State Department of Education.
C³ Schools

• Each LEA submitted a District Capacity Determination Document.

• The review committee comprises outside educational professionals and OSDE personnel.

• State Board of Education makes a decision regarding inclusion of Priority Schools in the C³ Schools.

• SEA assumes control of academic functions of schools recommended for C³ Schools.
District Capacity Review

• Historical Data Analysis
• District Expectations Communicated to All Stakeholders
• Academic Supports
• Organizational Supports
Funding: C³ Schools

- Funding for the C³ Schools will come from state and federal revenues that would have been allocated to the school through the LEA to ensure that funding follows the students being served. This includes all formula and competitive funds, including SIG funds if the Priority School was previously awarded a School Improvement Grant to implement a school intervention model. In addition, the State Board of Education may choose to reserve a percentage, not to exceed 20%, of the LEA’s Title I, Part A allocation to allow the SEA to begin or continue implementing the Turnaround Principles in C³S Priority Schools in the LEA.
Focus Schools are low achieving in reading and mathematics in the State’s lowest performing subgroups or have low graduation rates in the State’s lowest graduating subgroups.
Focus Schools

• **Focus School (Title I and non-Title I)** is
  
  — a school that has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, low graduation rates.
  
  — a high school with a graduation rate less than 60 percent over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school.
Funding: Focus Schools

• Each LEA with at least one Title I Focus School will be required to set aside a percentage, not to exceed 20% of its Title I, Part A allocation, to implement appropriate and rigorous interventions in the Focus Schools and to provide school choice options for parents/guardians of students in the school. This percentage will be determined on a sliding scale and will take the following into consideration:
  – the number of schools in the LEA that are identified as Priority Schools,
  – the number of schools in the LEA that are identified as Reward Schools,
  – the number of schools in the LEA that did not make AMOs or otherwise are in need of intervention as defined by the State’s Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support System, and
  – the percentage of the student population that is performing below grade level or at risk of not graduating.
Funding: Focus Schools

- Based on demand, at least 5% of the LEA’s Title I, Part A allocation must be available to provide school choice options to parents/guardians of students in Title I Focus Schools. These funds will provide transportation from the Focus Schools to higher-performing schools that are able to accept additional students.

- The remainder of the LEA’s Title I, Part A set-aside as described above must be spent on interventions and strategies consistent with the research-based *Menu of Interventions and Supports for School Improvement* (see Attachment 12). Selection of interventions that will be paid for with Title I, Part A funds must be done in consultation with SEA leadership, SEA staff, or a representative on behalf of the SEA and must align with the school’s improvement plan developed through WISE.
Focus Schools

• In order to exit Focus School status, a school must do the following:
  – Make AMOs in all student groups based on the State’s new Differentiated Accountability Recognition and Support System; and
  – Earn an A, B, or C on the State’s A-F Grading System
Funding: Priority, Focus, and Targeted Intervention Schools

• LEAs with any combination of Title I Priority, Focus, and Targeted Intervention Schools will not be required to set aside a total of more than 20% of the Title I, Part A allocation for implementing the required Turnaround Principles and interventions in these schools.

• LEAs will also use site allocations to implement these required Turnaround Principles and interventions as necessary.
Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

To support SEA and LEA development of evaluation systems that go beyond NCLB’s minimum HQT standards

• Develop and adopt SEA guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems
• Ensure LEAs implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that are consistent with SEA guidelines
Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

• Focus on Continuous Growth for All Educators
• Qualitative Components in Pilot Status for 2012-2013
• Additional Research and Educator Input on Quantitative Components
• Use of TLE Evaluations for hiring, firing, professional growth, teacher/administrator assignment, and compensation decisions
TIMELINE OF INFORMATION PROVIDED TO DISTRICTS

ESEA Flexibility Request and Supporting Resources


- Email to all Superintendents (November 2011)
- Phone calls to all Superintendents with Priority Schools (December 2011)
- E-Newsletter “Leadership Post” to all Superintendents (February 9, 2012)
- Live Webinar via WebEx (February 20, 2012)
- Phone calls to all Superintendents with Reward, Targeted Intervention, or Focus Schools (February 2012)
- Letter to all Superintendents with Reward, Targeted Intervention, Priority, or Focus Schools (March 2012)
- Live Videoconference (March 5 and March 9, 2012)