

***Elementary and Secondary
Education Act
(ESEA)
Flexibility***

**Community Meeting
New Castle County
January 4, 2012**

Why are we here?

- Opportunity to discuss the current classification and requirements of schools, districts and the state, that is, the current accountability system
- Opportunity to discuss the changes being proposed by the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) to better identify and provide support to schools and districts
- Opportunity to get your input

History of Major Education Initiatives in Delaware

1983: Data System with unique student identifier established

1988: State wide teacher evaluation system implemented

1995: Robust charter and state wide school choice laws passed
State wide standards implemented

1997: Delaware Student Testing Program implemented
Longitudinal tracking of state test scores begins

2002: Funding for Reading Resource Teachers begins at state level

2005: Curriculum aligned to standards. Teacher evaluations revised based on Danielson principles. Rodel Foundation publishes *Opportunity Knocks*

2006: High school graduation requirements aligned with university entrance requirements

2007: Delaware STARS rating system for early childhood education centers begins

2009: New regulations provide a framework for turning around low-achieving schools and link teacher evaluation to student growth;

2010: Delaware ranks first in federal Race to the Top grant competition, winning \$119 million; state launches Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System, a computer-adaptive, growth-model state test

2011: Delaware wins nearly \$50 million in federal Early Learning Race to the Top competition

What is ESEA Flexibility?

- In September, President Obama and U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan invited states to apply for flexibility from certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (aka No Child Left Behind) in exchange for aggressive, state-led reforms

Why is this significant?

- If their plans are approved, states will get flexibility in the setting of student proficiency targets, aka Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs).
- In other words, schools would not be required to meet 100% proficiency by 2013-14 and would not be subjected to some of the No Child Left Behind requirements, such as school improvement, corrective action, restructuring.

Why is this significant? – cont'd

- Schools would gain flexibility with some funding, i.e. choice and supplemental education services required under NCLB
- This initiative correlates to the Delaware Education Plan established under the leadership of Secretary Lowery and Governor Markell in 2009. More than 100 individuals participated in the discussions.

What does a state have to do to get flexibility?

- States must address four major reform areas in their applications:
 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

1. College- and Career-Ready (CCR) Expectations for All Students

- CCR standards adopted in at least reading/language arts and math
- Articulate a plan for transitioning to CCR standards
- Develop and administer statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth
- Adopt English Learner (EL) standards corresponding to state's CCR standards and develop aligned assessments

2. State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

- Set ambitious but achievable annual targets
 - A. Set targets in equal annual increments toward a goal of reducing the achievement gap within 6 years; or
 - B. Set targets that increase in annual equal increments with a result of 100% proficiency by 2020; or
 - C. Propose another method for ambitious but achievable targets

2. State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support – cont'd

- Identify specific classifications of schools:
 - Reward schools
 - Priority schools
 - Focus schools

- Provide incentives and supports for **other** Title I schools

- Build state, district and school capacity to improve student learning in **all** schools

3. Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

- Develop and adopt state guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems
- Ensure districts/charters implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that are consistent with state guidelines
- Student growth must be included in the evaluation system

4. Reducing Duplication and Unnecessary Burden

- Remove duplicative and burdensome reporting requirements that have little or no impact on student outcomes
- Evaluate and revise state administrative requirements to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on districts/charter schools

Impact on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Current	Proposed															
<p>Performance – disaggregated by 11 subgroups – 100% proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>Annual targets –</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="247 591 979 962"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>50</td> <td>49</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>66.5</td> <td>66.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>83.3</td> <td>83.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Reading	Math	2010-11	50	49	2011-12	66.5	66.3	2012-13	83.3	83.2	2013-14	100	100	<p>Performance – disaggregated by 11 subgroups</p> <p>Annual targets – statewide targets will reflect a 50% reduction of non proficient students by subgroups with a floor.</p> <p>Floor is based on 2011 targets (50% Reading and 49% Mathematics)</p>
Year	Reading	Math														
2010-11	50	49														
2011-12	66.5	66.3														
2012-13	83.3	83.2														
2013-14	100	100														

Impact on Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – cont'd

Current	Proposed
Participation (95%) – disaggregated by 11 subgroups	Participation (95%) – disaggregated by 11 subgroups
Other Academic Indicator (OAI) - Attendance (90%) for Elementary and Middle schools Graduation Rate (targets to be recalculated because of cohort reassignment) All students used for AYP; subgroups for Safe Harbor	Other Academic Indicator (OAI) - Attendance (90%) for Elementary and Middle schools Graduation Rate (targets to be recalculated because of cohort reassignment) All students used for AYP; subgroups for Safe Harbor
“N” count for cells – 40	“N” count for cells – 40
Confidence Interval - 98% Status Model Only	Confidence Interval - 98% Status Model Only
Safe Harbor including confidence interval 75% – Status Model Only	Safe Harbor including confidence interval 75% – Status Model Only
For Growth model – performance are points based on growth of students performance – Fall to Spring	For Growth model – performance are points based on growth of students performance – Fall to Spring

Principle 2

➤ Option C:

- Set 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
- Provide new annual targets and an explanation of the method used to set these targets
- Delaware proposes to use both the status model and growth model for performance calculations

Reward and Recognition Schools

- Use the same criterion outlined in ESEA Flexibility guidance for both Reward and Recognition schools
- Identify at least 5% of the Title I schools in the state as **Reward Schools (7 schools)**
- Based on...
 - schools identified as Title I in the 2010-2011 school year
 - assessment data for 2010-2011

Reward and Recognition Schools – cont'd

- Delaware proposes to select up to 10 additional **Recognition Schools** using the same criteria as Reward Schools (*not required*)

- Current Award Programs:
 - In 2010-11 and 2011-12, Delaware selected 5 schools each year to receive Academic Achievement Awards
 - Delaware also participates in the National Title I Distinguished Schools Program

Awards for Reward or Recognition Schools

Award	Reward School		Recognition School	
	Title I		Title I	Non-Title I
Financial Award	Yes – Title I and RTTT funds		Yes – Title I and RTTT funds	Yes – RTTT funds
Banner	Yes – Title I funds		Yes – Title I funds	Yes – state improvement funds
Certificate	Yes		Yes	Yes
Visit/ Ceremony	Yes		Yes	Yes

Partnership Zone Schools (Priority Schools)

- **Partnership Zone Schools** (includes Priority Schools as required by ESEA Flex)

- All states are required to identify at least 5% of the Title I schools in the state as Priority schools.
 - As a result of the current regulatory framework, Delaware already identifies schools that meet these criteria and have identified these schools as Partnership Zone Schools.

Partnership Zone Schools (Priority Schools) – cont'd

➤ Priority School Criteria as required under ESEA Flexibility:

- Among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the proficiency and lack of progress of the “all students” group
- Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years
- Tier I or Tier II School Improvement Grant (SIG) school implementing a school intervention model

Partnership Zone Schools (Priority Schools) – cont'd

- The calculation for Persistently Low Achieving Schools meets this definition
- The Priority schools pursuant to the ESEA Flexibility need to be determined only once during this Flexibility period (through 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14)

Focus Schools

- All states are required to identify at least 10% of the Title I schools in the state as Focus Schools
- The determination of schools is based on those schools identified as Title I in the 2010-2011 school year and the assessment data for that year.
- Delaware had approximately 140 Title I schools so this number is 14 schools.
- The proposal is to select **up to** 7 additional (5%) non Title I schools.

Focus Schools – cont'd

Focus School Criteria:

- Has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) **or**, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate
- Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement **or**, at the high school level, a low graduation rate
- A Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school

Focus Schools – cont'd

Identification based on gap and subgroup performance for all the following:

- Low Income vs. non-Low Income
- Low Income subgroup performance
- English Learners subgroup performance
- Students with disabilities subgroup performance
- Hispanic subgroup performance
- African American subgroup performance

What happens if you are a Partnership Zone or Focus School?

- Districts/charters would submit plans for their Partnership Zone and Focus schools
- There would be a menu of options from which the Focus schools select
- Partnership Zone requirements are set out in current DDOE regulation
- Focus School Funding
 - The 1003(a) funds could be used for the Title I Focus schools
 - LEAs would be allowed to set aside up to 10% of LEA funds for the plans

What happens if you are a Partnership Zone or Focus School? – cont'd

- Partnership Zone School Funding
 - 1003(g) and RTTT funds could be used for the Partnership Zone schools
 - Districts/charters would be allowed to set aside up to 20% of local funds for the plans

- Participate in the Comprehensive Success Review or equivalent process.

- The state school improvement funds could fund the non Title I schools.

What happens if you are a Partnership Zone or Focus School? – cont'd

- **Both the 1003(a) and state school improvement funds would be competitive for Focus Schools**
 - The competition is based on criteria and determination of the quality of the plan and not a competition among schools
 - Therefore all schools could be allocated funds to support their plans as long as the plans are quality based on a rubric.

- Exit criteria would be created for both Partnership Zone and Focus schools

School Classifications

Name/ Classification	Explanations	Title I or Non Title I
Reward	<p>Reward Schools: All states are required to identify at least 5% of the Title I schools in the state as Reward Schools. The determination of schools is based on those schools identified as Title I in the 2010-2011 school year and the assessment data for that year. Delaware had approximately 140 Title I schools so this number is 7 schools.</p>	Title I only
Recognition	The proposal is to select up to 10 additional Recognition Schools using the same criteria as Reward Schools.	Title I and Non Title I
Focus	<p>Focus Schools: All states are required to identify at least 10% of the Title I schools in the state as Focus Schools. The determination of schools is based on those schools identified as Title I in the 2010-2011 school year and the assessment data for that year. Delaware had approximately 140 Title I schools so this number is 14 schools. The proposal is to select up to 7 additional (5%) non Title I schools.</p>	14 Title I and up to 7 additional non Title I
<p>Partnership Zone (includes Priority Schools required under ESEA Flex)</p>	<p>ESEA Flexibility requires “Priority Schools”: All states are required to identify at least 5% of the Title I schools in the state as Priority schools. The determination is based on those schools identified as Title I in the 2010-2011 school year and the assessment data for that year. Delaware had approximately 140 Title I schools so this number is at least 7 schools.</p> <p>As a result of the current regulatory framework, Delaware already identifies schools that meet these criteria and have identified these schools as Partnership Zone schools.</p>	Title I and Title I eligible

Support System

- Three tiers of schools (slide 30)
- Identify and differentiate support for all schools
- Technical support and requirements to be tailored based on the level of tier which a school is identified

Support System

Name/ Classification	Criteria	Title I or Non Title I
Tier 1	Using the Status and Growth performance cells and Other Academic Indicator, as school that meets AYP in both the Status and Growth Models.	Title I and Non Title I
Tier 2	Using the Status and Growth performance cells and Other Academic Indicator, a school that does meet AYP in Status but does not meet AYP using Growth performance, the number of cells a school or district qualified and how many were missed, and the distance of the cells from the Status performance targets. OR Using the Status and Growth performance cells and Other Academic Indicator, a school that does not meet AYP in Status but does meet AYP using Growth performance, the number of cells the school or district qualified and how many were missed.	Title I and Non Title I
Tier 3	Using the Status and Growth performance cells and Other Academic Indicator, a school that does not meet AYP in either model, the number of cells the school or district qualified and how many were missed and then distance from target.	Title I and Non Title I

Delaware's drafts

- The first draft of Principles 1, 3, and 4 was sent to stakeholders on Nov. 28, 2011
 - 2 phone calls were held for comment

- The first draft for Principle 2 was sent on Dec. 9, 2011
 - DDOE is currently soliciting more comments around this area.

Questions/Comments:

DDOE welcomes all feedback and questions on the ESEA Flexibility Application. Please submit prior to February 1, 2012 to:

➤ Susan Haberstroh

- shaberstroh@doe.k12.de.us
- 302.735.4008

➤ Joanne Reihm

- jreihm@doe.k12.de.us
- 302.735.4103