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“Title I Initiatives of the Current Administration and How They Relate to Reauthorization of NCLB the Elementary and Secondary Education Act”

ESEA Reauthorization: Two Years Later

• Evolution of data systems and growth models
• Progress (some) with school turnaround
• Change in union leadership and strategy – Better relationships under Secretary Duncan?
• Democratic majorities?
• Healthcare outcome?
ESEA Reauthorization:
Recovery Act and current ESEA Structure

- In addition to program changes, there may be fiscal changes
  - Reexamine comparability
  - Reconsider the fundamental structure of federal fiscal support – formula vs. competitive
  - Is the 1965 ESEA model appropriate to the contemporary education reform focus?

ESEA Reauthorization: Congressional Strategy

- Original architects, particularly George Miller (D-CA) remain central
- Vulnerable Democrats are strategic
  - Success of Race to the Top
  - Recovery Act accountability fatigue
- Inverse relation to Health Care?

ESEA Reauthorization: Congressional Strategy

- Republican approach
  - Returning to federalist roots?
  - House Committee on Education and Labor Ranking Member Representative John P. Kline (MN) – NOW CHAIR
    - "I'm not looking to tweak No Child Left Behind," Kline said. "As far as I'm concerned, we ought to go in and look at the whole thing." (Nick Anderson, "GOP Leaving 'No Child' Behind," Washington Post, July 13, 2009)
Reauthorization Issues

• What do Secretary Duncan, RTT, 1003(g) and Stabilization, Phase 2 Rules tell us?

Reauthorization & Arne Duncan, Secretary of the Department of ED
Arne Duncan, Secretary of the Department of Education
✓ NCLB got it backwards: Restrictive where it should have been flexible
  • Interventions
  • Incentives
✓ Flexible where it should have been restrictive
  • Quality of Standards
    (Race to the bottom)
✓ Better tests
✓ Accountability based on achievement
✓ State flexibility

Reauthorization & Arne Duncan, Secretary of the Department of ED

• Targeted to Failing Schools – Subgroups
• Flexibility in Allocation
• Title I Waivers
• Title I Waivers for Title I in non-Title I Schools!!
Reauthorization & Arne Duncan, Secretary of the Department of ED

- Support for much greater variety LEA tutoring programs, etc.
- SES plus Choice in year 1
  - Title I Waiver

Education Committees Pre-Midterm

- House Education & Labor Committee
  - Chairman: George Miller (D-CA)
  - Ranking Republican: John Kline (R-MN)

- Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) Committee
  - Chairman: Tom Harkin (D-IA)
  - Ranking Republican: Michael Enzi (R-WY)

- **Post Midterm**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enzi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Kline - Press Release Nov. 3

- Robust oversight of Education and Workforce programs
- Modernize and streamline job training programs
- Education reform that:
  - Restores local control
  - Empowers parents
  - Lets teachers teach
  - Protects taxpayers
ESEA Reauthorization: Administration Proposal

“A Blueprint for Reform”

i.e. “A Blueprint for Reauthorization”
...if we have a Democratic majority!

Race To The Top (RTT)

- Phase I winners announced 3/29/2010
- Funding for Phase 2: $3.4 billion under ARRA
- $1.35 billion proposed for FY 2011
- Phase 2 winners announced 8/24/10

A Blueprint for Reform - 7 Sections

1. College Career Ready Students
2. Great Teachers and Great Learners
3. Meeting the Needs of Diverse Learners
4. A Complete Education
5. Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students
6. Fostering Innovation and Excellence
7. Additional Cross Cutting Priorities
1. College Career Ready Students

- State standards generally do not reflect knowledge/skills necessary for college career readiness

- New Approach
  - College/career ready standards/students
  - Growth rather than static scores
  - Turnaround lowest performing schools

1. College Career Ready Standards

- Upgrade existing standards
- Or common state standards
- Science standards continued
- May add others – i.e. history

- English Language Proficiency Standards - required
  - Reflect language skills necessary to master content

1. College Career Ready Standards - Rigorous Fair Accountability & Support at Every Level

- Reward progress
- Rigorous interventions
- Local flexibility on improvement and support
  - For most schools
1. College Career Ready Standards - Data on School Performance

• Data
  ▫ High School
    • Graduation rates
    • College enrollment
    • College enrollment without remediation – New!

1. College Career Ready Standards - Data on School Performance

• Accountability Systems
  ▫ Recognize progress/growth, reward success rather than only identify failure
  ▫ All students graduate or on track by 2020 – (New: All students proficient by 13-14?)
    • Targets - whole school and subgroups
    • Rewards for improvement

1. College Career Ready Standards - Accountability Systems

• “Reward”
  ▫ Schools, Districts, States
  ▫ $ For innovative programs in high performing schools and districts
  ▫ May include $ for staff and students
1. College Career Ready Standards - Accountability Systems

▫ May include flexibility for ESEA funds
▫ Competitive preference for high need reward districts and schools in other grant programs
▫ Flexibility in interventions

1. College Career Ready Standards
“Challenge:” School, Districts, States

• Cat 1- Lowest 5% Schools
  ▫ Academic achievement
  ▫ Student growth
  ▫ Graduation rates
  ▫ No progress
  ▫ Must implement 1 of 4 turnaround models

1. College Career Ready Standards
“Challenge:” School, Districts, States

• Cat 2 – Next 5%
  ▫ Warning: Implement locally determined strategy
1. College Career Ready Standards
   “Challenge:” “GAP Challenge” Schools

   • Cat 3
   • Persistent achievement gaps
   • Data driven interventions to close gap
     o Warning
     o Locally determined strategy
     o States/districts to implement locally determined strategy

1. College Career Ready Standards
   • For all challenge schools
     o Options – Expanded learning time SES
       – NCLB SES?
     o Choice – NCLB Choice?
     o Other

1. College Career Ready Standards
   State District Support: Reservations

   • Address equity (comparability)
     o Comparability “loophole” in current law
       • Payments for years of service excluded
   • Assessment
     o Formula grants for high quality assessments aligned to college/career
       • English & Math
1. College Career Ready Standards - Turnaround Grants
   - One of 4 models “to be chosen locally”
     - Transformation
     - Turnaround
     - Restart and Closure
   - 3 year awards – 2 additional possible

School Improvement Grants (SIG)
- Funding
  - ARRA: $3 billion
  - FY 2010: $546 million
  - Proposed FY 2011: $900 million
- Interim Final Requirements released on 1/21/2010
- Final – 11/1/2010

SIG
- Purpose
  - Improve student achievement in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring so as to enable those schools to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and exit improvement status.
SIG - Final Requirements

- Tier I:
  - Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring identified as a “persistently lowest-achieving school.”
  - Among the lowest-achieving five percent or the lowest-achieving five such schools; or
  - A Title I high school that has had a graduation rate that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

SIG Tier I - Newly Eligible Schools

- Any Title I school that is eligible to receive Title I, Part A funds; and
  - Either has not made AYP for at least two consecutive years or is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

SIG Tier I - Newly Eligible Schools

- Is no higher achieving on the State’s assessments combined than the highest achieving Tier I school that the SEA has identified under paragraph (a)(1)(i) of the definition of “persistently lowest achieving schools.”
SIG Tier II

- Any secondary school that is **eligible for, but does not receive**, Title I, Part A funds; and
  - Is identified by the SEA as a “persistently lowest-achieving school.”
  - Among the lowest-achieving five percent of such secondary schools in the State (or the lowest-achieving five such secondary schools) or is a high school that has had a graduation rate that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

SIG Tier II - Newly Eligible Schools

- Any secondary school that is **eligible to receive** Title I, Part A funds; and
  - Either has not made AYP for at least two consecutive years or is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

SIG Tier II - Newly Eligible Schools (cont...)

- Either is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving Tier II school that the SEA has identified as a “persistently lowest achieving schools” or is a high school that has had a graduation rate that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.
SIG Tier III

- Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I or Tier II school.
- Newly Eligible:
  - Any school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds; and
  - Has not made AYP for at least two years or is in the State’s lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and
  - Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

SIG - School Intervention Models

- Turnaround model, which includes, among other actions, replacing the principal and rehiring no more than 50 percent of the school’s staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with a State’s academic standards.

SIG - School Intervention Models

- Restart model, in which an LEA converts the school or closes and reopens it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.
SIG - School Intervention Models

- School closure, in which an LEA closes the school and enrolls the students who attended the school in other, higher-achieving schools in the LEA.
- Transformation model, which addresses four specific areas critical to transforming persistently lowest achieving schools.

2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

- New Approach
  - Elevate the profession – rewards
  - Teacher effectiveness – improved outcomes
  - Bold action
  - Strengthen pathways to high needs schools

- Effective teachers and leaders
  - Continue to improve formula grants to improve effectiveness (Title II?)
  - Statewide definition of “effective” teacher, principal; “highly effective” teacher, principal
    - Based significantly on student growth
  - Maintain HQT but with additional flexibility
2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

• Data linking
  ▫ Teacher and principal prep programs to:
    • Job placement
    • Student growth
    • Retention outcomes of graduates

• Districts with equitable distribution systems implemented
  ▫ Spend funds **flexibly**
  ▫ Unless not improving in
    • Equitable distribution – then **new plan**

• Measuring success
  ▫ Report cards – every **2 years**
  ▫ State and District
  ▫ Topics
    • Teacher qualifications
    • Designation of effectiveness
    • Hires from high performing pathways
    • Teacher surveys on level of support they receive
    • Novice status – teacher **and principals**
    • Attendance of teachers and principals
    • Retention
2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

- **Competitive** Grants
  - Ambitious Reforms
    - Identify
    - Recruit
    - Prepare
    - Develop
    - Retain
    - Reward
    - Advance
  - Effective teachers, principals
  - Leadership teams
  - In high need schools

---

2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

- Use of student growth for
  - Credentialing
  - Professional development
  - Retention
  - Advancement
  - Decisions

---

2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

- Use of funds
  - Reform Compensation Systems
    - Differentiated Compensation and Opportunities
    - To effective educators
    - Not linked to effectiveness - i.e. student performance
    - Eliminate incentives for credentials not linked to student performance
2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

- **Competitive** grants for recruitment and preparation
  - For high needs:
    - Schools, subjects, areas

2. Great Teachers and Great Leaders

- **Transformational Leaders**
  - Competitive grants for
    - Recruitment
    - Preparation
    - Support

Teacher Incentive Fund

- **Purpose**
  - Support efforts to develop and implement performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems in high-need schools.
Teacher Incentive Fund

• Goals:
  ◦ Improving student achievement by increasing teacher and principal effectiveness;
  ◦ Reforming teacher and principal compensation systems so that teachers and principals are rewarded for increases in student achievement.

Teacher Incentive Fund

• Projects
  ◦ Develop and implement performance-based teacher and principal compensation systems in high-need schools.

Teacher Incentive Fund

• Eligibility
  ◦ LEAs, including charter schools that are LEAs in their state, SEAs, or
  ◦ Partnerships of
    • an LEA, an SEA, or both, and
    • at least one nonprofit organization may apply.
Teacher Incentive Fund

- Appropriations
  - 2009 $200 Million
  - 2010 $400 Million
  - 2011 Proposed $800 Million

i3 Grant

- Purpose
  - Competitive record of improving student achievement and attainment;
  - Expand the implementation of, and investment in, innovative practices improving student achievement or student growth;
  - Closing achievement gaps;
  - Decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates; or
  - Increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

i3 Eligibility

- Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students (economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with limited English proficiency, students with disabilities); OR
i3 Eligibility (cont...)

- Significant increases in student academic achievement;
- In other areas, such as graduation rates
- Or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, with meaningful data.

i3 Awards

- Estimated Average Size
  Scale-up grants: $40,000,000
  Validation grants: $17,500,000
  Development grants: $3,000,000

i3 Grants

- Scale up grants
  - Grants to scale up practices for which there is strong evidence
  - Of improvement
  - Achievement
  - Growth
  - Closing achievement gap
  - Decreasing dropout rates
  - Increasing high school graduation rates
  - Increase college
    - Enrollment or
    - Graduation rates
i3 Grants

- Scale Up Grants
  - Effect to be important/substantial
  - Evidence of capacity

i3 Grants

- Validation Grants
  - Grants for practices that show promise for which there is moderate evidence
    - Practice will have statistically significant effect on categories above

i3 Grants

- Development Grants
  - High potential, relatively untested priorities
  - Reasonable hypothesis
  - Related research
3. Meeting the Needs of English Learners and Other Diverse Learners

- Continued commitment
  - Meet needs of ELL students
  - Maintain and strengthen programs for
    - Native Americans
    - Homeless
    - Migrant
    - Neglected and Delinquent
    - Rural Districts
    - Federally Impacted Districts
  - Meet needs of SWD through IDEA and ESEA

3. Meeting the Needs of English Learners and Other Diverse Learners

- SWD
  - Primarily IDEA But
  - ESEA – Support for
    - Inclusion
    - Improved outcomes
  - Better prepared teachers
  - More accurate assessments
  - Universal design

3. Meeting the Needs of English Learners and Other Diverse Learners - ELL

- Formula grants continued
- **Dual language programs**
- Transitional bilingual education
- Professional Development for teachers
3. Meeting the Needs of English Learners and Other Diverse Learners - ELL

- States must establish **new** criteria for
  - Identification
  - Eligibility
  - Placement
  - Duration
- Based on valid and reliable ELL proficiency assessment

3. Meeting the Needs of English Learners and Other Diverse Learners - ELL

- States not showing improvement
  - Lose **flexibility** in this program
- New competitive grants
  - For innovative programs
- States must develop
  - Grade x Grade E.L. proficiency
  - Standards linked to college/career ready standards

3. Meeting the Needs of English Learners and Other Diverse Learners - Neglected and Delinquent

- Indian, Native Hawaiian, Alaska Native Education
  - Continue support through formula and competitive grant programs
  - Greater flexibility in Indian education program
  - Improve tribal access to ESEA
  - Expand eligibility to LEAs and charters under
    - Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native Programs
4. A Complete Education - A New Approach

• Strengthen instruction
  ▫ Literacy
  ▫ STEM
  ▫ Aligned to improved college career ready standards

4. A Complete Education - A New Approach

• More rigorous standards for literacy
• Well-rounded education in high needs schools
• Expand access to accelerated course work in high needs schools

4. A Complete Education - Literacy

• Competitive grants
  ▫ Higher standards
  ▫ High quality literacy especially in high needs districts
• Required: State develop comprehensive, evidence-based Pre-K to 12 literacy plan
4. A Complete Education - Literacy

- Priority to states with common standards
  - College – Career ready standards
- **Competitive** Grants
  - Develop and support comprehensive literacy programs

4. A Complete Education - STEM

- **Competitive** Grants
  - Transition to higher standards
  - Support to high needs districts
    - High quality instruction and
    - Science and Math
- Priority to states with common standards
- Competitive subgrants – State – LEA
  - STEM in high needs schools

4. A Complete Education - Well Rounded Education

- College Pathways
  - Competitive Grants for accelerated learning opportunities
    - High School – College level work
    - Dual enrollment
    - Advanced Placement
    - International Baccalaureate
    - Gifted and Talented
5. Successful, Safe and Healthy Students

- Promise neighborhoods
  - Competitive Grants
    - Community services
    - Family support
  - Improve educational and
    - Developmental outcomes through:
      - Effective public schools
      - CBO’s
      - Other local agencies

- Needs assessments of all children in the community
  - Establish baseline
  - Improve outcomes
  - Promote community involvement
  - Leverage other public/private resources

- 21st Century Community Learning Centers
  - Competitive Grants
    - Comprehensive redesign of
      - School day
      - Year
      - Full service community schools
      - Before/After school services
5. Successful, Safe and Healthy Students

- Grant funds to improve
  - School safety
  - Student mental and physical health
  - Eating
  - Physical fitness

5. Successful, Safe and Healthy Students

- Competitive Grants
  - State or districtwide “climate needs assessments”
  - School engagement and
  - School safety
  - Public reporting

6. Fostering Innovation and Excellence

- RTT
  - Competitive grants modeled after RTT
- i3
  - Competitive grant to build on and expand i3
- Expanded education options
  - Competitive grants
    - Start or expand charter schools
    - Other “high performing” autonomous public schools – like charters – only more so
6. Fostering Innovation and Excellence

• Choice
  ◦ “High quality public school educational options”
  ◦ Inter and intra district transfers
  ◦ Theme based schools
  ◦ On-line learning

• Magnet Schools
  ○ Competitive grants
    • Expand and improve options

7. Additional Cross Cutting Priorities

• **Flexibility** for success???
• Replicate successful priorities
• Building the knowledge base

7. Additional Cross Cutting Priorities

• Technology
• **Evidence** – Review i3
• Efficiency
• ELLs and SWDs
• Rural
Education Jobs Fund

- $10 billion to save around 160,000 teachers’ jobs
- Considered an extension of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF)
  – Awarded under the same formula as SFSF
  – Authorized under same statute, with amendments
- Similar reporting requirements to ARRA
- As of September 3, 15 States and Territories have been approved for funding

Ed Jobs - Use of Funds

- 98% of State allocation awarded to LEAs via:
  – State’s primary funding formula; or
  – ESEA Title I, Part A Allocation
- Funds are only for “compensation and benefits and other expenses, such as support services, necessary to retain existing employees, to recall or rehire former employees, and to hire new employees in order to provide early childhood, elementary, or secondary educational and related services."

Ed Jobs - Use of Funds

- Meant for the 2010-2011 school year, but available through September 30, 2012.
- For expenses incurred on or after August 10, 2010.
- Allowable uses include (among others):
  – Ending furloughs
  – Salary increases/avoiding salary reductions
  – Bonuses/benefits
  – Retirement pensions
Ed Jobs - Use of Funds

- Meant only for school-level employees in the LEA
- May not use funds for contractual school-level services by individuals who are not employees of an LEA (including CMO employees)
- NO $ for LEA administration

IDEA Reauthorization

- Timeline Indefinite
- May go before ESEA
- No major overwhelming policy issues

IDEA: Possible Issues

- Assessment
- Disproportionality
- EIS Set-aside
- HQT for SPED teachers
This presentation is intended solely to provide general information and does not constitute legal advice or a legal service. This presentation does not create a client-lawyer relationship with Brustein & Manasevit and, therefore, carries none of the protections under the D.C. Rules of Professional Conduct. Attendance at this presentation, a later review of any printed or electronic materials, or any follow-up questions or communications arising out of this presentation with any attorney at Brustein & Manasevit does not create an attorney-client relationship with Brustein & Manasevit. You should not take any action based upon any information in this presentation without first consulting legal counsel familiar with your particular circumstances.