

**ESEA Flexibility:
Changes to School and District
Accountability and Assistance**

Some background information

This year – with stakeholder support and input – Arkansas received a waiver of certain NCLB requirements.

Regional stakeholder meetings for community members and educators,
Survey and email input, and
Meetings with Committee of Practitioners, professional organizations, civic groups, Superintendents Advisory Council.

Arkansas will move toward a unified federal and state accountability system beginning in 2012-13.

Goal is to have one classification system for all schools, using same indicators and measures.

Flexibility and opportunity to direct additional resources to schools with lowest achieving students.

What are the major changes?

NCLB goal of 100 percent proficient replaced with new goal of reducing proficiency gaps by half by 2017.

NCLB accountability status labels eliminated – only using accountability and assistance levels for all schools.

AYP replaced with accountability levels based on new Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) for schools and districts.

Performance (proficiency), growth and graduation rate indicators using minimum N of 25.

Enhanced focus on subgroups through the Targeted Achievement Gap Group (TAGG).

Federal SES and choice requirements replaced by supports and interventions responsive to identified needs.

What did NCLB require?

100% proficiency in ELA and math by 2013–14.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for all schools and districts.

Schools and districts identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

Required actions linked to NCLB status.

20% reservation of Title I, Part A for school choice and supplemental educational services (SES).

10% reservation of Title I, Part A for professional development.

What were the requirements for ESEA Flexibility?

Adopt college- and career-ready standards and assessments.

Set new ambitious but achievable annual targets toward specific goals
State, districts, schools, student groups.

Implement system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support
Identify high performance and/or growth, persistent subgroup issues,
lowest performance, schools not meeting annual targets.

Implement educator evaluation system.

Reduce duplication and burden.

Why seek flexibility?

Unify accountability and assistance system
Bring together state and federal requirements, and
Better differentiate between schools.

Maintain Arkansas's track record in setting high standards and expectations
Goals that are ambitious and attainable.

Incentivize improved student growth, achievement and graduation rates in
all schools.

Identify schools that need the most assistance in the aggregate and for
student subgroups, and recognize high achieving and improving schools.

Focus more deliberately on proficiency, growth and graduation rate gaps.
Assists in transition to CCSS and PARCC assessments.

Revised goals

Reduce *proficiency, growth and graduation rate gaps* by half by 2016–17.
Ambitious and achievable AMOs.

Goal is same for all, but targets are differentiated.

Focus on literacy, mathematics and graduation targets.

Flexibility to redirect resources to serve students with greatest needs.

Applies to state, districts, schools, and groups.
Performance, growth and/or graduation rate AMOs
All schools will have performance AMOs
Schools serving grades 4 through 8 students will have growth AMOs.
High schools will have graduation rate AMOs.
Depending on configuration, some high schools will have performance, growth and graduation rate AMOs (6-12 schools).

How will 2012 accountability be calculated?

Performance and growth AMOs were calculated based on 2011 test results.
Arkansas uses a lagging graduation rate for accountability.
Graduation rate AMOs were calculated using 2010 four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates.
2011 graduation rates will be compared to AMOs that were calculated using 2010 graduation rates.

Who is included?
Every full academic year student!

Which student groups are included for determining accountability status?
All Students
Targeted Achievement Gap Group (TAGG)
Economically disadvantaged,
English Learners (EL), and/or
Students with Disabilities (SWD).

Which student groups are included for ACSIP interventions and reporting?
African American
Hispanic
White
Economically disadvantaged
EL
SWD

Why use the TAGG?

Eliminates multiple counting of students who are in more than one subgroup
Holds more schools accountable for economically disadvantaged students, EL and SWD.
Only 9% of schools were accountable for ELs under AYP,
Only 16% of schools were accountable for SWD under AYP.

Holds more schools accountable for lower performing students in race/ethnic groups.

92% of Hispanic students

86% of African American students

90% of Hawaiian Native/Pacific Island students

Most schools and all districts will be placed in their accountability status based on meeting AMOs for All Students and the TAGG except Exemplary, Focus and Priority Schools

When Lowering N to 25 and the TAGG:

895 schools not accountable for SWD went to only 28.

968 schools not accountable for ELs went to only 28.

75 not accountable for poverty went to 28.

Classifying districts

Accountability Status	Description	ADE Engagement/ District Autonomy
Exemplary	High performance High progress High TAGG high performance High TAGG high progress	Very low ADE engagement/ Very high district autonomy
Achieving	3-yr ACSIP—meet all performance, graduation rate and growth AMOs for All Students and TAGG 1-yr ACSIP—meet all performance and graduation rate AMOs for All Students and TAGG, but miss growth AMOs for All Students or TAGG	Very low ADE engagement/ High district autonomy
Needs Improvement	Does not meet performance, graduation rate or growth AMOs for All Students and TAGG	Low to Moderate ADE engagement / Moderate district autonomy
Needs Improvement Focus	Schools with largest, persistent gaps between Non-TAGG and TAGG students	High ADE engagement/ Low district autonomy
Needs Improvement Priority	Schools with persistently lowest achievement in math and literacy over three years for All Students	Very High ADE engagement/ Low district autonomy*

Strategic use of Title I funds

Districts can use the flexibility granted by the waiver to help your lowest performing schools make their targets by...

Serving lowest performing schools with Title I and/or NSLA funding using most appropriate methods aligned to identified student and adult learning needs,

Designating any Focus or Priority School as a Title I schoolwide program school, even if the school does not have a poverty percentage of 40% or more,

Transferring up to 100% of your Title II-A funds into Title I and using them for Title I purposes

What are my continuing obligations for allocating Title I, Part A funds?

Prioritize your lowest achieving students in your lowest performing schools.

Allocate Title I, Part A funds equal to the scope of the problem.

Schools and districts must demonstrate alignment of federal and NSLA fund allocations sufficient to support implementation of interventions.

Key continuous improvement performance areas

Academic Performance:

Curriculum

Instruction

Classroom Assessment/Evaluation

Learning Environment:

School Culture

Student, Family and Community Support

Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation

Efficiency:

Leadership

Organization, Structure and Resources

Comprehensive and Effective Planning

High leverage strategies that connect to college and career readiness...

target your lowest achieving students in your lowest performing schools

aggressively address school performance and student achievement

provide a strong instructional core within a response to intervention

framework:

Regular structures/systems for collecting and analyzing data that directly inform instructional practice

Frequent teacher teaming and teacher-specific coaching linked to instructional practice

Responsive systems of tiered instruction, especially Tier II and Tier III interventions are monitored for efficacy and impact

In proposing use of prior set aside funds in your ACSIP...

Your ACSIP should demonstrate how you will use the flexibility opportunities granted by the waiver to provide maximum support to lowest-achieving students in your lowest-performing schools.

Your ACSIP should include description of your findings from self-assessment and data analysis. What problems/weak areas do your interventions address?

Include in your interventions the high-leverage strategies you will use to aggressively address school performance and student achievement, and how you will know if they are working.

Next Steps for Achieving Schools

Achieving Schools engage in self-assessment to determine what is working to continue these strategies.

If some ESEA subgroups didn't meet AMOs, Achieving Schools investigate the factors contributing to lower performance for these subgroups to determine interventions to support improved performance for these students.

Access regional and ADE resources to support plans.

Next Steps for Needs Improvement Schools

Needs Improvement Schools engage in self-assessment to identify areas of concern to address through ACSIP interventions.

Focus and Priority Schools engage with ADE School Improvement Specialist to conduct needs assessment and develop Targeted or Priority Improvement Plans (within ACSIP).

Districts and schools access regional and Statewide System of Support resources as needed to meet ACSIP, TIP and PIP.

Focus and Priority Schools have priority access to support as outlined in the ESEA Flexibility proposal.

Federal SES/Choice: What comes next?

School Year 2012-13:

Districts choosing not to continue offering SES or school choice in 2012-13 must provide parents with information to explain why and describe the interventions, incentives and supports that will replace those options

Any student who has transferred into a school through NCLB choice must be allowed to remain in that school through the highest grade served by the school

Summer 2012:

ADE releases preliminary 2012 Accountability Reports and school and district status comparing 2012 performance and growth and 2011 graduation rates to AMOs set using 2011 performance and growth and 2010 graduation rates.

Exceptions:

Focus and Priority Schools determined based on 2009 through 2011 data.

Exemplary Schools determined using 2009 through 2012 data.

2012 Accountability Status for determining Title I, part A allocations.