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Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education
NCLB Requirements

- 100% proficiency by 2013–14
- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for all schools & districts
- Schools & districts identified for improvement, corrective action, & restructuring
- Required actions linked to NCLB status
  - 20% reservation for school choice & supplemental educational services (SES)
  - 10% reservation for professional development
Massachusetts Framework

Accountability
District Actions - State Actions

Assistance
State Actions - District Actions

Level 1
Level 2
Level 3
Level 4
Level 5

Co-Governance
Why seek flexibility?

★ Two accountability systems
  ★ Federal: 81% of schools, 90% of districts not making AYP
  ★ State: Better differentiation

★ Opportunity for a unified system

★ Opportunity to focus more deliberately on proficiency gaps
Objectives of our waiver proposal

- Unify accountability & assistance system
  - Bring together state & federal requirements
- Maintain Massachusetts’ track record in setting high standards & expectations
  - Goals that are ambitious & attainable
- Incentivize improved student achievement in all schools
- Identify schools that need the most assistance in the aggregate and for student subgroups, and recognize high achieving and improving schools
- Incorporate growth in accountability determinations
Goal

Reduce proficiency gap by half by 2016–17

- Ambitious but achievable
- Requires greater progress for students furthest behind
- Focus on English language arts, mathematics, and science
Reduce the proficiency gap by half by 2016–17

Example: Math CPI – All Grades, Low Income
### Annual measurable objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>95% of all students must participate in MCAS (English language arts, math, science)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Meet or exceed statewide or group-specific gap closing targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth / Improvement</td>
<td>Meet or exceed student growth or improvement targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Indicators</td>
<td>Current: Meet HS graduation &amp; dropout rate targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future: Meet targets for other indicators of college and career readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress & performance reporting

- All students
- High needs subgroup (low income students, students with disabilities, English learners)
- Individual subgroups
  - Low income
  - SWD
  - ELL
  - Major racial/ethnic groups
Classifying schools and districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>On track to college &amp; career readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Not meeting gap closing goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Focus: Lowest performing 20% of schools (including schools with largest gaps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Priority: Lowest performing schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Priority: Chronically underperforming schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Commendation Schools*: High achieving, high growth schools (subset of Level 1)
Response – fund use

Under NCLB

★ Districts must reserve 20% of district’s Title I allocation for public school choice & tutoring if any school in the district is in improvement status

★ Additional 10% district reservation required if district is in improvement status

★ 10% of each school’s allocation must go to professional development if school is in improvement status

Under this flexibility

★ Districts reserve Title I funds on a sliding scale commensurate with most serious level of any school in the district (e.g., 0 to 25%), to be used to address identified needs

★ Districts select responses to fit local context and need; ESE engagement tailored to level designation

★ Greater fiscal accountability to ensure quality and efficiency
Response – supports

Under NCLB

- Supplemental Educational Services (SES) tutoring not strategically targeted to help the most struggling students
- Professional development is episodic and not necessarily connected to educators’ needs
- Mandated corrective actions & restructuring measures inappropriate to the scale of the problem in most schools
- Available interventions incomplete to address all student needs

Under this flexibility

- Expanded learning opportunities for struggling students, which may include tutoring and other supports forged through strategic partnerships
- Professional development is embedded, sustained, and connected to educators’ needs
- Districts select interventions to address identified needs; ESE engagement in schools with serious problems
- Interventions are aligned to conditions for school effectiveness, e.g., social, emotional, and health supports; family-school engagement
# Levels & ESE engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ESE Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Not meeting gap closing goals</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Focus: Lowest performing 20%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Priority: Lowest performing (up to 4%)</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Chronically low performance</td>
<td>Extremely High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
# Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board endorsement</td>
<td>October 25, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing stakeholder input</td>
<td>October &amp; November 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application submission</td>
<td>November 14, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application review</td>
<td>Winter 2011–12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory change</td>
<td>Early spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2012–13 school year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to Original Application Through January 18 Resubmission

- **Commendation Schools**
  - Changed eligibility criteria: may only be in Level 1 (as opposed to Level 1 or Level 2)

- **Level 1 & 2 Schools**
  - Modified thresholds and benchmarks for assigning credit in Progress & Performance Index

- **Level 3/Focus Schools**
  - Strengthened exit criteria for Level 3 Focus schools

- **Subgroups**
  - Reduced minimum group size from 40 to 30