

Title I: Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
Part A: Improving Basic Grants to Districts			
Standards and Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires all states to have final assessment systems in place to measure performance of Title I schools/students against state standards in at least math and reading/language arts by 2001. Students must be assessed at a minimum at some point during grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12. Requires results that can be disaggregated by demographic group by 2001. 	No change	Grants states one time, one-year waiver for implementation. Non-compliance would result in loss of Title I administrative funds.
Accountability System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires states to use an accountability model outlined in statute or an alternative one that is as rigorous and effective. Those without a statewide accountability system are required to develop one for Title I schools. Encourages states to develop single accountability system for all schools. As part of statute's accountability model, states would adopt three levels of proficiency: advanced, proficient, and partially proficient. 	No change	Requires states to develop an accountability system for Title I schools only.
Inclusion of LEP students	Requires states to test LEP students included in the assessment in language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what students know and can do in subjects other than English.	Does not alter assessment requirement, except that students attending US schools for 3 consecutive years must be tested in English.	No differences.
Adequate Yearly Progress and School Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State plans are required to demonstrate, based on assessments, what constitutes AYP of any school and any LEA served. AYP is defined as that which is consistent 	No change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not less than 90% of each subgroup of students must take the assessment. Adequate yearly progress, defined by

<p><i>designation</i></p>	<p>with continuous and substantial yearly improvement to achieve the goal of all children achieving at proficient and advanced levels on state assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 95% of a school's student population should be included in the assessment. 		<p>(among other things) yearly gains on state assessments by 90% of students taking exam and every subgroup.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States and districts must have 90% of LEAs and schools respectively meet standards for AYP. Clarifies that academic measures other than performance on state tests (eg, promotion, completion of college prep courses) may not change the identification of schools or LEAs for improvement or corrective action if they would be so identified based on test performance.
<p><i>School Failure: Improvement status, Corrective Action, and Consequences</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Improvement Status Establishes a process for school and school district improvement that requires that (1) districts identify schools not making adequate progress for two consecutive years; (2) identified schools revise Title I plans in the year after being identified; (3) school districts help the identified schools to improve and ultimately take corrective action against schools that fail for another two years. Corrective Action Corrective actions include curtailing a schools decision-making authority, transferring staff and/or students to other schools, or reconstituting the school. States use a similar continuum with regard to failing school districts. Removes from the improvement list schools that make AYP 2 out of 3 years after being identified in need of improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Improvement Status. Schools that fail to make AYP 2 years in a row are identified for improvement. Identified schools are required to make a change in Title I plan within three months and school district intervention begins immediately. A school district may take corrective action at any time after a school is designated for improvement. Corrective Action. Schools are placed in corrective action after 3 years of failure. Corrective action must include at least one of the following measures: (1) implementing a new curriculum, (2) redesigning or reconstituting the school, reopening the school as a charter school, (3) closing the school or LEA; (4) authorizing student transfers to other LEAs; or (5) a joint local-State plan to fix failing schools. Choice. State and districts must also allow students to transfer out of schools identified for corrective action and must provide transportation or cover 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Improvement Status. Failure to make AYP for 2 years leads to school improvement. Within 3 months of identification, school must devise a plan for improvement. A school district may take corrective action at any time after a school is designated for improvement. Corrective Action Failure to make AYP for 2 additional years leads to corrective action. LEAs must take at least 1 of 6 measures: (1) withhold funds; (2) decrease decisionmaking authority; (3) impose alternative governance such as reopening as a charter; (4) reconstitute the school; (5) authorize transfers; and/or (6) institute a new curriculum. Choice. Schools must allow students to transfer to other schools in not less than 6 months and not more than 18 months of the school being identified in need of improvement. Removal from Improvement or

		<p>transportation costs for these students to attend other public schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal from Improvement or Corrective Action list. As with current law, schools are removed that make AYP 2 out of 3 years after being identified in need of improvement. 	<p>Corrective Action list. As with current law, schools are removed that make AYP 2 out of 3 years after being identified in need of improvement.</p>
<i>Rewards for Success</i>	<p>States designate schools as distinguished if the school has exceeded the state's definition of adequate yearly progress for three straight years. These schools can then act as models/mentors for other Title I schools and are eligible for additional funds from the state.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires states to set criteria for designating schools and school districts as "distinguished." Criteria include measures such as gains in student performance, consistently high performance on state assessments, or improvements in participation. • Secretary will reward states that demonstrate significant achievement gains in core subjects for three straight years, close the gap between low and high performing students, have strategies in place for continuous improvement including reducing social promotion and retention. Rewards include priority in ESEA grant competitions, bonus funds to states, or increased flexibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires that LEAs reserve 25% of any increase in funds from the previous year for rewarding schools for meeting accountability targets. • 50% of the reserved funds (12.5% of the increase in funding) must be used for the poorest schools, defined as those in the lowest poverty quartile.
<i>Set Aside for turning around failing schools</i>	<p>Allows states to reserve 0.5% for technical assistance to schools in school improvement and corrective action</p>	<p>Sets aside 2.5 percent allocation at the state level (about \$200 million total) for states and school districts to carry out corrective action and help low-performing schools. At least 70% of funds would flow to districts to facilitate rapid action; 30% would be used for a state support system. Set aside would be 3.5% by 2003-04.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires LEAs to reserve sufficient funds to carry out school improvement and corrective action responsibilities • Allows, but does not require, states to set aside 0.5% Title I funds (no minimum) for school improvement purposes.
<i>School Choice Provisions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally allows Title I funds to support choice programs • No mandatory public school choice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts required to provide choice to students in corrective action schools (after third year). • Districts must provide transportation or cover transportation costs for eligible students to attend other public schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally allows Title I funds to support choice programs. Clarifies that school choice programs would be "consistent with State and local law, policy and practice pertaining to school choice and pupil transfer." (paraphrase). Also clarifies

			<p>that funding can be used to provide transportation for children in public choice programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts required to provide choice to students in schools identified for improvement not less than 6 months and not more than 18 months after being identified in need of improvement. Choice plan would have to be "consistent with State and local law, policy and practice pertaining to school choice and pupil transfer." (paraphrase). • Districts required to continue choice option for at least 2 years after school is removed from improvement status
<p><i>Teacher Quality</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires paraprofessionals to have a HS degree or its equivalent, or be within two years of obtaining either. • Paraprofessionals who work with LEP students are exempt from requirement. • Paraprofessionals must be under direct supervision of a teacher. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require districts to use 5% of Title I funds in years 1 and 2 and 10% of funds thereafter to support teacher development. • Require all new teachers paid by Title I or working in a Title I school operating a schoolwide program to be certified for what they are teaching or to have a BA and be working toward certification. • Require by July 2002 all paraprofessionals to hold a high school diploma and require those providing instructional support to have at least two years of college. • Exempts paraprofessionals who assist with LEP students from requirements. 	<p>Includes teacher quality provisions from HR 1995, Teacher Empowerment Act including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of teachers would have to be certified by 2003. • Requires a freeze on new paraprofessional hires until all teachers are fully qualified. New paraprofessionals would have to have 2 years of study in college; an associate's degree; or meet rigorous standards of quality that demonstrate knowledge and ability to instruct in reading, writing, and math. HS diploma or GED necessary but not sufficient for qualification. • Does not allow paraprofessionals to instruct in reading, writing, or math unless they have demonstrated on a state or local assessment the ability to effectively instruct in those areas. • Exempts paraprofessionals who assist with LEP students, except that they must have a HS diploma or GED. • No requirement for LEAs to reserve 5% to 10% of funds for ongoing professional

			development.
<i>Schoolwide programs</i>	Consistent with Ed-Flex and Title 14 waiver authority, allows schools with 50% student poverty to operate schoolwide programs. Prohibits exemption of schoolwides from IDEA requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require states to reduce fiscal and accounting barriers to combining Title I funds with funds from all sources. Require school districts to peer-review schoolwide and school improvement plans and states to peer-review district-level Title I plans and improvement plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasizes that schoolwide programs should focus on children most at-risk of academic failure. No requirement for peer review.
<i>Within District Targeting of Title I funds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires LEA to (1) rank schools that are above 75% poverty from highest to lowest and serve in order; (2) at schools with 75% poverty and below, districts are permitted to serve all grade spans or just one grade span in rank order. Districts can make any school above 35% poverty eligible for Title I funding. If an LEA serves a school below 35% poverty, they must allocate a 125% per pupil allocation to each school. 	No change.	Allows districts to give priority to fund elementary schools in rank order before other schools at schools above or below 75% poverty.
<i>Parent Involvement</i>	Requires districts to set aside 1% for parental involvement activities.	No change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires districts to establish parent advisory councils. Places a cap on funds that can be used for parental involvement.
<i>Early learning and preschool programs</i>	No language.	Allows districts to provide services to eligible preschool children through Title I schools or contract with Head Start programs. Encourages the use of diagnostic assessments in first grade for reading.	No language.
<i>Equitable opportunities for private school students</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires school districts to provide meaningful consultation to private school officials to determine needed services. Allows an LEA to use a third part contractor to provide services and requires Secretary to bypass LEAs which are prohibited by law from serving a private school or demonstrate an unwillingness to do so. 	Clarifies that teachers and families of participating private school students should participate equitably in professional development and parental involvement activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires stronger consultation with private school officials and an appeal process for officials who have not had meaningful consultation.
<i>Extended Learning Time</i>	No language.	Requires districts to describe in their Title I plans how they will promote the use of	No language.

<p><i>Title I Grants/Formulas and Grandfather clause</i></p>	<p>Provides 86% of funds to poor schools and districts using basic grant formula, a process which thinly spreads out dollars. Other 14% is distributed with concentration grants, which provides for highest poverty districts.</p>	<p>extended learning in Title I schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires at least 20% of Title I, Part A funds flow through targeted grants, which allocate greater dollars to schools with higher poverty; the balance would be allocated by the more thinly-distributed Basic Grants. • Allows ineligible schools to receive within-district Title I funds for one additional year if they were eligible in the previous year. • Requires Puerto Rico's allocations to be determined on the same basis as state allocations—provides 5-year timetable for phase-in. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires new formula: 50% of funding above FY2000 appropriation would be allocated under targeted grants, 50% would be allocated between the basic and concentration grant formulas (consistent with the 85%/15% ration between the two formulas. • <u>(I think this is now gone and bill supports Administration's 1 year language)</u> Established an 85% hold harmless for concentration grants to LEAs that for four consecutive years fail to meet the eligibility guidelines. • Requires use of the ratio of Puerto Rico's per pupil expenditure to the lowest state average per pupil expenditure in allocation formula. Clarifies that if allocation formula results in any state or DC receiving less money than the previous year, then the ratio used should not be less than the ratio used in the previous year.
<p><i>Comparability Provisions</i></p>	<p>Ensures intra-district school comparability.</p>	<p>Requires districts to ensure comparability in terms of staff qualifications, curriculum and school facilities.</p>	<p>No change from current law.</p>
<p><i>Administrative Set-Aside</i></p>	<p>Allows states to set aside 1% of allocation for state administrative expenses.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>Allows states to reserve same amount of funding they did in FY99, up to 1%. Would authorize appropriations for states to receive additional administrative funding.</p>
<p><i>Program Evaluation</i></p>	<p>No language.</p>	<p>Authorizes Secretary to reserve 0.3% of Title I funds to conduct evaluations of Title I and its effectiveness. Mandates a national longitudinal study of Title I's short and long-term impact.</p>	<p>Directs GAO to evaluate how waivers for schools and LEAs, as well as standard waivers, granted pursuant to Ed-Flex affect student learning to high standards.</p>
<p>Part C: Migrant Children</p>			
<p><i>Allocation and Funding</i></p>	<p>Provides funds to states based on number of children who reside in state full time and the number of "full-time equivalents" who reside in the state for some of the year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplifies funding formula • Establishes funding minimums • Deletes the comprehensive service-delivery plan requirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides funds based on number who reside in the state and the number of migrant children who attended summer or intercession programs.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deletes the requirement that awards be made competitively. Requires applications by states to describe how they will include migrant students in state assessments as required under Part A. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides hold-harmless guarantee that LEAs would receive the funding it received in FY99.
<i>Student records</i>	Requires Secretary to work with states to facilitate transfer of migrant student records.	No change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires Secretary, in consultation with the states, to develop data elements for migrant reporting. Authorizes a grant program for improving migrant services.
<i>Parent Involvement</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires state and local MEP consultation with parent advisory councils clarifies that MEP is subject to Part A provisions to increase parent involvement. 	
Part D: Delinquent and Neglected Children and Youth			
<i>Allocation, Focus of Funds and Standards</i>	Provides grants to states which provide grants to state agencies and LEAs for educational programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires funds to be focused on students in correctional facilities and delinquent institutions. Requires state plans to ensure students are held to same standards and offered comparable services as students in regular public schools. Allow states to use multiple measures to assess student performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established Transitional and Academic Services Program to provide for the needs of students returning from correctional facilities. Allows funds to be used for entrepreneurship education, mentoring and peer mediation.
Part F: General Provisions			
	Authorizes the Secretary to create a Title I policy manual and allows states to reserve 1% of Title I funds for administrative purposes.	No change	Deletes authority for Secretary to create a Title I manual and establishes a 4% LEA administrative cap on spending. Also requires Secretary to develop a definition of administrative costs.
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program			

<i>Authorization</i>	Established in 1997 to provides incentives to schools, especially Title I schools identified for school improvement, to implement researched-based programs to strengthen the quality of the educational program.	Reauthorizes Title I demonstration authority and the Fund for the Improvement of Education, through which the CSRD program operates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adds Part G to Title I to authorize existing program in statute. • Requires that ED reports on CSRD to be sent to both authorizing and appropriations committees. • Requires states in making awards to take into account the equitable distribution of awards to different geographic regions within the state, including rural and urban areas, and to schools serving elementary and secondary students. • Requires national evaluation of program results and implementation.
----------------------	---	--	--

Title II: High Standards in the Classroom

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
Part A: Teaching to High Standards			
<i>Funding Requirements, Allowances and prohibitions</i>	Teaching to High Standards takes the place of Title III of Goals 2000, Eisenhower professional Development Program and Title VI. New Title II intended to focus on giving teachers the tools they need to raise student achievement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focuses funding on professional development that has been shown to be successful in raising student achievement and that is sustained over time. • Allows 10% of reforms to be spent on the development of standards and assessments • Allows state departments to award grants to higher education and nonprofit institutions for innovative professional development. • Distributes half of remaining funds by formula that targets high poverty districts; other half distributed through a grant competition. • Allows states and school districts to use funds to redesign licensure systems • Competitive funding would give 	<p>Creates a new Title II, Part A Teacher Empowerment program of grants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires LEAs to use portions of such subgrants for: professional development activities in mathematics and science and to help student meet high standards; efforts to recruiting, hiring, and training certified teachers in order to reduce class size, or for hiring special education teachers. • Authorizes LEAs to use such subgrants for highly qualified teacher recruitment programs, including financial incentives for teaching in shortage areas; providing alternative routes to teacher certification for professionals from other fields; increased opportunities for individuals underrepresented in teaching.

		<p>preference to programs that focus on supporting teaches in first three years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes LEAs to use such subgrants also for highly qualified teacher retention programs; teacher quality improvement and professional development programs; distance learning; tenure reform; merit pay; teacher testing in the subject areas they teach, and instruction in how to teach character education in a specified manner. • Prohibits the provision of professional development funds from LEA subgrants if the activity is not directly related to the curriculum and content areas in which the teacher provides instruction. • Permits the use of such funds for instruction in methods of disciplining children. • Authorizes Secretary to award competitive grants to eligible consortia for Teacher Excellence Academies, which would provide alternative route to certification. • Prohibits the use of funds to plan, develop, implement and administer any national teacher test or certification; prohibits requiring states or LEAs to adopt specific methods of teacher certification.
<i>School success and failure</i>	No language	States can extend their grants if they met specific, predetermined goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes LEAs to use subgrants for teacher opportunity payments for certain teachers or groups of teachers to use for professional development of their own choosing. • Requires LEAs that fail to meet state teaching standards to make teaching opportunity grants available.
<i>Programs of National</i>	Provides support for the National Board for	No change.	Does not provide support for National

<i>Significance</i>	Professional Teaching Standards and the Eisenhower Clearinghouse for Math and Science Education.		Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
<i>Recruitment and Retention</i>	No language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes creation of national job bank for teaching positions • Provides support for efforts to increase portability of teacher credentials and benefits across states • Provides support for programs designed to recruit teachers and retain them for more than 3 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes creation of a program to recruit math and science teachers for high-need systems, following the Troops for Teachers model. • Authorizes competitive grants to eligible rural LEAs to recruit and retain qualified teachers.
<i>School Principals</i>	No language	Allows states and districts to use funds to improve principal practice in supporting instruction.	Provides funds for principal professional development
<i>Private School Participation</i>	No language.	Provides for equitable participation of private school teachers and students in appropriate activities.	Provides that (1) private, religious and home schools are not barred from participation in the programs and services under this Title and (2) nothing in the Title shall be construed to permit, allow, encourage or authorize any federal control over any aspect of private, religious or home school.

Title V: Promoting Equity, Excellence and Public School Choice

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
Part A: Magnet Schools Assistance Program			
<i>Use of funds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports magnet schools in LEAs that are implementing desegregation plans. • Grant recipients receive 3-year awards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows districts to use funds for professional development and other capacity-building activities • Allows up to 5% of funds to be used for evaluation, assistance and dissemination. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibits use of funds for transportation or any activity that does not augment academic improvement. • Prohibits funds to be expended for planning after the 3rd year.
<i>Instructional Staff</i>	No language.	Allows use of non-licensed teachers such as performing artists and doctors to support school mission. Staff must demonstrate knowledge and skill in	Staff must be "fully qualified."

		subject matter or field of instruction.	
<i>Civil Rights</i>	Requires the ED Office of Civil Rights to determine, before a grant can be made to an LEA, that the LEA will meet the civil rights assurances in its application.	No change.	Deletes requirement that ED OCR review civil rights assurance in application.
<i>Innovative Programs</i>	Authorized funding of schools through Innovative Programs.	Repeals Innovative Programs and folds activities into Part C of this title.	No change.
Part B: Public Charter Schools Program			
	Authorizes funding for program to help locals design and implement charter schools (in Title X).	Moves to Title V, Part B with no changes.	No change.
Part C: Options for Improving Our Nation's Schools			
<i>Programs to Increase Choice</i>	No language (new program).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorizes new grant program, OPTIONS, to support development, implementation, evaluation and dissemination of information about public school choice projects • Targets funds to high-poverty districts through statutory priority • Requires projects to include performance indicators and evaluations • Replaces Innovative grant program under Part A with program to support innovative approaches to use choice to support school desegregation. 	Authorizes \$20 million innovative choice demonstration program to support high-quality public school choice.

Title VI. Class Size Reduction

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
<i>Purpose of program and uses of funds</i>	Authorizes funding to reduce class size in the early grades and allows a portion of each district's allocation to be spent on professional development activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifies purpose to reduce class size in grades 1-3 to 18 students per regular classroom to improve reading. • Permits districts whose allocation is less than a starting teacher's salary to form a consortium with other districts; supplement funds; and use grants of less than \$10,000 entirely on professional development related to teaching smaller classes; permits 1% of funds to be used by states for administration • Requires districts with child poverty levels under 50% to fund up to 35% of activities in this program with non-federal funds. • Requires states to substantiate plan for reducing class size, including how the state will use other funds to reduce class size and improve reading. 	Terminates program.

Title VII. Bilingual Education Act

<i>Parental Notification</i>	No language	Requires schools to provide information to parents and to allow them to withdraw children at any time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires parental consent requirement for circumstances where instruction will be tailored for LEP children. • Provides that parental consent does not have to be obtained if parental consent can not be obtained after reasonable and substantial effort by the LEA.
------------------------------	-------------	--	---

Title IX. Indian, Alaska Native, and native Hawaiian Education

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
Part A: Indian Education			
<i>Flexibility</i>	Provides authority for LEAs receiving Indian education formula grants under this section to integrate these funds with other programs.	Allows tribal schools to determine enrollment through standard student eligibility requirements for public schools.	Permits LEAs that receive Indian education formula grants under this section to consolidate all federal funding that they receive on a formula basis, from any federal agency, into a single program, subject to several pages of conditions and requirements at both the local and federal levels.

Title X: Programs of National Significance

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
Part B: Gifted and Talented Children			
<i>Program focus</i>	Awards grants to state and local education agencies, IHEs, and other public and private agencies for research efforts.	Continue National Research Center's efforts to disseminate information to schools with high percentages of poor students.	After \$50 million in funds allocated to current program and structure, the balance would be granted to states. States would make competitive grants to LEAs for programs and research.
Rural Assistance			
	Authorizes Secretary to provide grants to LEAs with at least 15% poverty and not in a metropolitan statistical area (MSA) or an LEA with total enrollment under 2500 with no schools in an MSA.	No change.	Creates two subparts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart I allows LEAs under 600 students and eligible by USDA rural code to combine funds from Title II (Teacher Empowerment Act), Title VI, Title VII and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. LEAs would receive \$100 per pupil minus the combined amount from above funds. Guarantees 420,000; not to exceed \$60,000. • Subpart II allows LEAs with 20%

			poverty and eligible by USDA rural code to receive grants for technology, professional development, technical assistance, teacher quality, parental involvement or academic enrichment programs.
--	--	--	--

Title XI: General Provisions, Definitions and Accountability

Issue	Current Law	President's Proposal: Changes and Additions to Current Law	House Committee Differences from Current Law
Part B: Education Accountability Act			
<i>Turning around failing schools</i>	No language	Requires states to set aside 2.5% of its Title I funds in 2000-01, increasing to 3.5% in 2003-04, for turning around failing schools. At least 70% of funds would flow to districts; 30% would be used for a state support system. Districts would be required to use funds in 1 of 3 ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing a new research-backed curriculum • Redesigning or reconstituting the school or reopening as a charter school • Closing the school and allowing students to transfer. Subsequently, funds would be used to provide other support such as interventions and teacher training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires LEAs to reserve sufficient funds to carry out school improvement and corrective action responsibilities • Allows, but does not require, states to set aside 0.5% Title I funds (no minimum) for school improvement purposes.
<i>Assisting Students to Meet High Standards</i>	No language	Requires states and districts to put policies in place that (1) identify and support students in need of assistance, (2) provide qualified teachers in classrooms who use proven practices tied to state standards, and (3) provide continuing interventions for students in need.	No language.

<i>End Social Promotion</i>	No language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires states to put policies in place that ends practice of social promotion and traditional grade retention within four years. • Requires states to define key transition points (like 4th and 8th grade) including HS graduation and hold students accountable for meeting challenging standards at those points. • Holds states accountable for using valid assessments aligned with state standards, multiple measures for promotion/retention decision, including teacher evaluations; multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate readiness; and reasonable accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficiencies. 	No language.
<i>Teacher Quality</i>	No language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires states to ensure that 95% of teachers are fully certified, working towards full certification through an alternative route, or fully certified in another state and working to meet state-specific standards. • Requires states to ensure that 95% of secondary school teachers have had academic training or demonstrated competence in subject matter they teach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires 100% of teachers to meet President's proposed guidelines.
<i>School Discipline</i>	No language.	Requires states to hold districts accountable for discipline policies that focus on prevention and have community involvement and have provisions for helping expelled or suspended students to meet state standards.	

<p><i>Report Cards</i></p>	<p>No language</p>	<p>Requires, within one year, state, district and school-level annual report cards that go to the parents and public. Report cards would include information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student achievement • Teacher professional qualifications • Class size • School safety • Academic achievement of subgroups where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifies that report cards only need to report on Title I schools, except if state or LEA reports on all students in state or district, it must include Title I required information. Clarifies that schools • Requires states, LEAs and schools to provide report cards on student achievement and teacher qualifications, or some other means of information. • Allows parents to request information on child's teacher's qualifications and individual performance with the teacher.
<p><i>Accountability and Sanctions</i></p>	<p>No language.</p>	<p>Allows Secretary to require states that do not meet accountability requirements to submit an alternative action plan and to terminate states' administrative flexibility or withhold administrative funds for states which continue to fail to meet accountability requirements.</p>	<p>No language.</p>