

Author: Thomas Fagan at WDCJ01

Date: 5/14/98 3:04 PM

Priority: Normal

TO: Susan Wilhelm at WDCJ03, Mary Jean LaTendre, William Kincaid, Arthur Cole,  
Judith Johnson at WDCJ03, Patricia Gore at WDCJ02

Subject: Another thought on reauthorization

I have another idea about reauthorization of Goals 2000 (and part of ESEA that I think we might wish to explore. It stems partially from two questions we have been unable to answer satisfactorily.

1. How does the comprehensive reform in Goals 2000 and Obey-Porter relate to schoolwide programs?
2. How can we make schoolwide programs be more comprehensive and not extensions of targeted assistance to all kids.

What about folding Goals 2000, Obey-Porter, and Title VI into Title I. The new Part A of Title I would have two main sections - schoolwide reform and targeted assistance. Rather than choosing between the two approaches, schools would do both - some funds would be used to reform the regular school program, aligned to standards and using research based models. Other funds would be used for special activities for low performing children - preschool, summer school, extended day, primarily. This would marry the two approaches together, moving the extra services component out of the reform section. I think would lead to more true schoolwide efforts.

Advantages:

1. Focusses all the dollars on high (relatively) poverty schools - those most in need of reform
2. Directly connects the standards/assessment of Title I to reform. Title I is the driver anyway.
3. Can expand the Obey Porter approach dramatically.
4. Adds about \$1 Billion to Title I
5. Consistent with the targetting provisions in Obey-Porter and Goals (though not with Title VI which is not targetted)

I would like to have the work group think about this as an alternative to the consolidation I proposed to Mike Smith. He wants options and also thinks we need to do something to stimulate change in Title I at local level consistent with the changes we made to the program in 1994.

What about it?

Tom

## The Heart of ESEA

DRAFT May 11, 1998

### Core Purposes

The core purposes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are to support education reform efforts that:

- close the achievement gap between high poverty and low poverty schools;
- continually raise the general achievement levels of all students; and
- ultimately create highly a trained, internationally competitive workforce.
- The ESEA is fundamentally aimed at helping all students achieve at high levels of academic performance. It plays an important role in providing leadership to the nation for helping all students reach high standards. The ESEA has a core purpose of creating greater equity among schools and students and in continually raising the expectations for students in the public system. All students should have the opportunity to be active, productive members of our society, and, as such, must leave school prepared to participate in an internationally competitive workforce.

### Key strategies to achieve the purposes

The ESEA is driven by several core strategies to reach the purposes outlined above:

- Promote systems that are driven by high standards for all students.  
Develop accountability systems that use data to drive school improvement efforts and hold students, teachers, schools, districts, and states accountable for student achievement.
- Develop the capacity of teachers and administrators to help all students reach high standards.
- Create environments that are conducive to learning.
- Target resources to the areas of greatest need.
- Provide early literacy learning opportunities so that all students enter school ready to learn with a foundation of literacy skills that will enable them to learn to read.

### Attributes of ESEA programs

All ESEA program authorities should:

- be tied to helping students reach high standards;
- be based on best practice;
- be research-based;
- provide for appropriate and consistent State and local flexibility;
- use, wherever possible, common provisions for similar strategies;
- permit integration of strategies across programs;
- take a common approach to key areas such as higher state content standards, assessments,

and accountability;  
provide for common targeting provisions and couple targeting of funds and program  
coordination.

*The Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999*

---

## **Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999**

Established in 1965 as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson's War on Poverty, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) opened a new era of federal support for education, particularly for students who would gain the most from it: children in our high-poverty communities and at risk of educational failure.

Today, the ESEA authorizes the federal government's single largest investment in elementary and secondary education. Through the Education Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, the President and Congress will reaffirm and strengthen the federal government's role in promoting academic excellence and equal educational opportunity for every American child.

This reauthorization of ESEA comes at a critical time for the United States. At the turn of the century and the dawn of the Information Age, our country is the most productive in the world, yet we do not provide all of our children with an education equal to the best in the world. Students are making progress overall in improving achievement in both reading and math. However, on international comparisons of student achievement in mathematics and science, American students in the early grades score well relative to their peers in other nations, but by the end of high school they rank near the bottom. As technology continues to advance and global competition continues to increase in the years ahead, such disparities in educational performance will be an increasingly serious threat to the economic well-being of individual American citizens and of the nation as a whole.

The children in our poorest communities are at greatest risk of being left behind in an economy driven by expanded information, increased knowledge, and higher skills. Gaps in student achievement — between high-poverty and low-poverty students and between minority students and their peers — have persisted and in some cases widened in recent years. Overcrowded classes, crumbling school buildings, and unqualified teachers are all too common in high-poverty schools, where, paradoxically, students have the most pressing educational needs.

Through the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA — titled the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) — and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Congress and the Clinton Administration took a number of historic steps toward addressing these concerns and preparing all of America's students to meet high academic standards. With federal leadership and support, 48 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia have now completed the development of state content standards for all children, and the other two states have promoted challenging standards at the local level. In supporting the development of the same challenging standards for all children in all public schools, the reforms advanced by the IASA and Goals 2000 fundamentally transformed the Federal role in education, which had for too long accepted lower expectations for low-income students in high-poverty schools.

While many states and districts are still in the early stages of implementing high standards, there is a growing body of evidence that sustained standards-based reform is a powerful vehicle for improving student achievement. Recent research has shown, for example, that classroom instruction linked to high standards can produce significant gains in student performance in both reading and mathematics.<sup>1,2</sup>

The goal of the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999 is to continue and build upon this progress by supporting the efforts of states, school districts, and individual schools to make high standards a reality in American classrooms. Toward that end, the Act will support flexibility for states and schools to allow them to implement programs in ways that meet their particular needs and promote local innovation. It will also hold states, districts, and schools accountable for the quality of the education they provide and for student performance. Specifically, the Educational Excellence Act will:

- Make a firm commitment to high standards in every classroom;
- Improve teacher and principal quality to ensure high-quality instruction for all children;
- Strengthen flexibility coupled with accountability for results; and
- Ensure safe, healthy, disciplined, and drug-free school environments where all children feel connected, motivated, and challenged to learn, and where parents are welcomed and involved.

### **Improvement Since the 1994 Reforms**

In 1994, the IASA and the Goals 2000 Act established the clear expectation that all children can and should reach high standards. Five principles guided the 1994 reforms:

1. High standards for all children, with aligned educational elements such as curricula and assessments working as a coherent system to help all students reach those standards;
2. A focus on teaching and learning;
3. Flexibility to stimulate local school-based and district initiative, coupled with responsibility for student performance;
4. Stronger links among schools, parents, and communities; and
5. Resources targeted to where needs are greatest and in amounts sufficient to make a difference.

The two laws were built around the standards-based approach to reform: using federal resources to encourage and assist states in developing and implementing challenging state standards for all children and in using those standards to improve learning through a coherent and aligned system of curricula and assessments.

The 1994 laws complemented and helped to accelerate reforms in states and school districts. School districts in states that had begun standards-based reforms early — such as Kentucky, Maryland, and Oregon — found new federal support to help them use challenging standards to improve teaching and learning.<sup>3</sup> In states and districts where standards are used as a tool for classroom instruction, student achievement has shown significant gains in both reading and math<sup>4,5</sup>

For states that had not yet begun standards-based reform, the 1994 laws were a catalyst to change curriculum, teaching practices, and assessments to support more rigorous and challenging instruction. According to the General Accounting Office (GAO), state officials believe that Goals 2000 is helping states meet their own education reform goals.<sup>6</sup>

Goals 2000 and the ESEA are spurring standards-based reform in local schools and communities. More than 80 percent of poor school districts, and almost half of all districts nationwide, reported that Title I is "driving standards-based reform in the district as a whole."<sup>7</sup> The GAO recently found that states report that Goals 2000 has also been a significant factor in promoting their education reform efforts.<sup>8</sup> In part because of these laws, standards-based reform is taking hold nationwide.

It is clear that where states continue work on standards-based reform over a period of time, students have benefited. This evidence provides a compelling case for the federal government's continued support for state standards-based reforms coupled with strengthened accountability.

- *Education Week* recently reported that states which have built reforms around standards and assessments — including Colorado and Connecticut — were the only states to post statistically significant gains over their NAEP reading scores in both 1992 and 1994.<sup>9</sup>
- North Carolina and Texas made greater gains in math and reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) than any other state between 1992 and 1996 and Texas has shown significant signs of closing the achievement gap between white students and Hispanic and black students. A recent study by Rand researchers concluded that the most plausible explanation for gains in test scores in these states are their aligned systems of standards, curriculum, and assessments, and their efforts to hold schools accountable for the improvement of all students.<sup>10</sup>
- Three-year trends reported by states and districts show progress in the percentage of students in the highest-poverty schools meeting state standards for proficiency in mathematics and reading.<sup>11</sup>

The 1994 laws significantly expanded the flexibility of states and school districts to implement locally developed and driven education reforms.<sup>12</sup> Increased flexibility in 1994, for example, has allowed states to submit a single, consolidated application — instead of separate applications — for the majority of ESEA programs, helping reduce paperwork by 85 percent while encouraging a comprehensive approach to planning. The 1994 laws also allow the Education Department to waive statutory and regulatory requirements that block innovative reform upon the request of states, districts, and schools. The Department of Education received 648 requests for waivers, roughly 85 percent of these waivers were either approved or withdrawn because applicants learned they had sufficient flexibility under the law to proceed without a waiver.<sup>13</sup>

Both the IASA and Goals 2000 also recognized the integral role that families and communities play in helping all students achieve to high standards by encouraging increased parental involvement. Today, those partnerships are continuing to grow, not only through state-level leadership, but also through grassroots efforts to coordinate community resources and support efforts to improve our schools. The increased momentum behind charter schools signals new thinking, organization, and instructional approaches. Similarly, new partnerships for after-school learning, innovative professional development opportunities, and new ways of using technology are expanding traditional notions of schooling. The vision of good schools is fast becoming a vision of community schools, a vision that extends beyond the school walls and into virtual communities and engaging learning environments.

## Guiding Principles for ESEA 1999

As the U.S. Department of Education began work on the 1999 reauthorization, we examined the effectiveness of our efforts over the past five years by reviewing progress on the performance indicators

developed under the Government Progress and Results Act; analyzing congressionally mandated evaluations of Title I and other federal education programs resulting from the 1994 laws; and conducting nationwide conversations — built around the 1994 themes — with hundreds of teachers, principals, parents, community activists, state and local policymakers, researchers, and other education experts.

Through these discussions, a clear focus emerged on promoting academic equity and excellence through four principles: (1) high standards in every classroom, (2) improving teacher and principal quality, (3) strengthening accountability, and (4) ensuring that all children can learn in environments that are safe, disciplined and drug-free and where their parents feel welcome and involved.

### High Standards in Every Classroom

States have made substantial progress in developing state content standards. However, standards-based reform is a tremendous challenge that requires a continued commitment of substantial time, effort, and resources. Much work remains to be done.

For example, only 21 states and Puerto Rico have developed student performance standards — that spell out what children should be able to do — in at least mathematics and reading or language arts. Only six states have policies that link or align teacher professional development with State content standards, although 11 States are developing such policies.<sup>14</sup> And according to a 1997 review of state plans, only 4 states provided evidence that their standards were benchmarked against the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) or other external assessments.<sup>15</sup>

The Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, our proposal to reauthorize the ESEA, continues support for state efforts to help all children reach high academic standards by:

- Raising student performance through rigorous academic standards. Our proposal would retain the current Title I requirement that states establish content standards, student performance standards, and assessments aligned to high academic standards by the 2000-01 school year. Under the Teaching to High Standards initiative in Title II, states would receive a set-aside to continue the development and implementation of standards with a specific focus on bringing standards into the classroom through improved professional development. The initiative would also help states and districts align instruction, curriculum, assessments, and professional development to challenging academic standards.
- Implementing standards in the classroom by:
  - Helping states use standards to improve classroom learning. Only 36 percent of teachers feel "very well prepared" to teach to high standards.<sup>16</sup> Our Teaching to High Standards initiative would help give teachers the tools and training they need to help students reach high standards.
  - Strengthen the teaching of reading and continue efforts to reduce class size. Our proposal would help implement the recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences' study, *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*, by:
    1. Continuing the Class-Size Reduction initiative — which seeks to reduce the national average class size to 18 students per regular classroom in the first through third grades — to give all students the individual attention they need to learn to read well

and independently by the end of the third grade.

2. Focusing on professional development, extended learning time, and family literacy through the Reading Excellence Act.
  3. Helping children start school ready to learn by increasing the intensity and quality of family literacy services provided under the Even Start Family Literacy program. It would also provide grants for professional development for early childhood educators to help young children develop critical language and literacy skills through new grants.
- Make math and science a must. The ESEA would continue to have a special emphasis on improving mathematics and science instruction by dedicating the first \$300 million of the Teaching to High Standards grants under Title II to be spent on improving professional development opportunities for teachers of mathematics and science. The poor performance of U.S. students on the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the evidence that high student achievement depends greatly on high-quality teaching make it imperative to continue this special emphasis.

Our ESEA proposal also calls for the reauthorization of the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education and the Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia. The Clearinghouse helps improve access to K-12 mathematics and science resources for teachers, students, parents, and other interested parties. The 10 consortia offer information and technical assistance to help states and school districts improve math and science programs.

- Implement continuous improvement and accountability based on challenging standards. States would hold all school districts accountable and school districts would hold schools accountable for continuous and substantial progress in increasing the percentage of students meeting State performance standards, with particular attention to improving the performance of traditionally low-achieving students.
- Support technology as a tool to help raise achievement levels in every classroom. The Technology for Education initiative in Title III would (1) help prepare new teachers to actively engage students in learning challenging content; (2) support high-poverty school districts' efforts to help teachers use technology — including simulations, "hands-on modeling," and exploration in virtual environments — to better teach students to challenging state standards; (3) use such tools as distance learning and web-based instruction to bring challenging subject matter into all classrooms; and (4) provide national leadership by encouraging innovative technology applications and disseminating information about them.
- Help educators receive high-quality technical assistance focused on implementing challenging standards. States and districts need tools and resources to help all schools ensure that their students are meeting challenging state standards. Throughout the bill, our ESEA proposal would provide support for technical assistance, with a concentrated effort in Title II to support a comprehensive, market-driven system of technical assistance and information dissemination. Such a system would be responsive to the demands of customers, encourage local leveraging of resources, and identify high-quality support. It also establishes an interactive, technology-based network of federal, state, and local information and resources to promote promising instructional strategies and improve teaching and learning.

- Provide high-quality services to students with limited English proficiency (LEP) to help them master challenging standards and learn English. Under both Titles I and VII, teachers would be given professional development opportunities to better serve LEP students. School districts and schools would also be held accountable for ensuring that all LEP students make progress toward mastering challenging standards and developing English proficiency.
- Promote equity, excellence, and public school choice options for all students. No one school or program can meet the unique needs of every student. Public school choice provides students with the flexibility to choose among public schools and programs that differ with respect to educational settings, pedagogy, and academic emphasis. Title V would support programs that can enhance options for students and parents, including the Magnet Schools Program, the Public Charter Schools Program, and a new authority that would fund innovative options for public school choice.
- Provide students with opportunities for extended learning time. Extended learning time programs can improve student achievement when they are coordinated with challenging curricula and thoughtful instruction.<sup>17</sup> Our proposal would continue the Administration's strong commitment to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program, which provides grants to public schools to offer extended learning time opportunities for students and community members. Title I would also encourage the use of extended time.

### Improved Teacher and Principal Quality

Qualified teachers are the most critical in-school factor in improving student achievement.<sup>18</sup> We know that recruiting high-quality teachers, providing teachers with support in their first three years, and ensuring that teachers receive ongoing high-quality professional development leads to improvements in the quality of teachers and their ability to engage students, manage classrooms, and teach challenging content. We also know that when teachers receive support from strong principals, the school learning environment is more likely to lead to increased student achievement.<sup>19</sup>

Yet too many teachers still do not receive ongoing high-quality professional development to help them improve and build on their teaching skills, many teachers leave the profession in their first three years, and far too many teachers are teaching in a field in which they have not been trained. Students in high-poverty schools are more likely than others to be taught some part of the day by teacher aides with limited education and training<sup>20</sup> and they are more likely to be taught by a teacher teaching out of field.<sup>21</sup> We must redouble our efforts to ensure that all children in America have a talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher to help them reach high standards.

The Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999 will take several important steps to ensure that all children are taught by highly qualified teachers. It would:

- Help teachers teach to high standards. The new Teaching to High Standards initiative, Title II – Part A, would help educators apply high standards to improve learning in American classrooms, in part by supporting new teachers during their first three years in the classroom and ensuring that all teachers are proficient in academic knowledge and teaching skills. Because of the particular importance of teacher training opportunities in mathematics and science, Teaching to High Standards grants would focus first on improving professional development in those disciplines.
- Support a national effort to recruit talented individuals to become principals and support their

professional development to become effective instructional leaders. The Teaching to High standards initiative would authorize support for new and continuing principal development and leadership.

- Recruit and retain high-quality teachers. In recognition of national need to recruit 2.2 million teachers over the next decade, the Teaching to High Standards initiative and the new Transition to Teaching proposal under Title II would fund projects to recruit and retain high-quality teachers and principals in high-need areas.

Our Transition to Teaching proposal would continue and expand upon the successful Troops to Teachers initiative by recruiting and supporting mid-career professionals as teachers, particularly in high-poverty school districts and high-need subject areas.

- Renew our commitment to ensure high-quality teachers in our highest-poverty schools. Our proposal would require that all new teachers, paid through Title I funds or in Title I schools operating a schoolwide program, be fully certified and that all newly hired secondary school teachers be certified in the subject in which they teach. By July 1, 2002, our proposal would also limit teacher aides without at least two years of college to non-instructional duties and aides with two or more years of college to instructional support and tutoring under the supervision of a certified teacher. Finally, our proposal would help create a stimulating, career-long learning environment for teachers by requiring school districts to set aside 5 percent of Title I funds for teacher professional development in the first two years and 10 percent thereafter.
- End the practice of hiring emergency certified teachers and asking teachers to teach classes out of their subject expertise. Our proposal would help ensure that classroom teachers are qualified by requiring new teachers to demonstrate both subject-matter knowledge and teaching expertise as part of the state certification process. It would also require states to ensure that, within four years, at least 95 percent of their teachers are: (1) fully certified; (2) working toward full certification through an alternative route that will lead them to full certification within three years; or (3) are fully certified in another state and working toward meeting state-specific requirements. Finally, it would require states to ensure that at least 95 percent of secondary school teachers have academic training or demonstrated competence in the subject area in which they teach.
- Provide support for teachers to effectively use advanced technology in their classrooms. While access to hardware, software, and connectivity has increased dramatically over the last few years, considerable work needs to be done to ensure that technology is used effectively to teach to high standards. Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology supports consortia of public and private entities to train new teachers to use technology to create engaging learning environments that prepare all students to achieve to challenging state and local standards. The proposal will also strengthen the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund's role in supporting high-quality professional development.
- Help ensure that all teachers are well trained to teach students with limited English proficiency (LEP) through teacher education programs for new and prospective teachers and through professional development for current teachers.

### **Strengthened Accountability for School and Student Performance**

Title XI of our ESEA proposal is the Education Accountability Act: A package of accountability measures to hold schools, districts, teachers, and students to high standards and ensure that school

districts and states provide students with a high-quality education. These accountability measures would apply to all states and districts that receive ESEA funding.

The 1994 laws and the recently passed Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999 gave states and districts increased flexibility to coordinate, modify, and combine program activities in exchange for greater accountability for their schools' and students' performance. States, districts, and schools have begun to take advantage of the increased flexibility in the legislation in their efforts to create learning environments that help all students reach challenging academic standards. Eighty-four percent of districts said that even if they were given still greater flexibility to administer the federal programs, they would not change the services they provide.<sup>22</sup> However, effective accountability mechanisms are still incomplete — or do not even exist — in many programs.

The Education Accountability Act will strengthen and expand existing accountability provisions. It will:

- Support states in developing one rigorous accountability system for all districts and all schools. Our proposal would encourage states to develop one rigorous accountability system that holds all schools, including Title I schools, accountable for making continuous and substantial gains in student performance. States will have the flexibility to use either a model outlined in the statute or an alternative that is at least as rigorous and effective. States without a single statewide accountability system would be required to develop one for their Title I schools.
- Provide states and districts with additional resources to turn around low-performing schools. Our proposal would require states to continue to publicly identify and provide assistance to the lowest-performing districts, and require districts to continue to identify and provide assistance to the lowest-performing schools that have not improved over the previous three years.

If there is no satisfactory improvement in student performance within two years, districts would be required to implement strong corrective actions that dramatically alter the structure of schools and the instructional strategies to help students in the school or school district.

- Update the recently enacted Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999, which permits states to waive selected requirements of ESEA programs. To ensure that expanded flexibility is accompanied by strong accountability, states would be required to meet the requirements of the Education Accountability Act in ESEA and the Title I requirements regarding content and performance standards, assessments, and accountability.
- Increase accountability to parents and the public through school report cards. As a condition of receiving ESEA funds, our proposal would require states and school districts to produce and distribute annual report cards for each school, school district, and state. The report cards will include information on student achievement, teacher qualifications, class size, school safety, attendance, graduation rates, and academic performance by demographic group.
- Assist all students in meeting challenging state standards. Our proposal would hold states and school districts accountable for helping all students progress through high school and graduate having mastered the challenging material needed for them to meet high standards. States will be required to put policies in place that require school districts to (1) implement research-based prevention and early intervention strategies to identify and support students who might need additional help meeting challenging standards; (2) provide all students with qualified teachers who use proven instructional practices tied to challenging state standards; and, (3) provide continuing, intensive and comprehensive educational interventions to students who are not



school districts may use up to 5 percent of the ESEA funds they receive to provide elementary and secondary school students and their families with better access to the social, health, and education services necessary for students to succeed in school.

- Include a proposal to reform America's high schools. There are far too many high schools where students are nameless and faceless to adults — one student among many being shuffled through a large institution that is trying to provide the basics, but unable to go beyond. This new initiative would provide resources to help transform 5,000 high schools into places where students receive individualized attention, are motivated to learn through alternative teaching approaches, and receive information to help them reach their long-term goals. Our proposal would encourage effective practices such as smaller schools, schools within schools, Advanced Placement courses, and mentoring and counseling services for students as they make the transition from high school to careers or postsecondary education.
- Require every school district and school to have sound discipline policies. Our proposal would require states to hold school districts and schools accountable for having discipline policies that focus on prevention, are consistent and fair, and are developed with the participation of the school community. States would also be required to ensure that schools have a plan to help students who are expelled or suspended continue to meet the challenging state standards.
- Promote physical fitness and lifelong healthy habits through demonstration projects. Exemplary physical education programs can promote life long healthy habits, provide opportunities for students to connect to school, and become an important component of after-school programs.<sup>24</sup>

## Conclusion

In 1994, Congress and the President worked together to raise standards for all children and to provide a quality education for them to achieve those standards. We would no longer tolerate lower expectations and watered-down curriculum for poor and disadvantaged students.

Five years later, there is evidence that the new federal support for standards-based reform accelerated improvements already underway in many states, while helping spark reforms in others. Student achievement has risen, particularly in states at the forefront of standards-based reform.

This year, we must build upon the accomplishments of 1994. We must take the next step by helping schools and teachers bring high standards into every classroom and help every child achieve; improving the quality of our teachers and principals; strengthening accountability systems for student performance, and ensuring that all schools are safe, healthy, and drug-free.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Grissmer, D. & Flanagan, A. (1998). Exploring rapid achievement gains in North Carolina and Texas. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

<sup>2</sup> Cohen, D., Hill, H. (1998). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

- <sup>3</sup> Hannaway, J & Kimball, K. (1997). Reports on reform from the field: District and state survey results. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- <sup>4</sup> Grissmer, D. & Flanagan, A. (1998). Exploring rapid achievement gains in North Carolina and Texas. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.
- <sup>5</sup> Cohen, D., Hill, H. (1998). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- <sup>6</sup> U.S. General Accounting Office. (1998). Goals 2000: Flexible funding supports state and local education reform. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary Planning and Evaluation Service. (1999). Promising results, continuing challenges: The final report of the national assessment of Title I. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>8</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (1998). Goals 2000: Reforming education to improve student achievement. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>9</sup> Hoff, D. & Kennedy-Manzo, K. (1999). States Committed to Standards Reform Reap NAEP Gains. Washington, D.C.: Education Week.
- <sup>10</sup> Grissmer, D. & Flanagan, A. (1998). Exploring rapid achievement gains in North Carolina and Texas. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.
- <sup>11</sup> The McKenzie Group. (in press). Student achievement and accountability systems in urban districts.
- <sup>12</sup> U.S. General Accounting Office. (1998). Goals 2000: Flexible funding supports state and local education reform. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>13</sup> U.S. Department of Education. (1998). Waivers: Flexibility to Achieve High Standards Report to Congress on Waivers Granted Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>14</sup> U.S. Department of Education. (1998). Federal education legislation enacted in 1994: An evaluation of implementation and impact. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>15</sup> U.S. Department of Education. (1998). Federal education legislation enacted in 1994: An evaluation of implementation and impact. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>16</sup> U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (1999). Teacher quality: A report on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers. Washington, DC: Author.
- <sup>17</sup> U.S. Department of Education. (1995). Extending learning time for disadvantaged students: An idea book. Volume 1, summary of promising practices. Washington, DC: Author. P. i.

<sup>18</sup> Ferguson, R. (1991). Paying for public education: New evidence on how and why money matters. *Harvard Journal on Legislation*, 28.2(Summer): 465-498; Ferguson, R. & Ladd, H. (1996). How and why money matters: An analysis of Alabama schools. *Holding schools accountable: Performance based reform in Education*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

<sup>19</sup> Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Can leadership enhance school effectiveness. Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Seminar of the Economic and Social Research Council: Redefining School Management, Milton Keynes, England.

<sup>20</sup> U.S. Department of Education. (1999). Unpublished tabulations from the Follow-Up Survey on Education Reform.

<sup>21</sup> Haycock, K. (1998). Good teaching matters... a lot. *Thinking K-16*, 3(2, Summer): 7-9.

<sup>22</sup> Hannaway, J. & McKay, S. (1998). Local implementation study, district survey results 1: Flexibility and accountability. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Pp. 14, 64. <sup>23</sup> Resnick, M., Bearman, P., Blum, R., Bauman, K., Harris, K., Jones, J., Tabor, J., Beuhring, T., Sieving, R., Shew, M., Ireland, M., Bearinger, L., & Udry, J. (1997). Protecting Adolescents From Harm: Findings From the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 278: 823-832.

<sup>24</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, "Guidelines for School and Community Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical-Activity Among

###

---

[Overview]    [America's Education Goals]

---

*This page last modified June 2, 1999 (mik)*

## AGENDA

### Reauthorization of Goals 2000 and ESEA

Tuesday, August 18, 1998 11:00 am

#### I. BACKGROUND

##### A. Issue Papers

- Topics for cross-cutting issues papers were chosen based on the assumption that the 1999 reauthorization will further promote, develop and help to achieve the vision developed in 1994 -- high standards for all children, a focus on teaching and learning, flexibility and accountability, parent and community involvement, and resources targeted to the highest poverty communities.

Cross-cutting papers include:

Public School Choice

Standards, Assessment and Accountability

Professional Development

Technology

Parent Involvement

Technical Assistance

Early Childhood

Targeting and formula issues

Goals 2000 and its role in supporting school reform as part of ESEA

Program specific papers, e.g. Title I, are also being developed.

## B. Public Engagement

In addition to soliciting public comment through a Federal Register notice, five invitational forums and four regional meetings were held. Three of the invitational forums focused on general issues. In addition one forum focused specifically on Title I, and another focused on Goals 2000 and standards-based reform. Regional meetings were held in Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, and Atlanta. Several major themes were repeated throughout the public meetings:

- Continue support for standards-based reform
- Strengthen accountability for student performance
- Continue focus on equity -- programs targeted on helping specific groups of children should be continued
- Improve teacher quality
- Need for capacity building at State, district and school levels
- Need for more extensive and higher quality technical assistance (including stronger connection to research in OERI)
- Strong support for Title I schoolwide program authority
- Early childhood
- Flexibility
- Simplify Programs
- Parent involvement

### C. Major Education Groups

We have met at least once with most of the major K-12 education groups.

They are still developing positions on the reauthorization of Goals 2000 and the ESEA. However, at this point we know the following:

- The Council of Chief State School Officers is developing a consolidation proposal;
- The American Association of School Administrators has a consolidation proposal;
- The Council of Great City Schools has said there is a need for fewer education programs;
- The Science and Math teachers continue to be strong advocates for the math/science priority in Eisenhower;

### D. Responses to the Federal Register Notice *(over 1,000 resp.)*

The topics that elicited the most responses were Comprehensive State and local school reform, professional development, strategies for improving achievement, accountability and flexibility, and targeting resources/equalization.

### E. Context

- Expect Republican control of Congress to continue.
- Major Republican issues likely to be focus on vouchers (which may be packaged as tool to increase parent involvement), block grants, dollars to the classroom
- Reauthorization expected to be extremely political
- The Supreme Court may rule that vouchers are constitutional *(next spring)*
- The President will probably want to incorporate current initiatives into the reauthorization proposal *(class size, EDZ, High Hopes)*
- Continuing public impatience with the pace of school reform and a continuing decline of public confidence in the ability of schools to educate our neediest children. This is even more pronounced in our minority communities.

## II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Issues that we need to consider as we move forward in developing options:

Item I-- Given the agenda mapped out in the Crossroad Report, as well as the proposals for block grants and "Dollars to the Classroom" currently being discussed in the Congress, what type of assumptions should we make in:

- Developing a thoughtful program consolidation proposal and/or simplification proposal that will be supported by the education community and that can be differentiated from the proposals being put forth in the Congress (e.g. focusing

Title I on improving the teaching and learning of reading in elementary schools, or consolidating Titles II, VI, and Goals 2000 as a capacity building piece);

- Identifying the themes of such a consolidation /simplification proposal
  - Standards
  - Equity
  - Reading and math
  - Teacher quality/capacity building
  - Comprehensive School Reform
  - Public School Choice
  - Support for high performing schools
  - Extended learning time
  
- If you had to pick themes for the next reauthorization to be included in the State of the Union speech what would they be?
  
- Integrating the Secretary's priorities into the reauthorization legislation (e.g. reading, math, technology)?
  
- Integrating the President's initiatives into reauthorization (e.g. class size reduction, school construction, Educational Opportunity Zones, National Test)?

Do you see problems in continuing any of the President's current initiatives?

(Present thinking is that they need to be integrated and Mike Cohen is saying the same thing).

**Item II** -- What type of message should the Department put forth now in terms of our commitments in reauthorization? For example, we have been saying that the Department is committed to the concepts of the 1994 reauthorization such as standards, accountability, equity, and flexibility.

Can we say the Department is committed to:

- Sustaining the standards-based reform agenda started in 1994
- Continuing the Federal government's historical support for equity for educationally disadvantaged children through programs such as Title I
- Having a quality teacher in every classroom
- Examining ways in which the Department can help States, districts and schools acquire the tools they need to support implementation of high standards in the classroom
- Promoting safe environments conducive to learning
- Doing something significant in early childhood programs and
- Pursuing accountability measures with consequences and rewards

Are there other messages we should be sending out at this point?

Back-up Sheet  
Proposed Program Creations,  
Repeal, and Consolidations

7 Proposed New Programs

1. Early Childhood Professional Development
2. Transition to Teaching
3. Community Technology Centers
4. Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology
5. Project SERV
6. High School Reform
7. Strengthening Technical Assistance Capacity

5 Funded Programs Proposed for Repeal

1. Title I Capital Expenses
2. Even Start Women's Prison Program
3. Title I Neglected and Delinquent Local Agency Programs
4. FIE National Student and Parent Mock Elections
5. Ellender Fellowships

27 Unfunded Programs Proposed for Repeal

1. Title I State School Improvement Grants
2. Eisenhower National Teaching Project
3. Eisenhower Professional Development Demonstration Project
4. Educational Technology Product Development

5. Elementary Mathematics and Science Equipment Program
6. Hate Crimes Prevention
7. Dropout Prevention Demonstrations
8. Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Program
9. Impact Aid Additional Payments for LEAs with High Concentrations of Children with Severe Disabilities
10. Impact Aid Payments for Sudden and Substantial Increases in Attendance of Military Dependents
11. Indian Education Fellowships
12. Indian Education Gifted and Talented
13. Indian Education Grants to Tribes for Education Administrative Planning and Development
14. Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians
15. FIE Elementary School Counseling Demonstration
16. FIE Promoting Scholar Athlete Competitions
17. FIE Smaller Learning Communities
18. FIE Model Projects
19. Cultural Partnerships for At-Risk Youth
20. Instruction in Civics, Government, and the Law
21. Urban Education Demonstration Grants
22. Rural Education Demonstration Grants
23. Rural Education Higher Education Grants
24. School Facilities Infrastructure Development
25. National Diffusion Network
26. Minority-Focused Civics Education

27. Partnerships in Education for Mathematics, Science, and Engineering

3 Programs Proposed for Consolidation into "Teaching to High Standards"

1. Goals 2000 State and Local Programs
2. Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants
3. Innovative Education Program Strategies

2 Educational Technology Programs Consolidated into "Next Generation Technology Innovation Awards"

1. Technology Innovation Challenge Grants
2. Star Schools

2 Bilingual Education Programs Consolidated into "Program Development and Enhancement Grants"

1. Program Development and Implementation Grants
2. Program Enhancement Grants

7 Education for Native Hawaiians Programs Proposed for Consolidation into 1

1. Native Hawaiian Education Council and Island Councils
2. Family-Based Education Centers
3. Higher Education Program
4. Gifted and Talented Program
5. Special Education Program

6. Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment
7. Community-Based Education Learning Centers

3 Alaska Native Education Programs Proposed for Consolidation into 1

1. Educational Planning, Curriculum Development, Teacher Training and Recruitment Program
2. Home Based Education for Preschool Program
3. Student Enrichment Programs

## TITLE I REAUTHORIZATION ISSUES

### Schoolwide

Schoolwide paper (Includes CSRD issues that relate to schoolwides)

### Targeted Assistance (no separate paper anticipated)

Parallel changes will be made consistent with the decisions made in the schoolwide paper regarding the use of researched-based/effective practice including the NAS research. This part of the law also to be modified to reflect the decision made on extended time and early assessment for diagnostic purposes.

Note: We expect that Chairman Goodling will be asked to delete the requirement in current law that targeted assistance programs are accountable for both reading in math. The argument will be that small schools that only receive sufficient funds for one teacher and that teacher is a reading teacher should not also be held accountable for math achievement scores.

### Professional Development/ Paraprofessionals:

Paraprofessionals (including career ladders) and proposed 10 percent 10 percent set aside for professional development addressed in Teacher Quality paper. (Note: Title I professional development provisions to be made consistent with decisions made regarding uses of funds in overall TQ piece.)

### Standards, Assessment and Accountability

In the Standards, Assessment, and Accountability paper

### Targeting/Finance Issues:

*Formula:* Background paper on formula is completed. Needs decision memo to Mike Smith to determine if this whether this is an issue around which options should be developed.

*\*Comparability:* Needs to be done. Mike Smith would like us to examine the Title I comparability requirements and how they might be used to promote equalizations across districts (Background on equalization is in draft targeting paper prepared by targeting team last summer).

*\*Distribution of funds by poverty:* MJL would like an options developed around the issue of whether the statute continues to require that funds be distributed to schools on the basis of poverty.

*\*LEA minimum grant size* – Should a minimum grant size be established to ensure LEAs receive sufficient funds to operate a program.

Other issues – LEA discretion in distributing funds—no wide variance, should the 75 percent threshold be lowered

Note: Wendy Jo is working on the last two points.

### Neglected and Delinquent

Separate paper/completed

### \*Extended Day

Needs to be written.

### \*Parent Involvement (Option not covered in parent involvement paper)

Needs to be written. Recommend that Title I parent involvement provisions be expanded to require training/information for parents about the findings of brain research and NAS reading study on what they can do at home to help their children.

### Early Childhood/pre-school

Being addressed in early childhood paper.

### \*Early Childhood Assessment

Options for how diagnostic assessments could be done before grades 3 to ensure children in need of service are receiving them.

### Services for Eligible Children attending Private Schools

Separate paper (been presented to CORE team, under revision)

### \*Technical amendments

Construction—not necessarily just a Title I issue

## Options for Title I accountability

Draft

November 5, 1998

### Objectives of an accountability system under Title I:

- The system includes ALL students and holds them all to the same set of challenging standards.
- Title I schools are held accountable through the same system as other schools.
- The system provides meaningful information to schools, parents and students about student achievement.
- The information generated by the system is used to improve teaching and learning.
- The system promotes continuous improvement.
- The system promotes a sense of responsibility among State staff, district personnel, principals, teachers, and students.
- The system includes rewards and interventions for schools based on student performance.

### The Current Title I Statute:

- States determine, based on their final assessment system, what constitutes adequate yearly progress (AYP) of any LEA and school served by Title I. AYP must be defined in a manner that results in continuous and substantial improvements toward state standards and that is sufficiently rigorous to achieve that goal within an appropriate timeframe. Districts may add measures such as dropout, retention, and attendance rates to their definitions.
- States and districts designate distinguished schools and districts that have exceeded the State's AYP targets for three consecutive years. These schools serve as models and the State may choose to offer rewards.
- If a school does not meet its AYP targets for two consecutive years it is designated a school in need of improvement. It must then develop or revise a school plan to improve performance and submit that plan for district approval. It must also spend at least 10% of its Title I funds on professional development (unless it can prove that it is doing so otherwise) and it will receive technical assistance from the LEA.
- The SEA is required to publish assessment data for each district. If a LEA does not meet its AYP targets for two years, it is designated as in need of improvement. It must then revise its local plan and it is eligible to receive technical assistance and support from State Support Teams.
- If a school (or LEA) does not meet its AYP targets for three consecutive years based on the State's final assessment, then corrective actions must be taken. These can include a variety of measures ranging from withholding funds, to authorizing students to transfer schools, to decreasing school autonomy, to school reconstitution.

## State Status

Accountability systems are in many different stages across the country. States are not required to have their final assessments and accountability systems in place until the 2000-01 school year. They have been strongly encouraged, however, to implement their systems earlier. States are required to implement transitional assessment, and many have developed definitions of adequate yearly progress against their transitional assessments.

There are a few "facts" and preliminary findings that we do know:

- 19 States have self-reported to the CCSSO that they have their final assessments in place; none have reported this information to the Department.
- Many transitional definitions of AYP do not rigorously address the notion of "all students" reaching high State standards. For example:
  - Many definitions are not based on a timeline for having all students reach State standards, nor have they set targets for expedited growth in low performing districts and schools.
  - Many definitions are based on very low performance targets.
  - Some States, such as Alabama, have set an absolute standard or a cut score on a State assessment and do not recognize continuous progress in their accountability system.
  - Some States are using only a composite score on State assessments for accountability, and this may mask differences in achievement across subjects.
  - Few States examine disaggregated student data within their accountability systems. This could result in neglecting the performance of groups of students.
  - Some accountability systems as currently defined may encourage schools to focus attention on students who are close to meeting State standards so that scores will go up; rather than focusing on the lowest performing students (Chun & Goertz, 1998).
  - Some States, such as Tennessee, are adjusting assessment scores to reflect the SES of the school, raising concerns that some schools are held to lower standards.

The law envisioned a system of State Support Teams to provide technical assistance to low performing schools. However, Congress has never appropriated funds for the State Support Teams. States have used their administrative funds under Title I to set up State Support structures, but they have had varying degrees of impact. Ten States do not even have State Support Teams because of a variety of circumstances such as loss of a key staff person or restructuring of technical assistance efforts. Most States have set up either SEA teams or teams of outside experts to help schools, but their ability to address the needs of schools is severely limited by a lack of funds.

- States have been identifying distinguished schools and in some States, such as New York, the system has been reported to be a good motivator for school improvement.

- 23 States have passed their own State accountability laws that include provisions for "academic bankruptcy" and some kind of major State intervention such as State takeover of schools or school reconstitution. The impact of these laws is difficult to determine at this time because they are just going into effect. It does appear anecdotally, however, that Title I provisions are considered only as an afterthought in the development of these systems.

#### Options to improve Title I accountability:

**A: Maintain the current Title I accountability system with some improvements to 1) further define what constitutes adequate yearly progress, and 2) strengthen rewards and interventions.**

#### AYP improvements:

- Require AYP definitions to include improvements for low performing students.
- Require States to set a reasonable timeline for bringing all students up to State standards and establish AYP goals that reflect the gains necessary each year in order for all students to meet State standards within the timeline.
- Clarify that AYP does not refer to a single number, but to an array of indicators of student achievement against State standards. Incidental indicators such as retention, attendance, graduation should not be weighted so as to overpower indicators of student performance.

#### Improvements in rewards and interventions:

- Require the State to set aside funds (or create a new line item) to support rewards and interventions based on the accountability system.
- Provide competitive preference for CSRD, REA, and TLECF grants to schools and districts identified as in need of improvement.
- Target Federal technical assistance to schools and districts in need of improvement.

#### Pros:

- Strengthening definitions of AYP should encourage schools to pay attention to their lowest performing students; and it counteracts an incentive to focus on the middle students who are closest to meeting standards and will boost school performance ratings.
- This system should encourage schools to use data to improve their programs.
- The rationale behind AYP would be clearer to districts and schools.
- This should increase the sense of urgency for accelerating student achievement gains.
- This requirement will help ensure that States use multiple indicators in their assessment systems, rather than relying solely on a norm-referenced test.

#### Cons:

- This is a more prescriptive requirement and could be viewed as greater federal intrusion.
- Adding requirements to the law is not necessarily a greater motivator. It may

- cause places to set low targets just to comply with Federal requirements.
- There is no consensus about what constitutes a "reasonable" timeline.
- Many States are only using norm-referenced tests and it will be impossible to have all students reach a norm on such tests.
- This makes public reporting complicated and may be difficult to understand.
- States and experts do not yet know how to weight multiple indicators within a single system.
- This may contradict with other State approaches that require performance in other ways.

**B: Modify Title I accountability to require intensive interventions (and possibly sanctions) in the lowest performing schools and rewards for continuous progress.**

- States identify the lowest performing (bottom 5%) schools based on State assessment data, school attendance, and dropout rate information.
  - Provide State Support Teams and other technical assistance to these schools.
  - Lowest performing schools receive priority in grant competitions – CSRD, REA, TLCF (?)
- Chronically low performing schools have their Title I funds frozen while they:
  - Conduct a thorough needs assessment and develop a plan to address those needs.
  - Submit the plan to a peer review for feedback and approval.
  - Submit the plan to the SEA for approval.
  - Secure advice and assistance from an outside expert(s) for ongoing support of their school improvement efforts.
- Rewards are provided based on showing adequate yearly progress.
  - Adequate yearly progress is revised based on Option A above.

**Pros:**

- Intervention and support would be more clearly targeted to low performing schools.
- This system is easier to understand.
- The system would still promote continuous improvement while also intensifying efforts to improve the worst schools.

**Cons:**

- States will need funds to support intensive interventions in the lowest performing schools and it is not clear that Congress will fund these efforts.
- States may not have the capacity to turn around the lowest performing schools.
- Some schools could conceivably stay on the list of lowest performing schools for a long time even if they make improvements, which risks demoralizing and stigmatizing them.
- Some groups will protest the notion of singling out schools as the "worst" when their problems may stem from poverty and other factors out of their

- control.
- It is not clear whether temporarily withholding funds from chronically low performing schools and requiring a new plan will result in improvements.

**Option C:** Create an incentive fund for States that are committed to accountability. States compete for these funds to support their intervention and rewards programs.

- Maintain the current Title I approach with improvements described in Option A.
- States compete for incentive funds if they have developed quality interventions and incentive programs to support improved student learning.

**Pros:**

- This still promotes the notion of continuous improvements.
- Only States that are truly committed to making reforms will be funded.
- There should be greater quality control over the use of funds for interventions and rewards under a competitive program.

**Cons:**

- Many States that arguably need additional support may not win a competitive environment.
- This may create an excuse for States to not fully implement the Title I requirements if they do not receive extra funding.

Discussion  
- how are we going to carry out now - LEP - Navel - January 1

Standards, Assessment, and Accountability  
ESEA Title I and Goals 2000 Reauthorization Issues  
October 9, 1998

SUMMARY PAGE OF ISSUES AND LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall Recommendation: Tie all ESEA programs to expected gains in student achievement against challenging State content and student performance standards. Reference language on standards, assessment, and accountability systems throughout the bill.

OK

Issue A: Improving the quality, rigor and alignment of standards and assessments.

Recommendations:

- Maintain current requirements. *ok*
- Grants to State collaboratives. *ok*
- Authorize the implementation of a voluntary national test. *ok*

Order to consider bill

o. min title I

Issue B: Research

Recommendation:

- Create a set aside or line item to support research, evaluation, and technical assistance in standards, assessments, and accountability systems. *But do now*

yes

Issue C: Improving the inclusion of LEP students in assessments.

Recommendations:

- Maintain current language, but more clearly specify requirements for including and accommodating at least Spanish speaking students in statewide standards and assessments if that is their language of instruction.

yes

Hold schools and districts that serve LEP students accountable for showing progress among LEP students in the development of English language skills in addition to the core subject areas.

yes

- Create a set aside for research in these issues. *to study in 5th yr*

Issue D1: Strengthening State accountability.

Recommendations:

- Require public reporting of statewide assessment data and a plan for closing achievement gaps. *at least*

ok

Issue D2: Strengthening definitions of AYP.

Recommendations:

- Require definitions to include improvements among low performing students. *oh*
- Require definitions to include a timeline for all students to reach State standards. *State standards*

State standards

- Require definitions to include multiple indicators of progress.

yes  
substantive / require evidence?  
to provide  
minutes

*The most important part is the classroom reform to accomplish the standards -*  
*Part dev. / adopt clear size / quality desired curriculum for all!!*

Standards, Assessment, Accountability  
 Title I and Goals 2000 Reauthorization Issues

A foundation of Goals 2000 and ESEA is support for State efforts to develop a system that includes: challenging standards for all students; aligned assessments for measuring how well schools and districts are educating students so that they reach the standards; and a system to hold schools and districts accountable for educating all students in a manner in which students meet the standards. Goals 2000 provides foundation money to States to plan and develop these systems. Title I includes specific requirements to ensure that Title I participants are held to high standards, not a separate, lower set of standards. The intended system is one in which:

- Each student is held to high standards of academic achievement.
- States establish clear, challenging content standards in at least reading and math that describe what students should know and be able to do.
- States establish clear, challenging student performance standards that are aligned with the content standards and explicitly describe three levels of proficiency on the content standards.
- States develop and administer statewide systems of assessment that measure student progress toward meeting the standards. These assessments must be aligned with the State's standards, be valid and reliable, include all students, include multiple measures for evaluating progress, and be able to provide disaggregated information on student performance.
- States have a system tied to their statewide assessments that holds schools and districts accountable for continuous improvement in the performance of all students. Schools and districts that are low performing are identified and provided technical assistance and interventions to improve.

*This by itself will accomplish little!*

*le do*

**OVERALL ASSUMPTION:** The new legislation will maintain the current focus on building and improving aligned systems of standards, assessment, and accountability and promoting the standards-based reform efforts that were begun under Goals 2000 and Title I in 1994. We will maintain and strengthen the focus on getting standards-based reform into the classroom.

*le do*

We recognize, however, that in pursuing this approach there are several potential obstacles. For example, the development of new standards, assessment, and accountability systems takes time and significant financial investments. Political pressure to accelerate progress is increasing, and there is a need for baseline data collection. Also, States that have not invested in public engagement activities may suffer from a lack of political support when reforms get fully implemented. Finally, we expect that Congress will demand evidence of results and we have limited information at this point especially since we are only halfway through the timelines in the law.

*le do*

This paper examines a range of specific issues and recommendations related to supporting State systems of standards, assessments, and accountability.

**OVERALL RECOMMENDATION:** Tie all ESEA programs to expected gains in student

*le do*

*biggie obstacle!*

*What are you meant in for this?*

achievement against challenging State content and student performance standards. Reference language on standards, assessment, and accountability systems throughout the bill.

*Handwritten: Achieving Quality, Accountability*

**Issue A -- Improving Quality:** States are developing content and performance standards and aligned assessments, but the quality, rigor, and alignment of standards and assessments varies greatly from State to State. Should new legislation promote reviews of quality, rigor, and alignment?

The development and implementation of challenging standards, aligned assessments, and rigorous accountability systems is an iterative process. Even though States are expected to have final aligned assessment and accountability systems in place by the 2000-01 school year, we recognize that significant work will need to be done to ensure that all States have high quality systems. Not only is knowledge continually emerging from the field that can be applied to improve systems, but State political and educational contexts often change, which also leads to changes in State standards, assessment, and accountability systems.

Given that the field continues to develop, that there is little consensus on a single best approach to standards, assessment, and accountability, and that research is still emerging, we recognize that Federal legislation should not become too prescriptive. ESEA should support State efforts to improve their systems through technical assistance, leadership, and support for State-based improvement activities.

**Legislative options to support improvements in quality in standards-based assessment systems: (not mutually exclusive)**

1. Maintain current legislative requirements for standards, assessments, and accountability with some adjustments as determined throughout the other issues discussed in this paper. Couple legislative requirements with more aggressive technical assistance and peer reviews of State evidence of standards and aligned assessments.

**Pros:**

- This allows States to continue down the path of standards-based reform and make improvements to their systems. Dramatically changing requirements could be met with extreme resistance and derail standards-based reform efforts.
- Solid research-based evidence does not point to a one-size-fits-all approach to standards, assessment, and accountability. The current requirements allow flexibility in State approaches.
- The timelines in current legislation do not require a final system until 2000-01; a change in requirements just as these final systems go into place would slow down reform efforts and risks delaying implementation of assessment and accountability systems for a significant period of time.

**Cons:**

*Handwritten: Risk*



4. Specifically authorize the implementation of a voluntary national test that could be used as a benchmark for measuring the rigor of State standards. (NOTE: We recommend that a national test not be part of Title I, but instead be included in an innovation section of the legislation or in the OERI reauthorization.)

*why? ←*

**Pros:**

- Congress has argued that the Department is not authorized to implement the VNT. This ends that argument.
- A national test provides a national benchmark while not impeding flexibility for State standards and assessments.
- States would participate on a voluntary basis.
- There is a crying need for States to have something against which to benchmark their standards in order to justify, maintain, and improve their State standards and assessment systems.
- This would allow national comparisons.
- Would begin to develop national consensus.

**Cons:**

- This is highly political and could stall other work on the legislation.

**LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:** We strongly recommend options 1, 2, and 4—maintaining the current requirements while also funding State efforts to improve the rigor of their systems and funding a voluntary national test. These options will best support State standards-based reform activities. Grants and the VNT provide incentives for States that are committed to these reforms to improve quality.

**NON-LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

We also recommend that the Standards Team pursue the following non-legislative strategies as soon as possible:

- Intensify technical assistance work with States on their standards, assessment and accountability systems through:
  - IAS conference workshops
  - Regional workshops
  - Increased outreach by peer consultant teams
  - Guidance on how ED will review evidence of final State assessments
- A policy statement on the use of assessments to improve instruction and the use of norm-referenced tests within such a system
- Compliance and programmatic technical assistance activities under Title I tailored to States that are having trouble developing their performance standards and final assessments.
- Work with OERI on a research agenda to develop criteria for States to use in judging the quality of their standards.

*→ work with NSF, Admin, OERI ....*

*yes*  
*create full time post in the state*  
*see*  
*↑*

*yes*  
*will be the main?*  
*how?*

*yes*

LEPS & NSF

- Work with OERI on a research agenda that examines the effectiveness of different approaches to assessment and accountability systems. *yes*
- Develop an intensive public engagement effort to increase understanding and support for standards and assessment systems. *yes - with NSF/NAS/...*
- Compile and disseminate concrete examples of quality performance standards with examples of student work. *yes - ASAP*

Issue B: Supporting ongoing evaluation, and technical assistance on standards, assessment and accountability.

The success of State implementation of challenging standards will rely to a large extent on the quality of the standards and assessments that States put into place and the manner in which they are implemented. There are many issues that need additional research, especially in such critical areas as the inclusion of all students in State assessments and the design and implementation of accountability systems that result in meaningful improvements in schools. In addition, a significant technical assistance effort is necessary if we are going to help States access and implement the best knowledge available. Since knowledge is emerging as States put new systems into place, much of the technical assistance can come from bringing States together in constructive ways to help each other and through formative evaluations that produce models to share with States.

The Policy Evaluation Service used to have language in its authorization that allowed both a summative evaluation of Title I and ongoing, formative evaluations and technical assistance. In 1994 this language was eliminated, so our efforts to date have resulted in piecing together funds from any sources possible. They have been limited largely due to a lack of staff capacity and funding for the technical assistance necessary. There is currently no budget that we know of that is specifically devoted to supporting the formative evaluation needs that have emerged from State efforts to date and the technical assistance needs in these areas.

} did with AC!

RECOMMENDATION: Request a set aside for formative evaluation, dissemination of what works, and technical assistance in the area of standards, assessment, and accountability. Federally subsidize research to provide assistance to State assessment developers and policy makers about the best practices in the areas of standards, assessment, and accountability.

ok but see existing name right now

- Specifically designate studies of LEP issues such as how to increase the validity of new and established tests – at numerous points throughout the development, administration, scoring and reporting phases of large scale testing – for LEP student populations.
- Continue and expand technical assistance work to develop materials such as the LEP toolkit.
- Support research on expected gains and benchmarking for LEP students.
- Support formative evaluations of State reform efforts as they unfold.
- Support research that examines State initiatives that have demonstrated effectiveness in increasing achievement of disadvantaged children.
- Support technical assistance efforts that bring States together to develop and share strategies

167 points!

Put together a team right now to do this!

for reducing achievement gaps.

Support technical assistance and research into assessment and accountability issues such as the appropriate use of cohort analysis, multiple measures, combining measures, implementation of adequate yearly progress, benchmarking measures of adequate yearly progress, using disaggregated data, alignment of standards and assessments, and assessment literacy for teachers and administrators.

Support studies on effective accountability systems.

*Discussion*  
**Issue C: Improving the inclusion of LEP students in statewide assessments to ensure that LEP students master challenging State standards.**

*gh*  
The intent of the current Title I language is to include LEP students in assessments to ensure that they are included in school reform efforts and to ensure that they reach the same challenging standards as all students. It is important to include LEP students in assessment and accountability systems for two reasons: 1) to ensure that programs are helping these students develop skills in English; and 2) to ensure that LEP students are also developing content knowledge in other subjects.

The Title I statute requires all students to be included in statewide assessments with reasonable accommodations or adaptations for students with disabilities. Limited English proficient students are to be assessed "to the extent practicable," in the language and form most likely to yield knowledge about what they know and can do.

*use development of assessment for LEP student*  
Regulations: Sec. 200.4 (a)(1) "Each States shall develop or adopt a set of high-quality yearly assessments. Assessments under this section must meet the following requirements:

(7) Provide for –

(iii)(A) Inclusion of limited-English proficient students who shall be assessed, to the extent practicable, in the language and form most likely to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do to determine the students' mastery of skills in subjects other than English.

(B) To meet this requirement, the State –

(1) Shall make every effort to use or develop linguistically accessible assessment measures; and

(i) May request assistance from the Secretary if those measures are needed."

Current assessments do not maximize accessibility for all student populations. In particular, States are not fully including LEP students in assessments as required under Title I of the ESEA and current accountability provisions. For example:

- CCSSO's summary of State level assessment data found that 43 States allow exemptions for LEP students. Of these States, 16 exempt for time in US; 10 exempt for time in ESL; 4 exempt for formal assessment in English; 5 exempt for informal
- in*

assessment in English; and 3 exempt for other reasons.

- Only 14 States do not allow exemptions in all assessment components (CCSSO, 1998).
- The number of states which permit accommodations was 38; however, 12 of the 38 did not permit accommodations on all assessment components. Only 5 of the States that allowed accommodations permitted native language response.
- 11 States used alternate assessments for LEP students for whom regular assessments, even with accommodations, were not appropriate.

There are many reasons why it has been difficult for States to fully include LEP students in their assessments. The population of LEP students is growing. Furthermore, a growing number of languages in schools makes it difficult to address the needs of all students. Providing services to LEP students and tracking their progress is further complicated by the fact that LEP students are not necessarily literate in their home language. For those who are literate in their native language, there is a dearth of native language assessments to draw upon.

Furthermore, it is costly to develop comparable assessments for LEP students and such development requires a great deal of technical expertise. Information on developing comparable measures is also limited. Some States have promoted full inclusion policies, but including LEP students in the same statewide assessment as all students may not be valid – for example, California and Kentucky “fully include” LEP students under policies that require those students to participate in State tests even if they cannot read them.

#### Legislative options to promote inclusion – not mutually exclusive:

1. **No change.** Maintain the current language that requires States to include all students and, to the extent practicable, test them in their native language.

##### Pros:

- The problem is not with the legislative language, but with States' capacity to carry out the language.
- This compromise language recognizes the complexity of these issues and allows flexibility for different State approaches and for knowledge emerging from the field.
- The current language promotes the principle of full inclusion in standards and assessments.

##### Cons:

- The current language is vague and may allow States to escape responsibility for including LEP students in their standards and assessment systems by using the “to the extent practicable” language as a loophole if enforcement is not strict.
- It has been difficult to define “to the extent practicable” and therefore encourage and enforce it.

- Many States seem to be exempting LEP students despite this language.

2. Eliminate the language "to the extent practicable." Instead require native language assessments or comparable assessments (English with accommodations) in content areas other than English for students identified as LEP and for whom the State does not waive from administration of assessments.

Pros:

- This option eliminates a "loophole" that allows States to not assess LEP students.
- There is a growing population of LEP students and this ensures that they are assessed.

Cons:

- There are few commercially available tests for low incidence LEP populations.
- This will be very costly to develop and implement.

3. Maintain current language, but explicitly require that States offer at least Spanish assessments for students whose language is other than English, if Spanish is the language of instruction.

Pros:

- The large majority of LEP students are Spanish speakers.
- There are already numerous commercially available assessments in Spanish. Also, Puerto Rico has developed standards and aligned assessments in their content areas in Spanish.

Cons:

- Other language groups might protest.
- Commercially available tests, even in Spanish, do not necessarily align with every State's standards.
- Administration of multiple assessments will be costly.
- Few students will have Spanish language instruction all day, so it may be difficult to determine which assessment they should take.
- This may open up arguments that Title I participation should be limited to a specific number of years (similar to the goal of bilingual education for only 3 years).

4. Hold schools and districts that serve LEP students accountable for showing progress among LEP students in the development of English language skills in addition to the core subject areas.

Pros:

- This promotes accountability for ensuring that LEP students are progressing.
- Currently most districts and schools test English skills for placement purposes, but do not use these measures for accountability purposes.

- This provides a measure for ensuring that States provide appropriate, effective programs for LEP students.

Cons:

- This adds another requirement to districts and schools – the adoption, implementation, and reporting of another assessment.
- Districts and schools might not have a good mechanism for measuring English language skills.

5

Request a set aside for research and development in standards, assessments and accountability specifically designated for studying LEP issues. Federally subsidize research to provide assistance to State assessment developers and policy makers about how to increase the validity of new and established tests -- at numerous points throughout the development, administration, scoring and reporting phases of large scale testing -- for LEP student populations.

Title VII

Pro:

- The research set aside will allow states to pool resources, and foster support and commitment from all those charged with assuring that all children meet state standards.

Con:

- States currently do not have the resources to do this work.

oh but  
discuss

**LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:** Options 3, 4, and 5 – add a requirement to offer assessments at least in Spanish; hold districts and schools accountable for demonstrating progress among LEP students in mastering English language skills; and support research and technical assistance on these issues. There is considerable research and demonstrated methods available for including Spanish speakers in assessments and this should be recognized in the legislation. However, more research is still necessary to explore all of the inclusion issues.

**NON LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Department should continue and expand its technical assistance work to develop the LEP toolkit, and specifically address technical assistance on developing the following:

- guidelines, specifications and specific standardized procedures States and schools can use to implement assessment accommodations that will enable LEP students to show what they know in all academic content areas;
- a core of instructional procedures and supporting materials to use in TA to States and districts;
- a standard definition and measures of students' academic English language proficiency suitable for use in large-scale assessment programs; and
- a standard definition and measure of students' reading proficiency in Spanish;
- a definition of LEP that will lead to consistent criteria across States for identifying LEP students and determining eligibility for services and determining which students need



- Strengthening accountability for States to close the achievement gap; *yes*
- Tightening language regarding definitions of adequate yearly progress (AYP); *Not sure*
- Improving interventions, rewards, and sanctions (Note: this will be covered in another paper); *yes*
- Deepening research and development (Note: see Issue B). *yes*

At the outset, we would like to acknowledge that the approach in this paper does not directly address certain areas of accountability. Strengthening accountability for students (e.g. high stakes tests), teachers, and principals are not areas for which we recommend new requirements in the legislation. Although these are important activities, they are more appropriately addressed through State and local policies. We recommend that we provide models, examples, and research to States and districts on these issues. But developing requirements would be too prescriptive in areas around which there is little consensus. This point of view was supported by all of the experts with whom we have consulted to date (Porter, Corcoran, Fuhrman, O'Day, Baker, Blank).

*yes*

*right now*

*→ But certain things about this!*

*Very important!*

**Issue D1: Strengthening State accountability**

Currently States are held accountable for the process of putting systems into place. This occurs through federal monitoring and technical assistance. Rewards and consequences are not applied to States.

By the 2000-01 school year, States must have in place final assessments with data on student performance that can be disaggregated. The intent of providing statewide disaggregated results of student achievement was to ensure that all groups of students are making progress and being served throughout the State. Often this data is most meaningful at the State level because smaller districts cannot provide disaggregated data that is statistically sound. The current law requires State assessment data to be disaggregated "by gender, by each major racial and ethnic group, by English proficiency status, by migrant status, by students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled students, and by economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged."

When final assessments are in place, States could be held accountable for using the information provided by State assessment systems to take action to close the achievement gap among groups of students statewide.

Research indicates that public reporting of student achievement data as well as the threat of sanctions motivates changes in behavior at the district and school levels (Elmore, Abelman, Fuhrman, 1996; SREB, 1997). The accountability provisions in Title I mirror this finding. The law describes the purpose of the school reporting procedures as a process for continued

*yes*

*Very important*

improvement that provides schools with the information to continually refine their program. Currently the law requires reporting for schools and reporting on individual students, but State reports are not specified.

**Options for increasing State accountability:**

**1. No Change. Leave the system the same.**

**Pros:**

- Allows States to pursue their own approaches.
- Responsibility for defining accountability systems is still at the State level.

**Cons:**

- Provides weak incentives for State action.

**2** Require States to publicly report assessment results and the gaps among groups of students, and a State plan for closing that gap. Provide technical assistance to States that need help redirecting their resources and expertise to address these issues. (Note: Such a report could also include reporting on student achievement by geographical region within the State.)

*Yes*

**Pros:**

- Calls public attention to States' role in reducing disparities in student achievement, in addition to placing responsibility on low-performing (and often under-funded) districts.
- Provides a trigger for getting outside assistance for developing a plan to close the achievement gap.
- Encourages the use of data for decision making at the State level.
- Publicly releasing a plan for closing achievement gaps might encourage States to look comprehensively across local, State, and federal resources.

**Con:**

- Federal programs have very little leverage over the use of State resources.

**3** Require States to publicly report information; but require those with an achievement gap to develop a plan for closing that gap and direct Federal resources to that plan.

**Pro:**

- Same as above but offers a little more leverage because a Federal approval of such a plan allows greater influence.

**Con:**

- Enforcement of the gap-closing requirement could be problematic, given reluctance to withhold funding.

- It is not clear exactly how States would be required to direct their federal funds.

4 Create a recognition program for States that reduce the achievement gap.

Pro:

- Inexpensive way to provide incentives to reduce disparities in achievement.
- This is a positive incentive that State should greet favorably.

Con:

- Could be seen as federal intrusion – comparing and evaluating States.
- Defining the criteria that would be used to determine recognition will be complicated and difficult.
- It may be difficult to compare States with dramatically different degrees of diversity within their student populations. (Of course, recognition could be based upon reducing the gap between high and low poverty schools.)
- Determining how to weight different forms of achievement gaps for national comparisons will be problematic.

5 Create a line item for offering rewards to States that make progress in closing the achievement gap.

Pros:

- Provides a positive incentive that is more motivational.

Cons:

- Same as option 4.

This would give States more funds at precisely the time they are less likely to need them.

**LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:** We recommend Option 2 – public reporting of statewide assessment results. Public information may have the impact of influencing policy at the State level to provide support for groups of students who are not performing well. Public pressure and scrutiny of State plans to close the gap should encourage more comprehensive plans.

**NON-LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION:** We recommend that the Department increase its technical assistance support to State efforts to reduce achievement gaps.

- Support research into State initiatives that have demonstrated effectiveness in increasing achievement of disadvantaged children.

Support technical assistance that promotes State collaboration on strategies to reduce achievement gaps.

Provide technical assistance on the development of understandable State report cards.

*OK*  
*Yes - get next paper*  
*WES*  
*Shirley*

Issue D2: Strengthening definitions of adequate yearly progress (AYP).

The current requirements in Title I for States to establish definitions for adequate yearly progress (AYP) for schools that are based primarily on the statewide assessment. The purpose of requiring schools to meet AYP goals is so that all students will move toward the State standards and so that all groups of children will get the attention necessary to reach the standards. However, many State definitions for AYP under Title I do not rigorously address the notion of "all students" reaching high State standards. For example:

- Many State definitions for AYP do not reflect a goal of having all students reach State standards. Thirty States have problems stemming from setting low targets, setting a low goal for the percentage of students reaching a State standard, or establishing very long time periods for before students would meet State standards (i.e. beyond the expected years of schooling). This problem is compounded in States that do not include multiple measures in their assessment systems because scores from a single test do not provide a complete picture of student performance and often the single measure is a norm-referenced test which by design will not result in all students reaching a norm on the test. States often set these low targets because they reflect State accountability laws and because they fear that goals that are too high will derail standards-based reform efforts. *What is the measure?*
- Many State definitions of AYP do not include a timeline for having all students reach State standards, nor have they identified targets for expedited growth. A timeline is important for setting a meaningful measures for AYP that lead to having all students reach State standards. Timelines that do exist range from 5 to 20 years (Shenck and Carlson analysis, 1998). *Are not sure about this*
- Some States, such as Alabama, have set an absolute standard or a cut score on a State assessment and do not recognize continuous progress in their accountability system. This may mean that low performing schools do not get acknowledged for gains that they make and they could remain in school improvement for very lengthy periods. It also means that higher performing schools are not encouraged to continue to improve.
- Some States are using only a composite score on State assessments for accountability. This masks differences in achievement across subjects. For instance, if reading and math scores are combined as in Illinois, a school can have high math scores that hide reading problems. *Why is this?*
- Few States examine disaggregated student data within their accountability systems. This could result in neglecting the performance of groups of students. For instance, accountability systems as currently defined may encourage schools to focus attention on students who are close to meeting State standards so that scores will go up; rather than focusing on the lowest performing students (Chun & Goertz, 1998). Texas is the only State system that requires reporting of student progress for each group of students and rewards schools that make progress in moving low performing students to higher levels. It has been able to show that *Is this right?*

*Let's discuss!*

*Discuss*

the performance gap between groups of students is beginning to narrow.

- Some States are implementing value-added accountability systems to recognize the performance gains made by schools with different socioeconomic backgrounds. They argue that such a system encourages continuous improvement among high and low performing schools, whereas systems of absolute standards do not encourage continuous improvement (Clotfelter & Ladd, 1996; Meyer, 1996). However, if such a system is not carefully designed it can result in holding students in poor schools to lower standards. For instance, Tennessee describes its system as value-added, but it translates into adjusting State assessment scores based on a factor to reflect socioeconomic status.

*you*

*Value added & adjustment are only half district*

Legislative options:

1. Require AYP definitions to include improvements for low performing students.

Pros:

- This ensures that schools pay attention to their lowest performing students; it counteracts an incentive to focus on the middle students who are closest to meeting standards and will boost school performance ratings.
- This encourages schools to use data to improve their programs.
- This supports the traditional purposes of Title I – to provide supplementary services for students who need them most.

Cons:

- This is a more prescriptive requirement and could be viewed as greater federal intrusion.
- Adding requirements to the law is not necessarily a greater motivator. It may cause places to set low targets just to comply with Federal requirements.
- This may contradict with other State approaches that require performance in other ways, such as Texas which requires progress among disaggregated groups of students and other places that are examining value-added models.

2. Require AYP definitions to include improvements in all disaggregated groups.

Pros:

- This ensures that schools pay attention to all groups of students.
- This encourages schools to use data to improve their programs.
- This can help schools ensure that they provide opportunities for all groups to have the curriculum and supports necessary to master the standards. If schools go through the process of ensuring that all students have the opportunity to master the standards, then civil rights challenges of disparate impact will be diminished.

Cons:

- This shifts the focus from the lowest performing students (regardless of background) to specific groups of students. It could be divisive. The disaggregated groups of students will be captured in a system that requires gains among the lowest performing students.
- This is a more prescriptive requirement and could be viewed as greater federal intrusion.
- Adding requirements to the law is not necessarily a greater motivator. It may cause places to set low targets just to comply with Federal requirements.
- This may contradict with other State approaches.

3 Require States to set a reasonable timeline for bringing all students up to State standards then establish AYP goals reflect the gains necessary each year in order for all students to meet State standards within the timeline.

Pros:

- This helps ensure that States are serious about getting all students to master State standards.
- Districts would clearly understand the rationale behind definitions of AYP.
- This increases the sense of urgency for accelerating student achievement gains.
- This requirement will help ensure that States use multiple indicators in their assessment systems, rather than relying solely on a norm-referenced test.

Cons:

- There is no consensus about what constitutes a "reasonable" timeline.
- Many States are only using norm-referenced tests and it will be impossible to have all students reach a norm on such tests.

4 Clarify that AYP does not refer to a single number but to an array of indicators of student achievement against State standards. Incidental indicators such as retention, attendance, graduation should not be weighted so as to overpower indicators of student performance.

Pros:

- This enriches the approach to demonstrating annual progress in schools by offering a more complete picture of student performance.

Cons:

- This makes public reporting complicated and may be difficult to understand. States and experts do not yet know how to weight multiple indicators within a single system.

**LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS:** We recommend that AYP definitions be revised to include improvements for low performing students, include a timeline for all students to reach the State standards, and include multiple indicators. (Options 1, 3 and 4.)

## Strengthening Title I Accountability Requirements Draft 12/12/98

### BACKGROUND

#### Requirements in Current Law

The current law is based on the premise that effective accountability systems are based primarily on student results on assessments that are aligned to high standards. Accountability systems measure school progress and provide a mixture of rewards, interventions, and consequences to support improved performance.

- States are required to establish content and student performance standards by 1997-98.
- States are required to develop assessments aligned to the standards by 2000-01 school year. Such assessments are to include multiple measures, be valid and reliable for the purposes used, and provide disaggregated results on student performance. States can have interim assessments in place while they develop final assessments aligned to new, higher standards.
- States must define adequate yearly progress (AYP) (i.e., increase in percentage of students meeting state performance standards) for Title I schools and local school districts. States have discretion in determining AYP, but it must be defined in a manner that would result in continuous and substantial progress toward meeting state standards within a reasonable time frame.
- States designate distinguished schools and school districts that exceed AYP targets for three years, and may provide them with rewards.
- Schools that do not meet AYP targets for 2 consecutive years are designated as "in need of improvement" and must develop a school improvement plan. Similarly, districts that do not meet AYP targets for 2 consecutive years are also designated as "in need of improvement" and must develop an improvement plan. Schools and districts that are in need of improvement receive technical assistance from the school district or state.
- If a school or district does not meet AYP targets on the state's final assessment for three consecutive years, then corrective action must be taken. Corrective actions are determined by the state or local school district, and may include a variety of steps, ranging from withholding funds to authorizing students to transfer to other schools, to decreasing autonomy, to school reconstitution.

#### State Implementation Status

In many respects, state implementation of the above requirements has been disappointing.

- No states have officially reported to ED that final assessments are in place, though 18 have reported they have reported to other national organizations that such assessments are in place; because the timeline for triggering corrective actions kicks in when final assessments are in place, states may have an incentive for delaying official notification to ED. Also, States may still be working out technical issues associated with using multiple measures, disaggregating data, and defining AYP that could result in their hesitation to deem their assessments as final.
- About half the states have state accountability laws that provide for intervention in low performing schools; however, it appears that in most states the Title I requirements operate

independent of state accountability requirements – at least during this transitional accountability period before the final Title I requirements go into effect.

- Many states have failed to address significant requirements in defining AYP on interim assessments. However, those States that have defined their student performance standards (and are presumably further along in completing their final assessment and accountability system) have much better measures for AYP. Lessons from the interim system indicate that States have trouble building incentives into their accountability systems to ensure that all students are held to high standards and that schools make significant enough annual improvements to lead to all students reaching State standards within a reasonable timeframe.
- Current law envisions that states would establish (and Congress would fund) intervention teams to work with schools in need of improvement. However, Congress has not provided the program improvement funds (requested at \$10 - million per year) and there is considerable variation among states in their capacity for significant intervention.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Principles for accountability in the ESEA reauthorization

- The system promotes the achievement of challenging content and performance standards.
- The system is as simple and easy to understand as possible.
- The system can go into effect immediately upon enactment of the law.
- The ESEA measures are in line with State accountability systems.
- The system includes rewards, supports, and consequences for student performance.
- The system generates publicly reported information about student performance in the State, school districts, and schools.
- The system encourages diagnostic checks and preventive interventions to help all students master challenging state standards.

### Recommendations for Strengthening Title I Accountability Provisions

We are recommending a number of changes to current law that would promote more immediate and effective accountability systems. In particular, we recommend:

- *Require immediate identification of and intervention in low performing schools.* States would be required to immediately identify districts and schools in need of improvement and provide interventions and supports to the schools that are determined to have the greatest needs. Priority for interventions and supports should be given to the districts and schools with the lowest absolute levels of student performance that have made little or no improvement over the previous three years. (NOTE: even current transitional assessment and accountability systems will have generated this information by the time the law is passed.)

Such districts and schools must conduct a thorough assessment of their needs and develop a plan to address those needs in consultation with experts from outside of the district/school. These districts and schools would be able to access support from the State intervention fund and would have competitive preference for discretionary programs that directly serve issues

addressed in their needs assessment and school improvement plans.

- *Provide access to sizeable Excellence and Accountability funds once a State system meets the criteria for accountability under ESEA/Title I.* States must develop and adopt systems that hold districts and schools accountable for student performance against challenging State content and performance standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics. States would submit for Federal review evidence that their systems are rigorous, include all students, and offer incentives for improvement.

To ensure quality and rigor, States must submit evidence that their systems:

- Are tied to State content and performance standards in reading and math;
- Are predominantly based on students reaching State standards as measured through the State assessment system;
- Include multiple measures within the State assessment system (e.g. if a norm-referenced test is adopted, then other measures to assess student progress toward State standards must be incorporated into the overall assessment system);
- Include multiple indicators (e.g. student achievement, school retention and dropout rates, school attendance rates);
- Hold districts and schools accountable for achievement in both reading and mathematics (in other words, a State cannot base accountability solely on a composite score of reading and math because deficiencies in one subject may be masked by strong performance in the other subject) – *NOTE: should we really require this? Many state systems (e.g. IL, KY) use composite scores and such a specific requirement goes against our premise of being in line with state systems.*
- Are based upon rigorous targets for school performance that lead to all students reaching State standards within a reasonable timeframe;

To ensure the inclusion of all students, States must submit evidence that their systems:

- Measure the achievement of all students who have been in U.S. schools for at least three years;
- Provide public reports on student performance, including disaggregated data at the State, district, and school levels for all groups for which such data is statistically significant.

Incentives for school improvement must include:

- Recognition and rewards for schools and districts that showing improvements for two consecutive years;
- Identification of and interventions in schools and districts in need of improvement;
- Identification of and corrective actions in schools and districts that have not improved within two years of interventions.

*Possible issue:* Should we specify that States that use local assessments as the basis for their State assessment system must develop criteria for reviewing local assessments to ensure that they measure student performance against challenging State standards?

*Possible issue:* Many states are implementing accreditation systems for state accountability. These systems are more input oriented than student performance oriented. Would our requirements be waived in order to be aligned with State systems?

- *Create an Education Excellence and Accountability Fund to provide states and local school districts with the capacity to reward high performing schools and effectively intervene in low performing schools.* Currently, States may reserve up to .5% of their Title I allocations (totaling \$38 million across the States) for school improvement activities such as State Support Teams. We recommend a more substantial Education Excellence and Accountability Fund to support required interventions. By reserving 2.5% of the State Title I allocations for school improvement activities, States across the nation would have \$190 million to fund interventions and rewards – ranging from \$22.3 million in California to \$412,000 in Wyoming.

The intent is to create a large enough pool of funds for States to have adequate resources to really make a difference in a manageable number of the lowest performing schools in the state. In order to ensure that interventions are significant enough to make a difference, States would be required to prioritize the number of districts and schools that would be eligible for interventions and justify that such prioritization will lead to interventions that are significant enough to improve student achievement. The fund would be used to support:

- External consultation for the development of school improvement plans in low performing schools. States or local school districts would create external teams of educators to conduct serious, data-based assessments of low performing schools and identify priority areas for needed improvements. These teams would determine the causes of low performance (e.g., low expectations and an outdated curriculum, poorly trained teachers, unsafe conditions, etc.) and recommend necessary interventions. *NOTE: should the needs assessment and plan be developed in consultation with external experts or by them? The above language is what KY just passed for its 1998 revisions to accountability.*
- Implementation of needed improvements. The Fund would give states the resources to immediately address weaknesses in each school, such as purchasing up-to-date textbooks or technology, retraining teachers, reducing class size, providing school safety officers, etc. If it wishes, a State could increase this fund by withholding a small percentage (?) of funds from other programs (e.g., Eisenhower Professional Development, Reading Excellence Act) to fund efforts in low performing schools consistent with the purposes of each program.
- Extended learning time for all students in the school. Because virtually all students in a low performing school will be at least a year or two behind in achievement, the intervention strategy should provide them with extra help (after-school, Saturday school and summer school programs) to enable them to catch up academically.
- Rewards to high performing schools. Rewards must be based on districts and/or schools

demonstrating progress on State assessments for at least two consecutive years among disaggregated student groups. Rewards may include: public recognition, monetary rewards to be used for school improvement, or discretionary funds to support schools that apply to serve as State models and support other schools that need improvement.

- *Continue to require a progressively more severe range of interventions -- but implement them much faster.* Current law provides for a range of interventions, starting with the development and implementation of an improvement plan by the school. If there has not been satisfactory progress after an additional 2 years, then the state or school district must intervene more forcefully, through steps such as reconstituting the school staff, letting students the choice of attending other public schools, or closing the school down. This proposal would simply require that provisions for corrective action go into effect immediately upon passage of the new law. In other words, schools and districts that have identified as in need of improvement for the third consecutive year would receive corrective action – even if the assessment and accountability system is using transitional measures.
- *Require annual School Report Cards.* All districts receiving Title I funds should produce an annual school report card, made available to parents and the public, that reports on student achievement disaggregated for statistically significant populations, other non-academic indicators such as attendance and dropout rates, class size, teacher professional qualifications, parental involvement, and school safety and discipline. **NOTE: Should all of these factors be required or left to State discretion? Some States do this already, others have more simplified systems. Kathy/Hugh – do you have exemplars of report cards?**
- *Provide additional supports for students at risk of not achieving State standards.* Efforts to identify and support students who are at risk of failing to achieve State standards must be supported under Title I. States and/or districts must train teachers in the use of ongoing assessments that can help them identify student needs and provide appropriate interventions. Districts must also offer annual English proficiency exams for LEP students to determine their mastery of English language skills, appropriate interventions, and inclusion policies regarding their participation in English versions of State assessments. Title I funds at the State, district, and school level must support activities such as:
  - Professional development for using ongoing assessment to identify student needs and provide appropriate interventions;
  - The assessment of early literacy skills and appropriate interventions for students who need them;
  - Extended learning opportunities such as after school programs, Saturday academies, and summer programs, with priority given to students at risk of not meeting State standards;
  - Extended learning supports for English language learners who need it to master English or the core content areas, especially students who do not reach the 3-year goal.

**NOTE: Is this too much to require?**

## RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS – a work in progress...

### Assessment variability

- Assessment data from one year to the next covering different cohorts of students may not accurately reflect school contributions to learning for accountability purposes. A study that examined improvement in school performance found no obvious patterns in on-year differences among successive cohorts of fourth graders. In particular, the schools with the biggest gains from one fourth-grade cohort to the next are not the same schools in which students made the best longitudinal gains between third and fourth grade. (Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance: Some Preliminary Findings, Draft 12/98)

### Rewards and Interventions

Research is fairly limited on strategies that include more aggressive sanctions and rewards for student performance. However, we have learned a few lessons from early implementation:

- More recent studies of school reconstitution and probation policies in Chicago seem to point to the importance of teacher buy-in of outside consultants in order for their reform recommendations to be accepted and implemented.
- Research indicates that public reporting of student achievement data, as well as the threat of sanctions motivates changes in behavior at the district and school levels (Elmore, Ablelman, Fuhrman, 1996; SREB, 1997). Teachers in Kentucky reported that they were motivated by the threat of sanctions more than by the hopes for rewards (SREB, 1997).
- Successful schools in the Title I Special Strategies had access to advice and consultation from outside experts ...

## Options for Title I accountability

Draft

December 2, 1998

### Objectives of an accountability system under Goals 2000 and ESEA:

- The system includes ALL students and holds them all to the same set of challenging standards.
- The federal statute focuses on district- and school-level accountability.
- Title I schools are held accountable through the same system as other schools.
- The system provides meaningful information to schools, parents and students about student achievement.
- The information generated by the system is used to improve teaching and learning.
- The system promotes continuous improvement.
- The system promotes a sense of responsibility among State staff, district personnel, principals, teachers, and students.
- The system includes rewards and interventions for schools and districts based on student performance.

### The Current Title I Statute (and guidance):

Note: We focus on the Title I statute because it complements the Goals 2000 statute and is more explicit.

- States determine, based on their final assessment system, what constitutes adequate yearly progress (AYP) of any LEA and school served by Title I. AYP must be defined in a manner that results in continuous and substantial improvements toward state standards and that is sufficiently rigorous to achieve that goal within an appropriate timeframe. Districts may add measures such as dropout, retention, and attendance rates to their definitions.
- States and districts designate distinguished schools and districts that have exceeded the State's AYP targets for three consecutive years. These schools serve as models and the State may choose to offer rewards.
- If a school does not meet its AYP targets for two consecutive years it is designated a school in need of improvement. It must then develop or revise a school plan to improve performance and submit that plan for district approval. It must also spend at least 10% of its Title I funds on professional development (unless it can prove that it is doing so otherwise) and it will receive technical assistance from the LEA.
- The SEA is required to publish assessment data for each district. If a LEA does not meet its AYP targets for two years, it is designated as in need of improvement. It must then revise its local plan and it is eligible to receive technical assistance and support from State Support Teams.
- If a school (or LEA) does not meet its AYP targets for three consecutive years based on the State's final assessment, then corrective actions must be taken. These can include a variety of measures ranging from withholding funds, to authorizing students to transfer schools, to decreasing school autonomy, to school reconstitution.

## State Status

Accountability systems are in many different stages across the country. States are not required to have their final assessments and accountability systems in place until the 2000-01 school year. They have been strongly encouraged, however, to implement their systems earlier. States are required to implement transitional assessment, and many have developed definitions of adequate yearly progress against their transitional assessments.

There are a few "facts" and preliminary findings that we do know:

- 18 States have self-reported to the CCSSO that they have their final assessments in place; none have reported this information to the Department.
- Many transitional definitions of AYP do not rigorously address the notion of "all students" reaching high State standards. For example:
  - Many definitions are not based on a timeline for having all students reach State standards, nor have they set targets for expedited growth in low performing districts and schools.
  - Many definitions are based on very low performance targets.
  - Some States, such as Alabama, have set an absolute standard or a cut score on a State assessment and do not recognize continuous progress in their accountability system.
  - Some States are using only a composite score on State assessments for accountability, and this may mask differences in achievement across subjects.
  - Few States examine disaggregated student data within their accountability systems. This could result in neglecting the performance of groups of students.
  - Some accountability systems as currently defined may encourage schools to focus attention on students who are close to meeting State standards so that scores will go up, rather than focusing on the lowest performing students (Chun & Goertz, 1998).
  - Some States, such as Tennessee, are adjusting assessment scores to reflect the SES of the school, raising concerns that some schools are held to lower standards.
- Despite weak transitional definitions of AYP, the current definitions are improvements over the expected NCE gains under the old Chapter 1. Over half of the States had their consolidated plan approval withheld while the Department negotiated more rigorous interim accountability measures.
- The law envisioned a system of State Support Teams to provide technical assistance to low performing schools. However, Congress has never appropriated funds for the State Support Teams. States have used their administrative funds under Title I to set up State Support structures, but they have had varying degrees of impact. Ten States do not even have State Support Teams because of a variety of circumstances such as loss of a key staff person or restructuring of technical assistance efforts. Most States have set up either SEA teams or teams of outside experts to help schools, but their

ability to address the needs of schools is severely limited by a lack of funds.

- States have been identifying distinguished schools and in some States, such as New York, the system has been reported to be a good motivator for school improvement.
- 23 States have passed their own State accountability laws that include provisions for "academic bankruptcy" and some kind of major State intervention such as State takeover of schools or school reconstitution. The impact of these laws is difficult to determine at this time because they are just going into effect. It does appear anecdotally, however, that Title I provisions are considered only as an afterthought in the development of these systems.

#### **Options to improve Title I accountability:**

**A: Maintain the current Title I accountability system with some improvements to 1) further define what constitutes adequate yearly progress, and 2) strengthen rewards and interventions.**

#### **AYP improvements:**

- Require AYP definitions to include improvements for low performing students.
- Require States to set a reasonable timeline for bringing all students up to State standards and establish AYP goals that reflect the gains necessary each year in order for all students to meet State standards within the timeline.
- Clarify that AYP does not refer to a single number, but to an array of indicators of student achievement against State standards. Incidental indicators such as retention, attendance, graduation should not be weighted so as to overpower indicators of student performance.

#### **Improvements in rewards and interventions:**

- Require the State to set aside funds (or create a new line item) to support rewards and interventions based on the accountability system.
- Provide competitive preference for CSRÜ, REA, and TLCF grants to schools and districts identified as in need of improvement.
- Target Federal technical assistance to schools and districts in need of improvement.

#### **Pros:**

- Strengthening definitions of AYP should encourage schools to pay attention to their lowest performing students; and it counteracts an incentive to focus on the middle students who are closest to meeting standards and will boost school performance ratings.
- This system should encourage schools to use data to improve their programs.
- The rationale behind AYP would be clearer to districts and schools.
- This should increase the sense of urgency for accelerating student achievement gains.
- This requirement will help ensure that States use multiple indicators in their assessment systems, rather than relying solely on a norm-referenced test.

**Cons:**

- This is a more prescriptive requirement and could be viewed as greater federal intrusion.
- Adding requirements to the law is not necessarily a greater motivator. It may cause places to set low targets just to comply with Federal requirements.
- There is no consensus about what constitutes a "reasonable" timeline.
- Many States are only using norm-referenced tests and it will be impossible to have all students reach a norm on such tests.
- This makes public reporting complicated and may be difficult to understand.
- States and experts do not yet know how to weight multiple indicators within a single system.
- This may contradict with other State approaches that require performance in other ways.

**B: Modify Title I accountability (and/or broader ESEA accountability) to require intensive interventions (and possibly sanctions) in the lowest performing schools and rewards for continuous progress.**

- States identify the lowest performing (bottom 5%) schools based on State assessment data in reading/language arts and math, school attendance, and dropout rate information.
  - Provide State Support Teams and other technical assistance to these schools.
  - Lowest performing schools receive priority in grant competitions – CSR, REA, TLCF (?)
- Chronically low performing schools have their Title I (and other federal?) funds (or a portion of funds) frozen while they:
  - Conduct a thorough needs assessment and develop a plan to address those needs.
  - Submit an integrated plan for turning around the school to a peer review panel for feedback and approval.
  - Submit the plan to the SEA for approval.
  - Secure advice and assistance from an outside expert(s) for ongoing support of their school improvement efforts.
- Rewards are provided based on showing adequate yearly progress.
  - Adequate yearly progress is revised based on Option A above.

**Pros:**

- Intervention and support would be more clearly targeted to low performing schools.
- This system is easier to understand.
- The system would still promote continuous improvement while also intensifying efforts to improve the worst schools.
- This system should constantly ratchet up the expectations of schools. In other words, as the lowest performing schools turn around increasingly higher

performing schools will get assistance.

**Cons:**

- States will need funds to support intensive interventions in the lowest performing schools and it is not clear that Congress will fund these efforts.
- States may not have the capacity to turn around the lowest performing schools.
- Some schools could conceivably stay on the list of lowest performing schools for a long time even if they make improvements, which risks demoralizing and stigmatizing them.
- Some groups will protest the notion of singling out schools as the "worst" when their problems may stem from poverty and other factors out of their control.
- It is not clear whether temporarily withholding funds from chronically low performing schools and requiring a new plan will result in improvements.

**Option C: Create an incentive fund for States that are committed to accountability. States compete for these funds to support their intervention and rewards programs.**

- Maintain the current Title I approach with improvements described in Option A.
- States compete for incentive funds if they have developed quality interventions and incentive programs to support improved student learning.

**Pros:**

- This still promotes the notion of continuous improvements.
- Only States that are truly committed to making reforms will be funded.
- There should be greater quality control over the use of funds for interventions and rewards under a competitive program.

**Cons:**

- Many States that arguably need additional support may not win a competitive environment.
- This may create an excuse for States to not fully implement the Title I requirements if they do not receive extra funding.

**Option D: Modify Option C to create an incentive fund for States that are committed to accountability. States are all eligible for funds, but only receive them after demonstrating they have comprehensive intervention and rewards programs.**

- Maintain the current Title I approach with improvements described in Option A.
- Create an open account that States apply for once they have quality proposals developed regarding comprehensive intervention and incentive programs to support improved student learning.

**Pros:**

- Same as above.
- Not making this a competitive approach, allows States to develop thoughtful proposals and get buy-in before a discretionary deadline.

**Cons:**

- Same as above.
- An open account will be difficult to manage and the Department will be under intense pressure to fund all states regardless of the quality of their proposals.