



School Accountability Under ESEA Waiver

Huntington UFSD
Board of Education Meeting
September 10, 2012

ESEA WAIVER INITIATIVE

"REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY"

- **On 9/23/11, President Obama announced an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) regulatory flexibility initiative to revise No Child Left Behind (NCLB).**
- **On 5/29/12, the NYS waiver request was approved.**
- **On 6/19/12, the Board of Regents adopted regulations to carry out the provisions of the waiver.**

Primary areas of flexibility requested:

- **2013-14 timeline for all students becoming proficient**
- **School and district improvement requirements**

In exchange for flexibility, states must:

- **Set college/career ready standards for all students and develop and administer annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth.**
- **Develop systems of differentiated recognition, accountability and support.**
- **Support effective teaching and leadership, including the implementation of teacher and principal evaluation in which student growth is a significant factor.**

ESEA Flexibility Request

Big Picture Overview of ESEA Waiver

- 1. Revise the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO).**
- 2. Use school and district accountability standards that are better aligned to college and career readiness.**
- 3. Replace identification of Schools for Improvement, Corrective Action and Restructuring with identification of Priority and Focus Schools.**
- 4. Replace identification of Districts for Improvement and Corrective Action with identification of Focus Districts.**
- 5. Replace identification of schools as High Performing/ Rapidly Improving with Reward School identification.**
- 6. Use proficiency and growth measures to make accountability determinations for elementary and middle schools.**

ESEA Waiver Accountability Determinations

| Category | How Identified | Data Used for Identification |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Reward School | High Performance or Progress | Annual |
| Good Standing | Not Priority, Focus or Local Assistance Plan School | Annual |
| Local Assistance Plan Schools | School that is not a Priority of Focus School that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Has large gaps in achievement among subgroups b) Has failed to make AYP for (3) years for same subgroup on same measure c) Is located in non-Focus district but is among the lowest in the state for performance of subgroups and for which the school is not showing progress. | Annual |

ESEA Waiver Accountability Determinations

| Category | How Identified | Data Used for Identification |
|---|---|---|
| Focus District | Districts and charter schools among the lowest performing for a subgroup and that fail to show progress, or that have a priority school | Identified once based on 09-10/10-11 data; districts that improve performance may be removed from Focus status |
| Focus School (10% of schools in the state) | Schools in Focus Districts that have either the greatest #'s or greatest % of non-proficient or non-graduation results in pertinent subgroups | Identified by districts based on lists provided by Commissioner. District may request to modify annually its list of Focus Schools. |
| Priority School (5% of schools in the state) | Schools that were awarded a SIG grant in 11-12; have had graduation rates below 60% for the past three years; or are the lowest performing in ELA and math combined and have failed to show progress. | Identified once based on 09-10/10-11 data; schools that improve performance may be removed from Priority status |

Accountability Change Highlights

| | NCLB (old) | ESEA Waiver (new) |
|--|---|--|
| Overall Target (AMO) | <p>100% Proficient by 2013-14 in ELA and mathematics</p> <p>Science Fixed Target of a Performance Index (PI) of 100</p> | <p>Cut by 50% gap in ELA, math and science between 2010-11 baseline and goal (i.e., 100% proficient) by 2016-17</p> <p>Separate targets for ESEA accountability groups</p> |
| Elementary/ Middle School PI Calculation | PI based on achievement (Levels 1-4) | PI revised to include both achievement and growth to proficiency |
| High School PI Calculation | Full credit for achieving Regents diploma requirements and partial credit for meeting local diploma requirements | Full credit for meeting College /Career-Ready Graduation Standards and partial credit for meeting Regents diploma requirements |

Accountability Change Highlights

| | NCLB (old) | ESEA Waiver (new) |
|---|---|--|
| Subgroups | All students and racial/ethnic groups, economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English language learners | Same |
| School and District Accountability Categorization | Schools - In Good Standing, Improvement, Corrective Action, Restructuring Districts - In Good Standing, Improvement, Corrective Action | Schools - In Good Standing, Focus, Priority Districts - Focus Districts |

Focus Districts

The following parameters were used for preliminary identification:

- Two-Stage Process
 - Districts with the lowest performing subgroups that are not showing adequate improvement
 - Districts, with the Commissioner's approval, will identify Focus Schools within the district:
 1. Huntington HS
 2. Finley MS

Using Growth and Graduation Rates for Focus Identification

FOCUS:

A district will not be identified as Focus if:

All groups for which the district is identified have graduation rates above the state average for the respective groups on the 4-year graduation cohort.

All groups for which the district is identified have SGPs above the State median for the respective groups for 09-10 & 10-11 combined.

HUFSD Implications

- **New system, old data** – new identification based upon 09-10/10-11 data; essentially a roll-over of prior status under the former NCLB system
 - Notification of identification followed days after receiving 3-8 building growth score ratings for 11-12:
 - 2 buildings rated HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**
 - 4 buildings rated EFFECTIVE**(information scheduled for SED public release in December)
 - Newsday quote – SED representative Jonathan Burman:
“Using 2011-12 data would have required delaying implementation of the waiver for an additional year.”

HUFSD Implications

- **Does not reflect the performance of all students** – identification based upon a small subgroup at each building

We will continue our efforts toward addressing the needs of each and every student!

2012-2013 HUFSD On the Move!!

- Common Core curriculum implementation, K-8 ELA/math
- Data-driven instruction/Danielson framework
- Expanded middle school accelerated programs
- Increased Advanced Placement participation/performance
- Response to Intervention
- STEM initiatives/training/research
- Technological upgrades/training – desktops/laptops/iPads/WiFi/SmartBoards/PARCC assessment prep
- Blended learning/virtual opportunities
- College planning