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Today’s Agenda

• NCLB implementation status
• Who’s making AYP?
• Behind the numbers: Trends in state accountability plans
  – Including growth models
• Teacher quality, supplemental services and choice
• Who’s fighting the U.S. Department of Education on NCLB?
• Reauthorization status and proposals
• AASA’s position on reauthorization
• Polling data on NCLB
## Implementation of NCLB: A walk down memory lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Dec. – Bill passed in Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 8, 2002 – signed by President Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 24 – first letter with guidance to state chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. 6 – first NPRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall – first round of AYP identifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 2 – first final regulations dealing with assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Jan.-April – funding fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 10 – all state plans “approved” by USED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December – final regulations &amp; 1 percent rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Jan. – funding fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 10 – all state plans “approved” by USED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December – final regulations &amp; 1 percent rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Feb. – first flexibility policy re. LEP students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March – flexibility for teacher quality &amp; participation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring/Summer – continued funding fights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 5, 2004 – Paige announces intent to resign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 17, 2004 – Spellings nominated as new Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jan.-April – CT Fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 7 – Spellings announces intent for more flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. 31 – Chicago supplemental services waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. 21 – ED announces growth model states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 14 – updated regulations on special education: 1+2=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2006 – Decision letters on state assessments and ED cracks down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May – expansion of choice and SES pilot; growth models announced; intent to eliminate HOUSSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. – ELL rules announced; backs off from HOUSSE elimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov. – additional growth models announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan. 2007 – ED announces proposal for reauthorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schools not making AYP through the years

- 2003: 27% Many states still not fully up and running with new tests
- 2004: 30% Many states make major changes to acct plans
- 2005: 25%
- 2006: 29% Almost all states testing all grades
% of Schools Not Making AYP, 2006

* SINOI only  **preliminary  *** does not include high school
AYP Trends

• Many states finally seeing the effect of a higher bar
• Many states also impacted by increase in number of students tested
• Number of schools not making AYP nationwide has increased from roughly 25% in 04-05 to 29%
What’s Behind Those Numbers?

State Accountability Plans
Trends in state accountability plans – what’s new?

• Accusations of “gaming the system”
  – AP article
  – NAEP results
• The special education proxy – more than half the states now using it
• The growth model
• Subgroup sizes
• Federal crackdowns
Subgroup Sizes by the numbers
Subgroup Sizes – different approaches
Confidence Intervals
The special education “proxy”

Figure out what number would be 2.0% of all students assessed (approximates number of students who might benefit from modified assessments)

Add the proxy to the number of students with disabilities who are proficient

Use this new number to calculate AYP – ONLY for schools that did not make AYP solely due to SWDS

- [State] will calculate a proxy to determine the percentage of students with disabilities that is equivalent to 2.0 percent of all students assessed.
- For the 2005-06 AYP determinations, this proxy will then be added to the percent of students with disabilities who are proficient.
- For any school or district that did not make AYP solely due to its students with disabilities subgroup, [State] will use this adjusted percent proficient to reexamine if the school or district made AYP for the 2005-06 school year.

If proxy is 14.6, and 32% of students with disabilities are proficient, 32+14.6 = 46.6

If AYP target is 42%, then this school makes AYP.
2 Percent Rule Codified in New Proposed Regulations

- Modified achievement standards
- Focus on clear guidelines – states must have criteria for IEP teams to determine eligibility
- Out of level testing
- Subgroup sizes for groups of students
- 1+2 really does = 3
- Retests
- Coordination between ESEA and IDEA

Concerns
- What is a modified standard?
- Delay in regulations
- Role of IEP teams
- Concern for small districts
- Scientific basis
The Growth Model

• North Carolina and Tennessee first approved
  – Back to the Future: are they REALLY growth models?
    • “average schooling experience”
    • “on track” to proficiency
  – Nonnegotiables from the panel
    • 100% proficiency by 2014
    • Inclusion of all students – match rates
    • No resetting of goals or trajectories

• Not seeing much impact on the number of schools not making AYP
Latest on Growth Models

• Delaware, Arkansas, Florida approved to pilot this school year
  – DE: “value table,” points for different levels of improvement, subgroup basis, secondary look to AYP.
  – AR: nonlinear path to proficiency, but fixed target of cut score by grade 8
  – FL: track to proficiency similar to TN and NC
• Performance indices also encouraged
Use of Performance Indices

Weighted index
- Gives “credit” for students scoring just below proficient
- But cannot get “extra credit” for students scoring advanced
Federal Crackdowns
particularly state assessments, ELL

Map from Education Week, July 13, 2006
Trends in State Accountability Plans – What’s New?

• Continued shifts in what tests states use
  – About half the states have asked for changes in plans or extensions because of new tests
  – Nearly half the states have had to make changes to AMOs
• Late reporting
• Cracking down on “invalid tests” as nonparticipants
District AYP

Same subject + All grade spans + Two consecutive years = 35 states

Does it matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYP</th>
<th>Grade Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AYP</td>
<td>INOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from the Harvard Civil Rights Project

But it may also help and hurt districts disproportionately!
What’s working in state accountability plans

• Disaggregating data
• Special look at grad rates for LEP students? (WV)
• Increasing numbers of districts getting same subject all grade spans (35 states now)
• Changes in definition of Full Academic Year
Shifting Federal Policies

**Good, then Bad**
- Different subgroup sizes for different groups of students
- HOUSSE
- Nebraska’s test
- Arizona’s test for ELLs

**Bad, then Good**
- Dual accountability systems
- Out of level testing
- Assessments for students with disabilities
- Retests
- More than 4-year graduation rate
- Growth models
NCLB Choice Update

• Low turnout ~ 1%
• District compliance
  – Informing parents
• Logistical challenges
  – Schools identified on time
  – Capacity: class size, space
• ED getting pressure to enforce choice more strictly
Supplemental Services Update

• Expansion of “SES before choice” pilot
  – 4 districts in Virginia originally offered flexibility
  – 19 more districts in Alaska, Delaware, Indiana, and North Carolina now allowed

• Expansion of districts allowed to provide SES even if in need of improvement
  – Originally Boston and Chicago
  – Expanded to Anchorage and Memphis
  – ED chided by Inspector General for prohibiting this

• More children using
  – 19% of who qualified in 2004-05
  – 12% in 2003-04
Challenges with Supplemental Services:

- States, Feds, Districts, Providers all casting blame

- Schools identified on time
- Number of providers, esp. rural and inner city
- Low completion rates
- Complicated paperwork
- Funding
- Provider capacity, esp. for special needs students
- Evaluating and monitoring; showing progress
- Quality of teachers
Teacher Quality Update

• Getting highest quality teachers to the schools that need them most = formidable challenge
• Increased pressure on ED to enforce teacher quality provisions
• Increased push for teacher incentive grants to ensure best teachers in neediest schools?
• Teacher effectiveness
Teacher Quality Update

• Attempts to eliminate the HOUSSE
  – In May 2006, states were told they could only use the HOUSSE for:
    • Multiple subject teachers in rural school districts with fewer than 600 students
    • Special education teachers who are considered the primary instructors for students in more than one subject
    • Teachers coming to America from other countries
  – In September, amid protest, Spellings backed off
  – HOUSSE is in the law – does ED have authority?
  – Will HOUSSE survive reauthorization?
Fighting the good fight

- Nebraska testing fight
  - Locally-based testing system
  - Approved in 2004
  - Praised widely
  - Not approved in June 2006
  - Decision reversed in September 2006

- Arizona ELL fight
  - Struck deal with ED regarding testing of ELL students
  - ED, in AZ’s opinion, reneged on the deal
  - New regs say one year only
  - AZ says three years
  - Sues federal govt
Virginia defying ED over ELLs

- Resisting new regulation that requires testing in content areas in English after one year
- Districts passing resolutions
  - including Fairfax (where Sec. Spellings lives)
- Raises question of role of federal government
- See the resolutions at aasa.org
Reauthorization Proposals
Reauthorization Proposals

- Department of Education
- NEA: 37 recommendations
- School Boards: 40 recommendations
- State Legislatures: 40+ recommendations
- Center on Education Policy
- Rural Trust
- Many more!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tweaking NCLB</th>
<th>High Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sticking to 2014</td>
<td>• Codify graduation rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More growth models</td>
<td>• Rigorous coursework and more AP in high schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Prioritized support” on schools with “greatest needs”</td>
<td>• More money targeted to high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Codify 1% and 2% into statute</td>
<td>• Striving Readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SES earlier and more money</td>
<td>• Incorporate competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>More Choice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher Incentive Fund</td>
<td>• Nationwide vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continued flexibility for rural</td>
<td>• Union busting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjunct Teacher Corps</td>
<td>• More charter schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Information about Teaching and More Choice are marked by strikes in the table, indicating possible corrections or deletions.)
AASA’s Position: Legislative Principals

• A fundamental transformation of the federal role in education is needed.

• Local school districts should have the primary responsibility for determining educational methods and strategies.

• The goals of both the 2001 reauthorization (proficiency for all children) and the original ESEA in 1965 (equal educational opportunity for all children) are laudable.
Legislative Principles

- **The decision-making role** of the federal government in public education should be **proportional to its financial contribution**.

- **Poverty** is a factor in student achievement.
  - Schools cannot overcome this alone.

- Federal dollars are more efficient and effective and have longer lasting effects when they are driven to local school districts via **formula grants**.

- Transforming ESEA to help each child succeed requires adhering to core beliefs:
  - State and local school system leaders are dedicated to high levels of achievement for their students.
  - States’ and local school districts’ first responsibility is meeting state constitutional requirements for each child.
Recommendations: Appropriate Federal Role in Education

- School districts should be held **accountable** for achievement of their Title I students.
- The focus should be on providing states and school districts with **meaningful support** and capacity for improvement, rather than sanctions.
- There must be **complete transparency** in the U.S. Department of Education in the rulemaking and approval processes.
- Target Title I $ to concentrations of large numbers and percentages of low income students.
More Accurate and Instructionally Useful Accountability

- Permit states to use accountability systems that measure the academic progress of individual students using multiple measures.
- **Special education students** should be measured based on their IEP.
- Students with **limited English proficiency** should be appropriately assessed in English, math and other subjects as per individual student needs and not subject to arbitrary deadlines.
- A **broader definition of proficiency** determined by states that includes skills needed to be citizens in a global economy—creativity, collaborative and problem solving skills – is needed.
Collaborative Leadership for Educational Improvement

- ESEA should continue to support the development of processes that engage and support parents as partners. However, the nature of parental engagement should not be prescriptive.
- Excellent teaching is essential and states should set appropriate teacher standards.
Public Opinion on NCLB
A Majority Disagrees with “One Size Fits All” Penalties for Schools

Under the federal No Child Left Behind accountability system, there are at least 36 achievement targets that each school must meet. Currently, a school that misses 1 or 2 of its targets receives the same penalty as a school that misses nearly all of its targets. Do agree or disagree with this way of penalizing schools?

N=1,000  Source: AASA polls conducted by Ipsos-Reid
As you may know, schools around the country are rated in two ways - a state accountability system required under state law and a federal accountability system required by the federal No Child Left Behind Act. Is your opinion about the quality of schools in your community influenced more by state labels or federal labels?

People Are Influenced More By State Labels

- **State labels**: 68% (Parents) / 63% (All)
- **Federal labels**: 20% (Parents) / 21% (All)
- **Both equally**: 2% (Parents) / 3% (All)
- **Neither**: 5% (Parents) / 6% (All)

Source: AASA polls conducted by Ipsos-Reid
Impressions of School Quality Will Decline Some for Schools in the Federal Penalty Phase

If you heard that a school in your community received a passing mark under the state accountability system, but has failed to make adequate progress and is in the penalty phase under the federal requirements, would your impression of that school’s quality decline significantly, decline somewhat, or would it not have much of an effect at all?

Source: AASA polls conducted by Ipsos-Reid
Knowledge and Views of No Child Left Behind

- Six in 10 Americans say that NCLB is having no effect on or is actually harming the schools in their communities.
- The more Americans know about NCLB, the less they like it.

What Effect Has NCLB Had on Schools?

- Hurting Schools or Making No Difference, 58%
- Helping Schools, 26%
- Don't Know, 16%

PDK/Gallup Poll, 2006
Seven in 10 Americans do not believe a single state test can give a fair picture of a school.

Eight in 10 prefer measuring school performance by the improvement students make during the year rather than the percentage passing a single test.
Eight in 10 Americans do not believe a test in English and math only can give a fair picture of a school.

Eight in 10 are concerned that NCLB’s focus on these two subjects will mean less emphasis on other subjects.

The public . . .

Does not believe a test in English and math only can give a fair picture of a school

- ’03: 83%
- ’04: 83%
- ’05: 80%
- ’06: 81%

Is concerned that NCLB’s focus on English and math will mean less emphasis on other subjects

- ’03: 80%
- ’04: 81%
- ’05: 82%
- ’06: 78%

PDK/Gallup Poll, 2006
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