



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Title: Reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act

- As Related To:**
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Develop and support policies to close the achievement and opportunity gaps. | <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Ensure that every student has the opportunity to meet career and college ready standards. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Develop comprehensive accountability, recognition, and supports for students, schools, and districts. | <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Provide effective oversight of the K-12 system. |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |

- Relevant To Board Roles:**
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> System Oversight | <input type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advocacy | |

Policy Considerations / Key Questions: What are the highest priorities from the Board's standpoint for a reauthorized federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)? Why is it important for Congress to pass and the President to sign a rewrite of the long-since lapsed and deeply flawed No Child Left Behind Act this year? What message should the SBE transmit to the state's Congressional delegation as members deliberate on ESEA?

- Possible Board Action:**
- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Adopt |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Approve | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other |

- Materials Included in Packet:**
- | |
|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Graphs / Graphics |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Third-Party Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint |

Synopsis: The Board will receive a staff briefing on major issues for reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act and on the status of Congressional action on this crucial legislation. The Board will then hear perspectives on ESEA reauthorization from education leaders in Washington state. They include:

- Gayle Pauley, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
- Alan Burke, Executive Director, Washington State School Directors' Association
- Erin Jones, Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) District Director, Tacoma Public Schools

Reauthorization of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Major Issues

Issue	Options
Data Collection and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain current law requiring districts and states to produce annual report cards showing academic achievement on state assessments and other academic indicators such as participation rates on assessments, graduation rates, and each school's evaluation under the statewide accountability system. Continue to require disaggregation of data by subgroup in reporting on student achievement. • Maintain current requirements on data collection and reporting but also require reporting on non-academic indicators such as school climate indicators, opportunity measures, and per pupil expenditures.
Academic Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require each state to provide assurance it has adopted "challenging state academic standards" in reading, math and science that apply to all schools in the state and are aligned with college entrance requirements, without need for remediation. • Require that state standards be validated by USED to ensure that proficiency in the standards signals that students are on track to enter the workforce or post-secondary education without remediation. • Eliminate the federal mandate on academic standards. Leave the setting of standards to states and local districts.
Assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to require state-selected, annual assessments in each of grades 3-8, and once in high school, and in science in each of three grade spans. • Replace required annual assessments with tests in certain grade-spans only. • Give states an option to choose between annual assessments and grade-span assessments. • Continue to require annual assessments, but count only results of grade-span tests for accountability purposes. • Allow districts to choose their own local assessments, in place of state-selected ones, with (a) state, or (b) federal approval.
Accountability – School and District Designations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require states to identify schools in need of strategies for improving academic achievement, but provide flexibility as to how schools must be identified. • Be more directive on designations, requiring, for example, identifying specific percentages of schools for certain interventions and supports. • No federal requirements. Designations left to the states.
Accountability – Performance Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate AYP. Require states to set performance, growth, and graduation targets for all students, • Eliminate AYP. Require states to set annual district and school-level targets for grade-level achievement, high school graduation, and closing achievement gaps for all students, including accelerated progress for subgroups. • Eliminate AYP. Leave the setting of performance targets to the states.

<p>Accountability – School Improvement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require each state to develop a single statewide accountability system meeting a few broad parameters, including annually measuring the academic achievement of each school. The state system must include a system of school improvement interventions, locally implemented, schools determined to be poorly performing under the state accountability system. Repeal mandated school improvement, corrective actions, and interventions in current law to give states and districts flexibility to develop appropriate turnaround strategies for their schools. • Require each state to use performance targets to identify schools in need of support that have missed targets and high priority schools that have both the lowest achievement and challenges identified by equity indicators. Schools in need of support must develop plans to improve achievement and address school challenges. High priority schools must develop plans to improve school-wide factors that affect student achievement and school climate. LEA’s and SEA’s must provide resources to support schools in implementing locally-identified interventions.
<p>Accountability – School Improvement Grant (SIG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate the SIG program, together with its four federal turnaround models, and redirect its funding to Title I. • Retain SIG, under revised USED rules.
<p>Teacher Quality – Highly Qualified Teachers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeal the NCLB requirement that districts identify and document “Highly Qualified Teachers,” defined as holding a B.A. degree, being fully certificated or licensed by the state, and demonstrating competence in each core subject area taught. • Maintain the federal definition of Highly Qualified Teacher.
<p>Teacher Quality – Equitable Distribution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require each state to assure that low-income and minority children enrolled in Title 1 schools are served by effective teachers and school leaders, and to adopt measures to evaluate and report to USED on its progress on this assurance. • Continue to require states to ensure equitable distribution of qualified and effective teachers and school leaders in classrooms with high percentages of low-income and minority students.
<p>Teacher Quality – Teacher Evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorize use of current federal funds for developing a rigorous and fair evaluation system for teachers, principals, and other school leaders that is based in part on evidence of student achievement and may include academic and other growth measures, as determined by the state or LEA. • Authorize use of funds for development of state or locally driven teacher evaluation systems under broad parameters, including making student achievement data a significant part of the evaluation, using multiple measures of evaluation in assessing teacher performance, and seeking input from parents, teachers, school leaders and others in developing the system. • Ensure high-quality, comprehensive teacher and school leader evaluations that are developed foremost to inform professional development, include multiple measures of learning and practice, and are tied directly to targeted support for educators. • No federal requirements on teacher evaluations.

Early Childhood Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide formula grants to states, with a state match, for high-quality, full-day pre-kindergarten for 4 year-old children from families earning below 200% FPL. Require states to provide subgrants to local entities to offer children high-quality prekindergarten, with requirements for staffing, instruction, and other provisions. • Do not add provisions for early childhood education in a reauthorized ESEA.
English Language Learners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require each state plan to describe how the SEA will establish English language proficiency standards that are derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading and writing and are aligned with the state's academic standards in reading or language arts. • Require each SEA to adopt and annually administer statewide English language proficiency assessments that are aligned with the State's English proficiency standards and academic content standards; are accessible, valid and reliable; measure proficiency in reading, listening, speaking and writing in English; assess progress and growth on language and content acquisition, and allow for the LEA to retest a student in individual domain areas.
Finance – Maintenance of Effort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate current “maintenance of effort” provisions, which require states and school districts to keep their own spending to no less than certain levels in order to access Title I funds. • Retain “maintenance” of effort provisions.
Finance – Title 1 Portability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give states the option of allowing Title I money to follow low-income students to the traditional or charter public school the student chooses to attend. • Provide for Title 1 portability, but permit the money to follow low-income students to a private as well as public school. • No provision for Title 1 portability.
Finance – Grant Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate federal grant programs into a much smaller number, allowing more flexibility for states and districts to use funding to meet identified needs. • Maintain most dedicated grant funding for programs targeting special populations and needs.
Secretary of Education Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicitly limit the Secretary of Education's authority, including for imposing specific conditions on states for waiver of provisions of the ESEA, and imposing requirements in areas such as standards, assessments, and state accountability plans. • No additional provisions to limit the Secretary's authority.