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Our Mission: to help organizations become more effective & achieve dramatic results, especially for high-needs students

Sample List, Not Exhaustive

Districts
- Cleveland Metropolitan School District
- CMS
- Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
- Franklin-Mckinley School District
- Achievement School District
- New Haven School Change
- Los Angeles Unified School District
- Pittsburgh Public Schools
- SFUSD

State Agencies
- RIDED
- Louisiana Believes
- MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
- CCSSO
- Council of Chief State School Officers

Charters & Private
- Summit Public Schools
- Harmony Public Schools
- Cristo Rey Networks
- YES Prep Public Schools
- KIPP
- San Antonio College Preparatory Public Schools
- ACE

Advocacy, Product & Service Providers
- WestEd
- ACT
- City Year
- The Mind Trust
- Microsoft
- Educators Excellence
- Google
- Teach for America
- College Summit
- Education Cities
- Teaching Trust

Intermediaries & Foundations
- The Friedman Foundation
- Fordham Institute
- Kern Family Foundation
- Walton Family Foundation
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Michael & Susan Dell Foundation
No Child Left Behind Timeline
How did we get here?

Jan. 2002: No Child Left Behind enacted

2007: NCLB reauthorization effort begins; Miller-McKeon discussion draft

2005-06: Accountability measures (including reading & math testing, AYP, and HQT) must be in place

2007-08: Science testing must be in place

2011: NCLB Waiver plan unveiled; Kline bills piecemeal markup; Harkin-Enzi bill markup

2012-13: First year of NCLB waivers

2013: Kline bill floor vote; Harkin bill markup

2013-14: AYP based on 100% of students proficient in reading & math

2015: Kline bill markup; Alexander-Murray markup??
NCLB is exceeding expectations in key areas…

**Area**

**Public Support**
- Overwhelmingly bipartisan support at passage
- Overwhelmingly bipartisan support for overhaul today

**Performance & Accountability**
- Clear goals for school performance
- Accountability for schools based on subgroup performance, as well as overall performance averages
- NAEP biennial assessments required:
  - In 2013, all-time high scores in 4th and 8th grade reading and math for all subgroups
  - Racial gaps in NAEP scale scores have narrowed since the late 1990s in nearly every grade/subject

**Resources & Interventions**
- Increasing interventions in schools that missed goals over time
- Federal education dollars better targeted to high-poverty communities

**Data & Capacity**
- Public, disaggregated, annual collection of student and school data
- State Longitudinal Data Systems and new education research
  - No state included all ten essential elements in its data system in 2005; by 2011, 36 states had incorporated all ten elements and 8 states had nine of ten (Data Quality Campaign).
... but still has room to improve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>• Lack of agreement on how to overhaul the law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance &amp; Accountability</td>
<td>• 100% proficiency goal outlived its utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little emphasis on student growth over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited number of accountability measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variance in test quality and performance standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measured teacher qualifications rather than effectiveness, creating a paper chase rather than real improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Interventions</td>
<td>• Interventions based on how long schools had missed goals rather than how many they missed, how far off they were, or why they missed them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uneven implementation of interventions, especially choice and tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Did little to address resource inequity: comparability of funding, access to rigorous coursework, distribution of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Capacity</td>
<td>• State and local capacity lacking to respond to data and accountability and to turnaround low-performing schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequence: Rhetoric sets the battleground for NCLB reauthorization

“This law is fundamentally broken and we need to fix it this year. It has created dozens of ways for schools to fail and very few ways to help them succeed.”

– Arne Duncan, 2011

“Student problems can no longer be swept under the rug. Because of ‘consequential accountability,’ business as usual is no longer acceptable. Make no mistake: Much more than accountability is needed, and we have a long way to go. But accountability works. It must stay.”

– Sandy Kress, 2011
NCLB Reality: positive student outcomes in graduation rates...

Record High Graduation Rates Following Several Decades of Stagnation
Cohort graduation rate

- Between 1975-2002, high school graduation rates stagnated, hovering between 71% and 75%
- Since an initial uptick in 2005, graduation rates have reached an all-time high of 81%

Source: NCES
... and NAEP performance in both reading and math...

Record High NAEP Scores for all Subgroups
NAEP Math average scale scores, 2003-2013, by sub-group

- All-time high scores on NAEP in 4th and 8th grade math and reading for all subgroups
- In 1990, half of 4th graders were innumerate—scoring Below Basic. Today, it’s 17%. The same was true in 1990 for over 80% of black 4th graders, but now the figure is 34%.

- Consistent evidence of positive effects on math performance, but not reading, and in elementary and middle schools, but not in high schools
- Little evidence that accountability has had a negative effect on student performance

Source: NAEP
... with a mixed bag of responses and second-order effects.

Positive
- Schools and districts redesigned learning environments (e.g. fewer self-contained special education classrooms)
- State and district investments in teacher training, PD, and data systems

Neutral
- Teachers expanded or reallocated instructional time, especially in math and reading
- Teachers shifted attention to students just above/below proficiency levels

Negative
- States tinkered with proficiency standards or performance targets
- Schools strategically classified students into special education to avoid accountability
- Educator and administrator cheating on standardized assessments
Future Outlook for ESEA

ESEA Flexibility
Request

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1840-0798
Expiration Date: March 31, 2012

Paperwork Redesign Statement
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1840-0798. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 300 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and submit the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4557.
**Big picture trend: diminished federal role and greater state autonomy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Minimum Federal Role</th>
<th>Maximum Federal Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Testing</td>
<td>No federal testing requirements</td>
<td>States test in grades 3-8 and once in HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States test once per grade span and/or local tests allowed</td>
<td>States test in additional grades and/or subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Performance Targets</td>
<td>No targets required</td>
<td>Significant number of federally suggested targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited number of state-defined targets</td>
<td>Large number of federally prescribed targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Accountability Ratings</td>
<td>No fed req. for performance measures or categories</td>
<td>States create acct. systems with certain required measures and categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States create acct. systems with certain required measures</td>
<td>Feds create acct. system including measures and categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement &amp; Interventions</td>
<td>No federal requirements, guidelines, or strategies</td>
<td>Strategies determined by states and districts with fed guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies determined by states and districts</td>
<td>Strategies defined by federal government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bellwether Education

Current Law
Big picture trend: leaner school accountability

### Schools Identified as Low-Performing under NCLB

Identified as schools in “Need of Improvement”, “Priority”, or “Focus”, 2005-06 – 2012-13

- **Puerto Rico**
  - States without Waivers (in 12-13)
  - States with Waivers (in 12-13)

- **Nearly 50% decline in waiver states from 2011-12 to 2012-13**


- **2005-06**
  - States without Waivers: 9,903
  - States with Waivers: 5,469

- **2006-07**
  - States without Waivers: 10,781
  - States with Waivers: 5,986

- **2007-08**
  - States without Waivers: 11,660
  - States with Waivers: 7,011

- **2008-09**
  - States without Waivers: 12,597
  - States with Waivers: 7,805

- **2009-10**
  - States without Waivers: 14,561
  - States with Waivers: 8,396

- **2010-11**
  - States without Waivers: 15,888
  - States with Waivers: 9,022

- **2011-12**
  - States without Waivers: 19,270
  - States with Waivers: 11,294

- **2012-13**
  - States without Waivers: 16,548
  - States with Waivers: 5,901

- **Source:** [http://eddataexpress.ed.gov/](http://eddataexpress.ed.gov/)

- **+95%**

- **-14%**
Five Opportunities for Gubernatorial Leadership

1. Accountability & Performance Improvement
   - Performance targets based on new testing systems
   - School Accountability during the transition to new testing systems
   - School Turnaround
   - Teacher Evaluation and Development

2. Curriculum & Instructional Models
   - Standards and Curricula
   - Assessments
   - Technology, Innovation, and Personalized Learning

3. Data & Transparency
   - Data Privacy
   - Report Cards and Feedback to students

4. Supports & Systems
   - School funding
   - Opportunity to Learn
   - Early Childhood
   - Teacher Preparation

5. School Choice and Charter Authorizing
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