ESEA Flexibility Waiver

APPLICATION
(Draft)

Office of the
State Superintendent of Education (OSSE)

January 18, 2012

ESEA Flexibility

Request

Revised September 28, 2011
This document replaces the previous version, issued September 23, 2011.
(The document was formatted to ease usability on October 14, 2011)

U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0708
Expiration Date: March 31, 2012

Paperwork Burden Statement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Insert page numbers prior to submitting the request, and place the table of contents in front of the SEA's flexibility request.

Although not required as part of the ESEA Flexibility application, an overview of Principle 4: Reduce Unnecessary Duplication and Burden is included on page 77.

COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

Legal Name of Requester: Office of the State Superintendent of Education	Requester's Mailing Address: 810 First Street NE, 5th Floor Washington, DC 20002

State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request

Name: Dr. Kayleen Irizarry

Position and Office: Assistant Superintendent, Elementary and Secondary Education

Contact's Mailing Address:
810 First Street NE, 5th Floor
Washington, DC 20002

Telephone: (202) 741-0258

Fax: (202) 741-0227

Email address: kayleen.irizarry@dc.gov

Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Hosanna Mahaley	Telephone: (202) 727-3471
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X_____	Date:

The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to meet all principles of the ESEA Flexibility.

By submitting this flexibility request, the SEA requests flexibility through waivers of the ten ESEA requirements listed below and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements by checking each of the boxes below. The provisions below represent the general areas of flexibility requested; a chart appended to the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions* enumerates each specific provision of which the SEA requests a waiver, which the SEA incorporates into its request by reference.

☒ 1. The requirements in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(E)-(H) that prescribe how an SEA must establish annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) to ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the end of the 2013–2014 school year. The SEA requests this waiver to develop new ambitious but achievable AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics in order to provide meaningful goals that are used to guide support and improvement efforts for the State, LEAs, schools, and student subgroups.

☒ 2. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA and its Title I schools need not comply with these requirements.

☒ 3. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that it need not comply with these requirements with respect to its LEAs.

☐ 4. The requirements in ESEA sections 6213(b) and 6224(e) that limit participation in, and use of funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) and Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) programs based on whether an LEA has made AYP and is complying with the requirements in ESEA section 1116. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA that receives SRSA or RLIS funds may use those funds for any authorized purpose regardless of whether the LEA makes AYP.

☒ 5. The requirement in ESEA section 1114(a)(1) that a school have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more in order to operate a schoolwide program. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA may implement interventions consistent with the turnaround principles or interventions that are based on the needs of the students in the school and designed to enhance the entire educational program in a school in any of its priority and focus schools, as appropriate, even if those schools do not have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more.

☒ 6. The requirement in ESEA section 1003(a) for an SEA to distribute funds reserved under that section only to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may allocate section 1003(a) funds to its

LEAs in order to serve any of the State's priority and focus schools.

☒ 7. The provision in ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) that authorizes an SEA to reserve Title I, Part A funds to reward a Title I school that (1) significantly closed the achievement gap between subgroups in the school; or (2) has exceeded AYP for two or more consecutive years. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may use funds reserved under ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) for any of the State's reward schools.

☒ 8. The requirements in ESEA section 2141(a), (b), and (c) for an LEA and SEA to comply with certain requirements for improvement plans regarding highly qualified teachers. The SEA requests this waiver to allow the SEA and its LEAs to focus on developing and implementing more meaningful evaluation and support systems.

☒ 9. The limitations in ESEA section 6123 that limit the amount of funds an SEA or LEA may transfer from certain ESEA programs to other ESEA programs. The SEA requests this waiver so that it and its LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the funds it receives under the authorized programs among those programs and into Title I, Part A.

☒ 10. The requirements in ESEA section 1003(g)(4) and the definition of a Tier I school in Section I.A.3 of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) final requirements. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may award SIG funds to an LEA to implement one of the four SIG models in any of the State's priority schools.

Optional Flexibility:

An SEA should check the box below only if it chooses to request a waiver of the following requirements:

☒ The requirements in ESEA sections 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(b)(2)(A) that restrict the activities provided by a community learning center under the Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program to activities provided only during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (*i.e.*, before and after school or during summer recess). The SEA requests this waiver so that 21st CCLC funds may be used to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.

ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that:

☒ 1. It requests waivers of the above-referenced requirements based on its agreement to meet Principles 1 through 4 of the flexibility, as described throughout the remainder of this request.

☒ 2. It will adopt English language proficiency (ELP) standards that correspond to the State's college- and career-ready standards, consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 3113(b)(2), and that reflect the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the new college- and career-ready standards, no later than the 2013–2014 school year. (Principle 1)

☒ 3. It will develop and administer no later than the 2014–2015 school year alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2) and are aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards. (Principle 1)

☒ 4. It will develop and administer ELP assessments aligned with the State's ELP standards, consistent with the requirements in ESEA sections 1111(b)(7), 3113(b)(2), and 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii). (Principle 1)

☒ 5. It will report annually to the public on college-going and college credit-accumulation rates for all students and subgroups of students in each LEA and each public high school in the State. (Principle 1)

☒ 6. If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and uses achievement on those assessments to identify priority and focus schools, it has technical documentation, which can be made available to the Department upon request, demonstrating that the assessments are administered statewide; include all students, including by providing appropriate accommodations for English Learners and students with disabilities, as well as alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2); and are valid and reliable for use in the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. (Principle 2)

☒ 7. It will report to the public its lists of reward schools, priority schools, and focus schools at the time the SEA is approved to implement the flexibility, and annually thereafter, it will publicly recognize its reward schools. (Principle 2)

☒ 8. Prior to submitting this request, it provided student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, or it will do so no later the deadline required under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. (Principle 3)

☒ 9. It will evaluate and, based on that evaluation, revise its own administrative requirements to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on LEAs and schools. (Principle 4)

☒ 10. It has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its request.

☒ 11. Prior to submitting this request, it provided all LEAs with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request and has attached a copy of that notice (Attachment 1) as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs (Attachment 2).

☒ 12. Prior to submitting this request, it provided notice and information regarding the request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its website) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice (Attachment 3).

☒ 13. It will provide to the Department, in a timely manner, all required reports, data, and evidence regarding its progress in implementing the plans contained throughout this request.

If the SEA selects Option A or B in section 3.A of its request, indicating that it has not yet developed and adopted all guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, it must also assure that:

☒ 14. It will submit to the Department for peer review and approval a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. (Principle 3)

An SEA must meaningfully engage and solicit input from diverse stakeholders and communities in the development of its request. To demonstrate that an SEA has done so, the SEA must provide an assurance that it has consulted with the State's Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in the request and provide the following:

1. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from teachers and their representatives.

The District of Columbia operates in an education landscape that includes one large Local Education Agency (LEA), DC Public Schools (DCPS), and multiple public charter school LEAs that are responsible for the oversight of teachers and school administrators. In order to ensure that District public school teachers and their representatives are partners in the development of the ESEA Flexibility application, the Office of the State Superintendent (OSSE) facilitated open forums, extended office hours and provided online opportunities for teachers to participate in the development of the ESEA Flexibility application. OSSE met with representatives of the Washington Teachers Union (WTU) and the Council of School Officers, which is the association for DC principals. Additionally, teacher centered focus groups were held to ensure that the needs and concerns of District teachers are identified and addressed in the application. Teachers also participated in several of the focus groups detailed in the community engagement efforts included in this application. The outcome of these teacher centered outreach efforts is summarized below.

Teachers expressed general consensus for reforms such as 1) revised school level performance targets; 2) performance targets that cut the gap in non-proficiency by 50 percent over the next six years; and 3) the implementation of a rating system that considers multiple measures.

Some participants felt the annual measurable objectives should extend beyond the core subjects of mathematics and English Language Arts (ELA) in order to ensure that public schools in DC produce global citizens that are internationally competitive. Teacher retention and parental involvement were identified as critical components of school climate that should be included in a rating system. The importance of implementing evaluations based on assessments that are aligned to schools' curricula and that incorporate critical barriers such as chronic truancy was also emphasized. Members of the Mayor's Education Transition team expressed the importance of looking at teacher data when evaluating schools.

Some teachers suggested phasing in assessments as PARCC objectives are achieved. Others expressed concerns that growth measures may not capture growth for students whose performance falls several grades below actual grade level and that untested grades and subjects present special challenges in teacher evaluation. Options such as end-of-year tests, a portfolio of several assessments and external assessments (ex: ACT/SAT for high school) were discussed as optional measurements that could be used to inform teacher assessments.

Overall, there was clear support for multiple measures of teacher effectiveness and of reporting that will equip the community to recognize, reward, and learn from the schools and teachers that are effective. Teachers encouraged the adoption of strategies that would not prove to be overly

burdensome on the District such as the adoption of pre-existing assessments and existing data sets. Teachers expressed a desire for increased flexibility overall and cautioned against introducing unintentional rigidity by limiting the means of measuring student performance. It was suggested that growth measures be very lightly weighted in teacher evaluations given that that assessments for non-tested grades are of a different nature. Teacher union representatives suggested that assistant principals and possibly lead teachers be included in the teacher and leader evaluation requirements as crucial members of the leadership team.

Participants cautioned against holding schools and staff to the same goals without providing equitable support. Further discussion centered on concerns that accountability systems tend to be implemented such that supplemental services and supports are removed once a school improves significantly when the supplemental services may be critical to continuing improvements in performance.

Though supportive of reasonable and achievable objectives differentiated by school, participants expressed concern about having sufficient time to demonstrate progress prior to being obligated to implement prescriptive measures or being labeled as low. For example, secondary teachers were concerned about being held accountable for incoming grades after approximately seven months of instruction. This concern also was expressed by rapidly growing charter schools who were concerned about the appropriateness of using assessment data for newly arrived students to evaluate teacher or school effectiveness.

2. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes.

OVERVIEW: The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) conducted extensive outreach in order to meaningfully engage and solicit input on its ESEA Flexibility application. OSSE sought to gather early input from critical and diverse education stakeholders in the District of Columbia by providing opportunities for stakeholders to readily access information on the ESEA flexibility option and by soliciting public input via a variety of media. The outreach plan centered on a commitment to keeping the District's education community informed of and involved in the consideration and development of the ESEA Flexibility application in order to ensure that the needs and concerns of the District's public education stakeholders are addressed. A parallel goal of outreach and consultation efforts was to create or fortify partnerships with individuals and groups that will implement, support, develop or be impacted by the educational strategies identified in the application.

STRATEGIES: In addition to inviting public comment via the agency's website and at town hall meetings, OSSE ensured that select stakeholders impacted by the District's education program had opportunities to participate in smaller focus groups where unique needs and perspectives were discussed. To meet these objectives, the SEA worked to identify and leverage existing opportunities for seeking input. Accordingly, OSSE consulted with existing advisory groups, such as the DC Council, the State Board of Education, the State Committee of Practitioners, the Youth Advisory Council, Advisory Neighborhood Commissions (ANC), DC Teachers Union, the Human Capital Task Force, members of the Mayor's Education Transition Team, the Student Growth Measure

Task Force, the Common Core Task Force and the District's accountability peer review team. Participants included experts or advocates representing specific wards (geographical regions) and unique groups inclusive of homeless families, charter schools, delinquent students, faith based organizations, parents, students, teachers, LEA administrators, community based organizations, institutes of higher learning, special education experts, local businesses, community liaisons, and English language learners.

While initial efforts to seek input for the ESEA Flexibility application from the larger community focused on town hall meetings, the SEA strategy was subsequently revised to ensure that appropriate forums and media were utilized for each critical stakeholder group. As a result, focus groups were scheduled in various settings across the District in order to eliminate geographical, economical or temporal barriers. OSSE worked collaboratively with elected bodies including the State Board of Education, the DC City Council, and neighborhood associations to solicit public input through stakeholder roundtables, online video informational interviews, in-person meetings, and through our online public comment space. In addition, a focus group will be held in Spanish to eliminate potential linguistic barriers for the District's largest English language learner community.

Information regarding the ESEA Flexibility application was disseminated via the OSSE website, press releases, social media (i.e. Facebook, Twitter), email blasts, blogging, robo-calling and extended Open House and Office Hours. In addition, an SEA newsletter was published solely to address the ESEA Flexibility option. Participants were able to participate by phone, through written or electronic mail, by webinar, by teleconference, or during in-person meetings. More than 50 meetings, town halls, and focus groups were held with stakeholders to discuss reforms related to the Flexibility request. Once a draft application was prepared, an open comment period began and comments will be accepted until February 14, 2012.

The strategy of holding focus groups representing unique stakeholder communities produced critical feedback. Participants received an overview of the ESEA flexibility option and were advised that focus group results would be used to inform the application process. To facilitate and guide discussion, open-ended questions that became increasing specific were asked by SEA facilitators. Participants were encouraged to share opinions, concerns, priorities and perspectives relevant to the group and to the four principles of ESEA Flexibility. Discussions addressed how proposed reforms will change the future of DC public education. Finally, information was given regarding additional opportunities for participants to provide further input. Beyond the critical input shared below, focus group outcomes include a shared understanding of flexibility options, timeline, and process.

The following focus groups have been held:

Focus Group	Date
Public Charter School Board	11/4/2011
DC Public Charter School Board	11/7/2011
DC Council Chairman Kwame Brown	11/8/2011
DC Public Schools	11/8/2011
Race to the Top Student Growth Task Force	11/8/2011
DC CAS Technical Advisory Committee	11/15/2011
DC State Title I Committee of Practitioners	11/17/2011
Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)	11/21/2011

Workforce Investment Council (WIC)	12/5/2011
DC State Board of Education	12/7/2011
DC State Title I Committee of Practitioners	12/8/2011
Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Engagement- Outreach Specialist (8 Wards)	12/8/2011
Parent Information Resource Center Group	12/8/2011
DC Public Charter School Board	12/9/2011
DC Association of Chartered Public Schools	12/13/2011
Youth Advisory Group	12/13/2011
Teacher Focus Group	12/13/2011
DC Council	12/15/2011
Human Capital Task Force	12/15/2011
Members of the Mayor's Transition Team - Education Committee	12/19/2011
Friends of Choice in Urban Schools (FOCUS)	12/20/2011
Public Charter School Board	1/4/2012
Washington Teachers and Council of School Officers (WTU/CSO) Meeting	1/5/2012
LEA Leaders	1/5/2012
Organizations for English Learners	1/6/2012
LEA Leaders	1/9/2012
Education Advocates & Activists	1/9/2012
Institutes of Higher Learning	1/12/2012
Special Education Focus Group	1/12/2012
PTA Focus Group	1/13/2012
Special Education Target Group	1/17/2012
Special Education Target Group	1/17/2012
Institutes of Higher Learning	1/18/2012
Ward 5 Council on Education	1/17/2012
Capitol Hill Parent School Organization	1/17/2012
LEA Leaders	1/18/2012
ANC Leadership	1/18/2012

The following focus groups are scheduled to occur:

Focus Group	Date
CBO Subgrantees	1/23/2012
Community Based Organizations	1/23/2012
2F ANC	2/1/2012
Hearst PTA Meeting	2/1/2012 (tentative)
Palisades Citizen Association	2/7/2012 (tentative)
John Eaton Home & School Association	2/7/2012 (tentative)
ANC 1A	2/8/2012
3-4G ANC	2/13/2012
4B ANC	2/27/2012

CONTINUING OUTREACH: OSSE's efforts to engage and garner robust discussion regarding the proposed plan will continue until February 14, 2012. Specifically, OSSE will seek added input at Advisory Neighborhood Commissions in various wards, provide regular updates on Twitter to update the public, and continue to make ESEA Flexibility information readily available through press releases, media alerts, and OSSE web updates. OSSE will continue to provide ESEA Flexibility resources to the public, including an ESEA Flexibility Overview, Frequently Asked Questions, Focus Group Schedules, and the draft application. Outreach efforts will culminate with an open comment period which will close on February 14, 2012.

The following summary is not exhaustive but captures some of the most common input received across focus groups.

PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

There is support for this requirement across groups. Community advocates, the Youth Advisory Council (YAC), the Committee of Practitioners (CoP) and LEA participants emphasized the importance of including these expectations at the elementary level. Several participants requested reporting, resources and supports to address dropout, attendance, and college preparation from preschool through graduation. Members of the Mayor's Transitions team suggested that the SEA partner with local universities to develop training programs that provided both subject area expertise and the skills needed to meet the needs of a high poverty urban student population. Stakeholders expressed a desire for information that demonstrates the extent to which students will be nationally and internationally competitive.

There were suggestions that the current system of awarding Carnegie units as a graduation requirement be replaced by a competency-based concept of college- and career-readiness that would allow for alternate pathways to college and career readiness.

PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

Resetting AMOs- Focus groups generally agreed that current AYP targets had become unreachable and were no longer meaningful for the majority of the District of Columbia schools given that more than 90% of tested schools are projected to be in improvement or restructuring by the 2012-13 school year under the current accountability model. Informal polls showed a preference for setting annual targets to reduce achievement gaps by 50% within six years. Several groups indicated that provisions would need to be developed for unique groups such as students with special needs or who are English language learners.

Differentiated Recognition and Accountability: Groups generally agreed that that 1) an rating rating system with multiple indicators would provide more meaningful data, 2) the present accountability model does not accurately document school effectiveness and 3) that growth measures need to be incorporated into the accountability system. Although there was general consensus that multiple indicators would more accurately assess school effectiveness, many stakeholders expressed concern that identifying data sets that were common across LEAs would be very challenging and overly burdensome for the District. Several charter school advocates expressly

opposed State imposed measures that would create added burdens for LEAs and they encouraged OSSE to leverage work completed during the development of the Public Charter School Board's Performance Management Framework (PMF) and the DC Public Schools' School Report Card.

Growth Measures: Some participants felt growth measures were appropriate but that LEAs should be provided with flexibility in defining student growth, given that LEAs have unique assessments and suggested that where possible, OSSE could define and require LEAs to use standardized assessments. Conversely, several parents and community advocates asked that the plan address the need to provide stakeholders with transparent, meaningful and *comparable* data for all LEAs. Stakeholders discussed the need to consider if a single model would meet the needs of schools with specialized purposes (e.g., special education, alternative education, adult education etc.).

Other Measures: Although some charter school advocates preferred an accountability system that did not extend beyond federally mandated elements, other stakeholders felt that items that reflect the capacity of District students to be nationally and internationally competitive (e.g., writing, technology, etc.) should be included in the accountability plan. Most groups agreed on the importance of setting realistic attainable goals but expressed strong concern about the implied message of setting differentiated goals for schools or subgroups of students. The Youth Advisory Council expressed concern that differentiated targets would be interpreted as an indication of inferiority and that students, teachers, and administrators would not feel compelled to strive for achievement beyond that articulated in the accountability model.

Stakeholders also sought recognition of non-academic factors known to impact student achievement and advancement. Related discussions centered on phasing in indicators deemed critical but for which clear measurements are not available. The importance of parental and community involvement was discussed in several groups. YAC, community advocates, and parent members of the Parental Information Resource Center (PIRC) training program requested school climate indicators that address issues of safety, truancy and appropriate student/staff behavior. YAC, community activists and teacher groups indicated that teacher retention should be incorporated as an important measure. There were concerns about developing these and other measures of non-academic indicators (i.e. suspensions, expulsions, re-enrollment) and the potential burden on LEAs to develop new data collection and reporting strategies.

Members of the Mayor's transition team advocated the evaluation and inclusion of the impact of principal and teacher replacement on student performance. One participant expressed concern regarding the length of time that Teach for America teachers remain in a given school. COP members suggested that the accountability model include available measures such as SAT, PSAT, ACT; Advanced Placement results, International Baccalaureate outcomes, etc. LEA and charter school participants strongly advocated leveraging work done by DCPS and the Public Charter School Board in developing LEA level scorecards. There was general agreement that science should be included in the accountability model at some point but strong concern about the District's present current capacity to do so.

Parental Engagement: Parents and community advocates asked that the plan address the need to provide stakeholders with transparent, meaningful, and comparable data for all LEAs. Several participants noted that the currently accountability model did not assess effectiveness of Prekindergarten through second grade and included only one high school grade. Concerns were

expressed about implementing accountability measures that did not reflect inequities related to unique challenges, school level funding, school supports, and other resources at each public school.

Ward Liaisons: Ward liaisons asked for increased transparency regarding the amount of local funding directly provided to each school. YAC members cited differences in resources such as mentoring and internship opportunities that were not currently reported in state level reports. In general, there was a call for high quality reporting that provides comparable and meaningful data to parents.

Support and Interventions: Parent and community representatives advocated the inclusion of information regarding the distribution and availability of support and resources for schools that would not be identified as priority or focus schools. Community advocates strongly expressed concern about how the District could ensure that resources reached neediest school once federal funds were disbursed to LEAs.

The Committee of Practitioners (CoP) members expressed the importance of establishing a common understanding that all schools strive to meet common core standards. LEA administrators, COP members and Youth Advisory Council members (YAC) expressed concern regarding the absence of curricula aligned to common core standards. Charter school advocates stressed the importance of adhering to autonomy guidelines established by the DC Charter School Act as it relates to curricula.

YAC members and community advocates wanted performances measures that recognize inequities aligned to the unique challenges, funding levels, and school supports at the school level. Several groups identified the need for supports for professional development, classroom management and social challenges relevant to urban high poverty communities. CoP members sought endorsement from the SEA for LEA to LEA mentorship, increased opportunities to share best practices, and support in preparing for assessment based on common core standards.

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

Several groups felt that tremendous focus had been placed on hiring teachers with subject area expertise, while little attention has been given to the unique needs of a high poverty urban district and the skills that teachers need to succeed in these environments. Partnering with universities and LEAs to develop Bachelor of Education programs that prepare new teachers to succeed in high poverty urban environment was suggested as one way in which the state could support effective instruction. The need for such supports was echoed by student participants who felt that additional professional development was needed in order to equip teachers to manage the classroom environment more effectively.

There was a call for better data on factors known to impact school effectiveness such as truancy, teacher retention, suspensions and expulsions; and for the inclusion of this data in the development of interventions tailored to meet the unique needs of each population of students to be served. Participants also called upon the state to establish uniform comparable means of looking at school effectiveness and requiring the use of that data to inform the development of state level supports. Parents, neighborhood liaisons, students and teachers called for increased transparency regarding school level resources and funding. Lastly, community members asked for information regarding

programs that had proven to be effective and how such programs could be expanded.

With such transparency, stakeholders felt the education community would be better equipped to ensure that school level supports that are aligned with identified student needs and are likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

PRINCIPLE 4: REDUCING DUPLICATION AND UNNECESSARY BURDEN

In considering differentiated measures of accountability, stakeholders asked for diligence in ensuring that duplicative and burdensome reporting requirements that have little or no impact on student outcomes be avoided. Although most supported the inclusion of a growth measure, some stakeholders did not want to see additional measures added to the system because of the implied burden on LEAs. Most groups felt strongly that the state plan should leverage work and data systems already in place such as the work of the Mayor's Education Transition Team, the Race to the Top federal grant program, the Public Charter School Board's Performance Management Framework (PMF) and the DC Public Schools' School Report Card.

While most stakeholder groups acknowledged that a single accountability system would be the simplest strategy, there was strong encouragement to leverage the two existing systems of performance while working to address parent calls for comparable data across the public school system. Additionally, as noted previously, there were concerns about developing measures of non-academic and the potential burden on LEAs to develop new data collection and reporting strategies. Although there was general consensus that multiple indicators would more accurately assess school effectiveness, many stakeholders expressed concern that identifying data sets that were common across LEAs would be very challenging and overly burdensome for the District. Several charter school advocates expressly opposed State imposed measures that would create added burdens to for LEAs and violate the autonomy granted to charter schools under local law.

Stakeholders asked for more information regarding how the next ESEA authorization might impact the potentially burdensome task of identify common performance measures across all LEAs.

EVALUATION

The Department encourages an SEA that receives approval to implement the flexibility to collaborate with the Department to evaluate at least one program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs implement under principle 1, 2, or 3. Upon receipt of approval of the flexibility, an interested SEA will need to nominate for evaluation a program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs will implement under principles 1, 2, or 3. The Department will work with the SEA to determine the feasibility and design of the evaluation and, if it is determined to be feasible and appropriate, will fund and conduct the evaluation in partnership with the SEA, ensuring that the implementation of the chosen program, practice, or strategy is consistent with the evaluation design.

☒   Check here if you are interested in collaborating with the Department in this evaluation, if your request for the flexibility is approved.

Provide an overview (about 500 words) of the SEA's request for the flexibility that:

1. explains the SEA's comprehensive approach to implement the waivers and principles and describes the SEA's strategy to ensure this approach is coherent within and across the principles; and

2. describes how the implementation of the waivers and principles will enhance the SEA's and its LEAs' ability to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.

For many years, the District of Columbia has been and continues to be an innovator in areas of human capital recruitment, retention, and training; charter school innovation and cooperation; and school turnaround. As well, the District of Columbia offers both the experience and political will to demonstrate the feasibility of achieving exceptional outcomes backed by a strong reform agenda and aligned leadership and support. The list of factors that positions DC for success is long and includes a vibrant charter sector, a head start ?on reform under mayoral control, improved state-level capacity, a supportive network of leading local and national partners, and District-wide urgency around the work that remains to be done. This flexibility will provide the District an opportunity to leverage the work already begun as part of Race to the Top and will push education forward all students to be college- and career-ready.

In 2001, the passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was a watershed moment for education in the US. For the first time, state education agencies were required to develop standard assessments to measure student proficiency, enforce a system of accountability for schools, measure performance based on subgroups of students, identify underperforming schools, and implement prescribed interventions in those underperforming schools.

While the core tenants of NCLB are still relevant and important, the "one size fits all" approach is in need of revision. With proficiency targets between 70 and 74% in 2011, only 25 schools out of 187 in DC met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in both reading and math. Of those 25 schools, over half made AYP due to the safe harbor provision giving credit to schools that were able to reduce by 10% the number of students not meeting proficiency targets. Because of the current accountability requirements under NCLB, schools were not acknowledged for making great strides in student growth achieved from year to year or for demonstrating progress in other indicators that measure college and career readiness. Moreover, the prescribed interventions did not demonstrate significant improvement in student outcomes.

We respect the original intent of the federal law and want to build upon it so that we can more effectively measure school success. Like with NCLB, we expect that 100% of our students still meet proficiency in the common core state standards. In our proposed new accountability system, we are now also expecting that 100% of our students show growth each year.

The Office of the State Superintendent (OSSE) believes that students come first and what matters most is what happens in the classroom. OSSE also believes that the best qualified professionals to

impact student learning are teachers and school leaders. To that end, OSSE's Theory of action is that if we remove barriers to education and provide the necessary supports to maximize student learning, then school leaders and teachers who are best qualified to provide solutions can improve student outcomes.

ESEA flexibility will revitalize our current accountability system and set higher standards and expectations for teaching and learning. The improved accountability system will be based on a diversified set of annual measurable objectives (AMOs) that will allow OSSE, LEAs, and other education partners to target rewards and supports based on academic achievement and needs. The flexibility in the use of federal funds will ensure greater success in student outcomes and teacher and leader effectiveness. This improved accountability system will focus on incentivizing continuous improvement and support LEAs and schools that need assistance.

Politically, DC is unique. Its size, education governance, and reform structures enable aggressive change at the state level that is able to reach individual schools, classrooms, and students with great speed and impact. DC enrolls over 72,000 students in a little over 200 schools, with 90% of the students represented by 30 out of 54 LEAs that have committed to participate in Race to the Top (RTTT).

The implementation and sustainability of the principles required in the ESEA Flexibility request are underway as part of RTTT. In June of 2010, DC adopted the common core state standards. This year, the state assessment - DC CAS - will be aligned to the common core in English Language Arts with the math assessment being aligned to common core for next year's test administration. OSSE is also providing RTTT funding to DC Public Schools in its school turnaround work, applying one of four turnaround models to the persistently lowest-achieving 5% of schools as well as the broader lowest-achieving 20% of schools. OSSE plans to increase capacity and provide additional support to the lowest-achieving 20% of schools through a newly formed Office of Innovation and Improvement.

Also this year, teacher and leader evaluation systems will be implemented in RTTT participating LEAs. To achieve this outcome, OSSE worked in partnership with various task forces consisting of LEA representatives to: establish requirements for Race to the Top LEAs' teacher and leader evaluation systems, adopt a teacher value added model to identify level of teacher effectiveness, and develop an innovative statewide growth model that is currently being used by both charter and traditional public schools to compare schools' ability to improve student performance.

In an effort to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement, OSSE will focus this upcoming year on providing support, training, and technical assistance around: job embedded professional development and the provision of exemplars of best practice, the alignment of common core standards with state assessments, and the alignment of teacher and leader evaluation systems with common core standards.

We believe that pursuing the ESEA Flexibility opportunity is the right approach for education in the District of Columbia. Flexibility will provide the opportunity to increase proficiency, close achievement gaps, reward schools, and support LEAs and schools to enable continuous improvement and increase student outcomes. The waivers of certain ESEA provisions will free up resources in both time and money so that the school community can focus on its unique needs and provide information to parents to help them make better school choices.

PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

1.A   ADOPT COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

Option A	Option B
☒ The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that are common to a significant number of States, consistent with part (1) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards. i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)	☐ The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that have been approved and certified by a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), consistent with part (2) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards. i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4) ii. Attach a copy of the memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of IHEs certifying that students who meet these standards will not need remedial coursework at the postsecondary level. (Attachment 5)

1.B   TRANSITION TO COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Provide the SEA's plan to transition to and implement no later than the 2013–2014 school year college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and schools and include an explanation of how this transition plan is likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. The Department encourages an SEA to include in its plan activities related to each of the italicized questions in the corresponding section of the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance*, or to explain why one or more of those activities is not necessary to its plan.

Overview

The District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) is in a unique position to use the Common Core State Standards to launch the next level of reform for all

students in DC, both in our traditional public schools and those served by public charter schools. DC has 54 local education agencies (LEAs), one being a traditional public school system and 53 charter LEAs, with varying governances within the charter community. This structure and the charter LEAs' autonomy creates an opportunity for DC to serve as a model of school choice while maintaining the quality and rigor of instruction the Common Core State Standards demand.

The current learning standards in English language arts and mathematics, adopted by the State Board of Education in 2006, were recently given a B+ in English language arts and an A- in mathematics by the Fordham Foundation study. The Common Core State Standards were given the same grades, a B+ in English language arts and A- in mathematics. Teachers in DC have been trained in using rigorous standards to guide instruction which will be beneficial as we transition to the Common Core State Standards. While our current standards were rated as highly as the Common Core State Standards, DC knew there was more to do to raise the expectation of learning for our students.

It is OSSE's vision to ensure all students are college- and career-ready. The Common Core State Standards will focus our efforts to move that vision forward.

Adoption Process

After the NGA's Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO released the draft college and career readiness standards on September 21, 2009, DC proactively began the process of adopting the Common Core State Standards, and communication with stakeholders began immediately.

OSSE released a memo on October 1, 2009, inviting public comment on both the English language arts and mathematics standards. Two public surveys were designed and made available to stakeholders via the Internet, with a request for feedback by October 15, 2009. A joint public hearing of the DC State Board of Education and OSSE was held on October 7, 2009 to elicit public comment from the community.

Soon after the initial period for public comment, a joint letter was issued from former State Superintendent Briggs and former State Board of Education President Raymond to Gene Wilhoit, Executive Director of CCSSO on October 21, 2009, indicating the continued support of both OSSE and SBOE for the common standards.

When the draft standards in kindergarten through grade 12 were made available to state education agencies in March 2010, OSSE staff created a cross-walk of the District's existing content standards with the proposed draft standards to review the alignment of the Common Core State Standards with current DC standards in order to identify content gaps. OSSE staff brought in over 50 stakeholders to review the crosswalk and collect feedback. The stakeholders included school leaders, instructional coaches, educators, members of the business community, higher education faculty, and elected officials. Several public meetings were held to discuss the new standards, the changes the standards would bring, and gather feedback on the need to adopt.

The combined feedback was used to propose to the State Board of Education to adopt the Common Core State Standards, which they did on July 21, 2010.

Timeline for Implementation

After adoption of college- and career-ready standards, OSSE collaborated with all LEAs to move towards implementation. In a joint decision by the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) and other charter LEAs, it was decided that DC would target an aggressive implementation timeline, starting with 2011 – 2012 school year. Beginning in 2011 – 2012, instruction would focus on the Common Core State Standards for all students in English language arts and mathematics in grades K – 2. For grade 3 – 12, English language arts instruction would focus on the Common Core State Standards with a transition to informational text and writing to a text. The 2012 state assessment system in reading and composition, the DC CAS, would be aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Mathematics instruction would focus on priority standards, the DC mathematics standards that would most prepare students to be successful after the mathematics transition to start in 2012–2013. These standards were identified in consultations with Student Achievement Partners and are indicated on the 2012 blueprint DC CAS mathematics (appendix). In conjunction to the priority standards, teachers are encouraged to incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice into instruction, and these practices are included on the 2012 DC CAS blueprint.

Outreach and Dissemination

As a governing state of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), DC is prepared to provide the necessary guidance and direction its LEAs need to prepare students for success in college and in the workforce. Additionally, our continuing partnerships with Achieve, the American Diploma Project (ADP), Chief Council of State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) provide us with guidance and information to support our transition to the Common Core State Standards and assessments. In addition to these partnerships, OSSE did the following activities:

- A crosswalk of the current DC standards to the Common Core State Standards is posted on the OSSE website for teachers to use in their instructional planning. OSSE invited teachers to complete this work using the Achieve online tool, and then sent the analysis to a third party for the next iteration. The final version was reviewed and approved by selected teachers in DC, and this crosswalk was used to drive the blueprint for the 2012 DC CAS assessment.
- In June 2011, the 2012 DC CAS blueprint with the Common Core Alignment was distributed to all LEAs and posted on the OSSE website.
- In August 2011, each teacher for mathematics and/or English language arts in DC received a printed copy of the standards. These standards were sent to each school site where each building leader distributed them to educators.
- OSSE distributed printed PTA guides to schools for each student to have a brochure introducing the Common Core State Standards to take home to parents. These were created for English language arts and mathematics by grade and demonstrate to parents the importance of this shift and what they can expect in the classroom with the new standards.
- DC held meetings for LEA leaders and educators to explain the shift to the Common Core State Standards and how this will translate in the classroom. These meetings discussed the changes to the assessment, changes in instruction, and what these changes look like in the classroom. Several experts spoke at these meetings, including David Coleman, one of the

writers of the standards.

- Through Race to the Top, OSSE created a Common Core Task Force with members representing over 20 of our 30 LEAs. This task force helped to drive decision making around the implementation plan and became the Common Core experts for their LEAs to deliver updates and information.
- OSSE is currently working with a contractor to create an interactive website with professional development units, item banks aligned to the Common Core State Standards, information about the PARCC assessment, sample lesson plans, exemplar teaching units, student work, and teacher created videos. OSSE will maintain control of this site to ensure high quality materials aligned to the standards are posted.
- OSSE sends out monthly newsletters, updates the twitter page, and has plans for future public meetings.
- DC is currently planning an instructional and curriculum summit for summer 2012.

Special Populations

OSSE realizes the challenges implementation of the Common Core State Standards will present to special populations of students. The Common Core Standards are for all students and its implementation requires DC to make the standards accessible to all students.

For English language learners (ELLs), DC has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with WIDA to align the current language acquisition standards and assessment with the Common Core State Standards. We also convened a group of school leaders to discuss ESEA Flexibility and provide input on the proposed application, AMOs, and interventions.

DC is also a Member of the Assessment Services Supporting ELs through Technology System (ASSESTS) consortium. The consortium will build on the foundation of standards, assessment, professional development, and research already developed by the managing partner, WIDA, to provide comprehensive assessment tools in order to help English learners succeed in becoming college- and career-ready. The consortium will develop online summative, benchmark, and screener assessments in addition to formative assessment resources for use in the classroom.

Reviewing our student growth percentile data, our English language learners are those that are making the most growth across the district. DC will look to those successes to continue the growth in ELLs and will call together leaders in the ELL community to evaluate how to meet the needs of our ELL population while meeting the expectations of the Common Core State Standards. DC will provide professional development on English Language Development Standards, language differentiation during content instruction and assessment, and how to effectively use assessment results to increase student achievement.

For our special education students in our one percent group (the students taking the DC CAS Alternative test), it is most important that our current entry points are aligned to the Common Core State Standards to enable teachers to differentiate instruction according to an individual student's starting point and allow students to set challenging but achievable academic goals. These entry points are used to guide the portfolio assessment OSSE uses for these students. OSSE has currently aligned the DC CAS Alt Entry Points to the Common Core Standards for English language arts in preparation for this year's administration.

OSSE has joined the assessment consortium with the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC). Through the partnership with Workgroup 1 Community of Practice, OSSE will continue to develop performance level descriptors, claims, focal knowledge, skills and abilities for mathematics to provide information and guidance about the Common Core State Standards.

Once the Learning Progressions being created by NCSC are released, OSSE will work to adopt these progressions and plans to facilitate teacher and educator professional development on the use of the Learning Progressions to inform Individualized Education Plan (IEP) teams as well as how to link curriculum and intervention resources to ensure standards progression throughout the school year for all students.

DC currently has a Community of Practice (CoP) comprised of approximately 20 individuals including general and special education teachers as well as technical assistance providers to ensure the practicality and feasibility of the curricular, instructional and professional development modules that are developed by NCSC. The CoP receives training on the Common Core State Standards, the relationship between content and achievement standards, curriculum, assessment, and access to the general curriculum. The CoP will implement model curricula and help to refine and clarify materials and resources.

Finally, SEDS, the statewide special education data system, will be upgraded to align with the Common Core State Standards and the Learning Progressions. SEDS will contain a drop-down menu listing the Common Core Standards to inform IEP writers. This functionality will allow educators to use the database, not only to track IDEA compliance, but also to develop IEP goals aligned with Common Core Standards and to monitor student progress toward those goals. OSSE will provide training and support to all LEAs throughout this process, with this system ready for 2012 – 2013 school year.

Preparing for the Next Generation of Assessments

In preparation for the shift to the PARCC assessment, OSSE decided to begin transitioning the DC CAS for school year 2011 – 2012 to align to the Common Core State Standards. Starting in summer 2010, OSSE worked with its test contractor to modify the current DC CAS. All field test items on the 2011 DC CAS were aligned to a Common Core Standard, and in 2012 DC CAS, all items on DC CAS reading will be aligned to a Common Core Standard with a shift to informational text. The 2012 DC CAS math will focus on priority standards to better prepare students for the transition to math Common Core Standards in 2012 – 2013. These standards were identified as the critical skills and knowledge students need to know to be successful on the Common Core State Standards in math, and generally represent one or two essential skill sets for each grade. A complete list of priority standards can be found on the 2012 DC CAS Blueprint found in the appendix.

In addition, OSSE will field test/operationalize new composition prompts that are aligned to the Common Core Standards and focus on the skill of writing in response to a text. Both the reading and the composition DC CAS will report on the Common Core Standards in all reports, students, school, LEA and state levels. OSSE worked with its Technical Advisory Council to ensure that this transition maintains the achievement standards and does not disrupt trend lines in achievement.

Our transition to a fully-aligned DC CAS math to the Common Core Standards will be in three phases. Beginning in 2012-2013, the DC CAS grades 3-5 will be aligned to the Common Core Standards with all LEAs implementing those standards in grades K-5. In 2013-2014, we will include grades 6-8 in our implementation ultimately leading to all grades being aligned to the math Common Core Standards in 2014-2015. This tiered implementation will provide our LEAs with opportunities to address instructional gaps while directing greater attention to the Common Core Standards for mathematics so that all LEAs will be ready for the PARCC assessment in 2014-2015.

For the first time in 2012, OSSE will administer the DC CAS assessments in reading and math for grade 2 and reading for grade 9 that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Originally, these assessments were only for DCPS, our largest LEA. However, after several charter LEAs wanted to use the assessments, OSSE assumed the contract and will make the assessment available for no charge to charter LEAs as an option. At this time OSSE does not plan to require the assessment or to use the data at the SEA level; however, that decision may change in the future. The benefits to offering these assessments are that LEAs have another data point to determine student achievement and the second grade assessment gives LEAs an early indicator of students achievement aligned to the Common Core Standards.

Through Race to the Top, participating LEAs have agreed to adopt interim assessments in all schools that are aligned with the Common Core Standards. All other LEAs are encouraged to follow the same practice. LEAs adopting paced-interim assessments have developed a supporting professional development plan designed to build teacher capacity around using student data to drive instruction. Each LEA works with their vendor to collect the data in a timely manner so it can be analyzed by the LEA during professional development.

Supporting Teachers

In an effort to ensure the successful transition and implementation of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in all schools and for all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners, OSSE is providing on-going state level training in the areas of English language arts (ELA), math, pedagogy and assessment. The professional development will distribute the state level message as well as to assist those LEAs with greater needs around curriculum planning. Six instructional shifts have been identified by lead authors of the CCSS in both ELA and math. ELA shifts include balancing nonfiction and fiction text, building knowledge in the disciplines, a staircase of text complexity throughout the grades, text based answers, writing from sources and academic vocabulary. Math instructional shifts include focus, coherence, fluency, deep understanding, applications and dual intensity of practicing and understanding.

Rather than offering professional development that simply makes educators familiar with a set of standards, the trainings being offered by OSSE are delivered through the lens of the instructional shifts. This approach allows teachers to become familiar with the CCSS, compare former DC standards to the CCSS, as well as develop an understanding of how teaching, learning, and instructional materials will need to evolve in order to meet the demand of increased rigor found in the CCSS. Two specific examples of trainings addressing the CCSS instructional shifts include: Instructional Routines for Effective Small Group Instruction and Intervention and Authentic Performance Tasks.

To support teachers across the District of Columbia where approximately 55% of students (elementary and secondary) are scoring below proficiency in reading, the *Instructional Routines for Effective Small Group Instruction and Intervention* training is being offered. Based on the gradual release of responsibility model (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983) and targeted to address specific reading needs (comprehension, fluency, phonics, vocabulary), participants will learn six explicit and systematic instructional routines. These routines provide precise teaching moves in order to accelerate students' learning and answer the call for students reading complex text.

Answering the call for building knowledge in the disciplines, text based answers, developing deep understanding, and intense practice and understanding is the *Authentic Performance Tasks* training. Having a collection of motivating, authentic performance assessments with corresponding tasks and rubrics, aligned to CCSS, across grade levels and content areas is a key strategy to differentiate instruction. Using these tools effectively will also motivate students, increase achievement, and save teachers time. The seminar provides step-by-step procedures that will help educators make differentiated instruction happen in the classroom.

The trainings for mathematical practices will gather educators grouped by grade levels to explore the desired student behaviors needed to demonstrate proficiency and excellence in mathematics. Participants will engage in discussions that identify and examine ways they need to enhance their practice to incorporate the Standards for Mathematical Practice in their daily classroom activities and lessons. These trainings will be the conduit for continuous conversations with Professional Learning Communities at participants' schools and their Local Education Agencies. OSSE will support this process by having follow-up sessions which will allow participants to return and share the successes and challenges of implementing these practices.

LEAs must be integrally involved in supporting teachers as they bring the Common Core Standards to the classroom, and through Race to the Top, each LEA created an implementation plan to include professional development, curriculum alignment, program evaluation and analysis of quality material that was reviewed and approved by the Common Core Task Force. Each year LEAs must revisit and revise their implementation plan and include in their statement of work how they will support the transition to Common Core State Standards.

As a governing state of PARCC, DC will make available all resources provided by the consortium. DC serves as the chair for the Common Core Implementation and Educator Engagement working group. This group was integral in releasing the PARCC Model Content Frameworks and creation of Educator Leader Cadres. DC has disseminated the Model Content Frameworks and invited educators to take part in informational webinars. DC will also participate in the Educator Leader Cadres with members from both DCPS and the charter schools to build expertise in the field.

In 2012, a gap analysis, conducted by a third party, will determine areas of improvement and/or need as evident by scores on the DC CAS and the grade correlation between current DC Standards and the Common Core State Standards. Transition units will also be developed to help LEAs improve their instruction to the Common Core State Standards.

Increased Rigor

OSSE is currently working in collaboration with the State Board of Education to review and revise

the graduation requirements to include more focus on college and career readiness. Also, there was a bill introduced in council that would require all students to take either the SAT or ACT and apply to college as part of the graduation requirements. Through this application, OSSE is reviewing its reporting requirements and plans to include AP and IB participation and proficiency, ACT and SAT participation and performance, and other indicators of college and career readiness. OSSE is beginning to collect data through the State Longitudinal Data System (SLED) of post-secondary acceptance, attendance and graduation. All these work together to signal students, teachers and parents the shift to more rigor in the classroom.

Below is OSSE's plan for transition to common core state standards.

Key Milestone or Activity	Detailed Timeline	Party or Parties Responsible	Evidence (Attachment)	Resources (e.g., staff, time, additional funding)	Significant Obstacles
Conduct a professional development needs survey	August 2011	OSSE staff	Results of survey	Staff capacity	Completed
Create an interactive website	June 2012	OSSE staff, Contractor	Web address	Contract and procurement process	OCTO, Contract and Procurement, Capacity
Print and distribute PTA guides to all students	August 2011	OSSE staff, School personnel	Distribution list	Additional funding	Completed
DC CAS Aligned to Common Core - Blueprint released	June 2011	OSSE staff, Test vendor	Blueprint document	Staff capacity, additional funding	Completed

Conduct gap analysis	January 2012	OSSE staff, contractor	Result report	Staff capacity, additional funding	Capacity, Contracting
Create transition units in math	February 2012	OSSE staff, contractor	Sample unit	Staff capacity, additional funding	Capacity, Providing supportive guidance and information
Distribute PARCC/SBAC technology survey	March 2012	OSSE staff, PARCC	Survey results	Delay in creation of survey	Getting information in a timely fashion. Questions from LEAs.
Transition SEDS to align to the CCSS	July 2012	OSSE staff, Vendor	Screen shot of new system	Additional funding	LEA capacity, Accessing information, Compliance, Capacity, Contracting
Distribute printed CCSS in math and ELA	August 2011	OSSE staff, School personnel	Distribution list	Staff capacity, additional funding	Completed
Develop new composition prompts aligned to CCSS and offer professional development on the transition	November 2011	OSSE staff, Test Vendor	Sample prompt released	Additional funding	Completed

State professional development	Beginning Summer 2011	OSSE staff, Contractor	Professional development calendar	Staff capacity, additional funding	Pre-Activity, Space, Capacity, Low-Turnout, Participant Core Knowledge
Crosswalk reading standards to SPED entry points	July 2011	OSSE staff	Crosswalk document	Staff capacity	Completed
Publish historical writing data	December 2011	OSSE staff	Data charts	Staff capacity	Gathering all data. Creating a base line that is easily defined.
Review graduation requirements for math	January 2012	OSSE staff, State Board of Education	Final approved policy	Staff capacity	High School / Secondary Math Courses - whether they follow a traditional or integrated pathway.
Community Outreach	Beginning Summer 2011	OSSE staff, other stakeholders	Sample power point used	Staff capacity	Capacity, Participation

1.C DEVELOP AND ADMINISTER ANNUAL, STATEWIDE, ALIGNED, HIGH-QUALITY ASSESSMENTS THAT MEASURE STUDENT GROWTH

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

Option A	Option B	Option C
☐ The SEA is participating in one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition. i. Attach the State's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) under that competition. (Attachment 6)	☐ The SEA is not participating in either one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition, and has not yet developed or administered statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs. i. Provide the SEA's plan to develop and administer annually, beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year, statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs, as well as set academic achievement standards for those assessments.	☒ The SEA has developed and begun annually administering statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs. i. Attach evidence that the SEA has submitted these assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review or attach a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review. (Attachment 7)

PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

2.A DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATE-BASED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

2.A.i Provide a description of the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that includes all the components listed in Principle 2, the SEA's plan for implementation of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, and an explanation of how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

Despite its small size, the District of Columbia has diverse LEAs. It includes a traditional, geographic LEA (the District of Columbia Public Schools) and more than 50 individual charter LEAs, which range from small, single-school LEAs to multi-campus charter networks.

At the LEA level in the last few years, much work has gone into designing and publishing frameworks to be used in school evaluation. The Public Charter School Board created its Performance Management System and the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) is using its School Report Card system. These tools give valuable insight to how schools compare to each other in the service of students, and they give an array of valuable data points when evaluating schools.

In this special environment in DC, OSSE is committed to preserving LEAs' innovation and autonomy, in exchange for proven success in student achievement based on standardized test scores, including student growth measures. Under the new system, for schools that are producing great academic results, there are no prescriptive measures. For schools that are not making AYP (barring the Priority schools), the LEAs will still have full autonomy over instructional practices and improvement strategies. Schools will be required to identify areas of improvement, create a plan and monitor its implementation. However, the LEA will have full the ability to design its own system to complete these tasks within a framework for the planning and monitoring process established by OSSE.

DC ACADEMIC CHALLENGES

The best academic measure of comparative performance across states is the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Since 2002, it has been given in urban areas to allow comparisons of academic progress across large urban districts. In a state-to-state comparison, the District of Columbia has the lowest academic performance in the country, scoring as the 51st state on reading or math in 4th or 8th grade in 2011. While DC has looked better in recent years in comparison to other urban districts, it is still well below the national urban average at both 4th and 8th grade and in both reading and math.

Percent Proficient on the NAEP

	DC	National Urban	National Public
4th Grade Reading	19%	24%	32%
4th Grade Math	22%	30%	40%
8th Grade Reading	16%	23%	32%
8th Grade Math	17%	26%	34%

DC students are not achieving expectations at the same rate as students in other cities and states. This sets the context for any revised statewide system of accountability, intervention, identification, and support. Some other states have used the this waiver process as a way to recognize that the majority of schools within the state are successful and only failing to close AYP achievement gaps within their state rather than overall proficiency. DC has a different situation – most schools are still failing to make AYP because of the low overall proficiency levels of all students in many schools. As a result, DC is maintaining its commitment to holding all schools accountable and recognizes that, as one city, all students must make progress toward success.

Even with the need for significant improvement, and the need to close achievement gaps that exist, schools have shown academic progress. Since 2007, DC has shown tremendous growth in comparison to other states. The following charts show the academic progress made toward closing achievement gaps within DC since 2006 and compared to national performance since 2007.

Reading DC CAS Proficiency

	SY2005-2006	SY2010-2011
All Students	34.57%	45.46%
Asian	61.65%	71.51%
African American	31.52%	41.28%
Hispanic	39.53%	47.08%
White	84.43%	88.26%
Economically Disadvantaged	29.53%	38.33%
English Language Learners	31.37%	24.77%
Special Education Students	11.94%	15.94%

Math DC CAS Proficiency

	SY2005-2006	SY2010-2011
All Students	26.12%	47.03%
Asian	65.53%	82.02%
African American	34.00%	42.05%
Hispanic	31.49%	53.07%
White	79.67%	88.29%
Economically Disadvantaged	21.26%	40.95%
English Language Learners	26.83%	35.95%
Special Education Students	16.22%	18.87%

While both charts show substantial academic growth over the last several years the progress that has been made in mathematics is particularly notable. Additionally there have been truly substantial gains on the NAEP for DC as well. A recent article by Matthew Ladner noted, "If you combine 4th and 8th grade reading gains for general education students, and only look at Free and Reduced lunch eligible students for a bit of socio-economic apples to apples, here is what you find:

Combined NAEP Reading Gains (4th and 8th Grade) for Free and Reduced Lunch Eligible General Education Students, 2007-2011

State	Gain
Rhode Island	17
District of Columbia	17
Connecticut	17
Nevada	14
Alabama	13
North Carolina	12
Michigan	12
Georgia	11
Arizona	11
Wisconsin	10
New York	10
Massachusetts	10
Kentucky	10
New Jersey	9
Maryland	9
Indiana	9
Colorado	9
Vermont	8
Tennessee	8
South Carolina	8
Kansas	8
Florida	8
Arkansas	8
Mississippi	7
Louisiana	7
Illinois	7
Pennsylvania	6
Ohio	6
Nebraska	6
Hawaii	6
Delaware	6
Wyoming	5
New Hampshire	5
Missouri	5
Oklahoma	4
New Mexico	4
Washington	3
Texas	3
South Dakota	3
Minnesota	3
California	3
Alaska	3
Oregon	2
North Dakota	2
Virginia	1
Utah	1
Maine	1
Montana	-1
Iowa	-1
Idaho	-1
West Virginia	-2

The posting continues, stating, "DC students had the largest general education 4th grade reading gains in the country, and tie for first in the combined 4th and 8th grade reading gains. The District of Columbia, in short, made very substantial reading gains during the 2007-2011 period." These gains have likely been driven by the policy changes made in DC to support academic improvement.

EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT THROUGH POLICY

DC has made significant efforts to support academic achievement in schools through policy changes. Several areas of policy change are: a commitment to charter school autonomy, mayoral control, a focus on early childhood education, rigorous programs enacted under Race to the Top, and a strong program of school choice. A timeline of major policy initiatives is below.

In 1995, DC enacted one of the strongest charter school laws in the country. In the past fifteen years, charter schools have grown to serve over 40% of the District's students. This makes DC the largest state in the share of students enrolled in charter schools by a huge margin. This has a huge impact on the overall impact of DC educational policy by broadening the number of LEAs providing service to students in the district.

In 2007, DC passed the Public Education Reform Amendment Act. This turned control over DCPS to the mayor which set the stage for reinvigorated efforts in DCPS including closing low-performing schools, a new teacher contract, the IMPACT teacher evaluation system, and new momentum around improvement within DCPS generally. Additionally, the mayoral takeover legislation eliminated the lower-performing charter school authorizer and created OSSE – the state education agency independent of DCPS.

Two years ago, as council chair, current mayor Vincent Gray spearheaded an effort to establish universal high-quality pre-K that would be available to any DC 3 or 4 year old. This effort has been successful - according to the Quality Counts Education Week report released January 12th, 2011 DC has more than 65% of 3- and 4-year-olds enrolled in academic programs, and 87% of kindergarten students enrolled in academic programs – the highest participation rates in early childhood education in the nation.

In 2010, DC was a second round winner of the Race to the Top grant. This provided a unique opportunity for collaboration and best practice sharing across DCPS and public charter schools. DC's participation in Race to the Top has enabled an enhanced support system for the lowest-performing 10% of Title I schools, development of LEA and state level data systems to support instructional improvement, and new systems of teacher evaluation using student performance to 30 LEAs serving over 90% of K-12 students.

The sum of these efforts is significant reform across major areas of education policy. A new accountability system, through ESEA Flexibility, will allow DC to build on these other areas of policy reform.

ACCOUNTABILITY EFFORTS

DC is among a minority of states that is not currently implementing a state-level accountability system in addition to AYP. Instead the only accountability system that currently applies to every school in the District is AYP. This has resulted in identifying failing schools as successful,

identifying otherwise successful schools as failures due to low performance of only one subgroup, creating an accountability system widely recognized as meaningless and failing to result in meaningful interventions.

AYP continues to recognize failing schools as successes through the safe harbor provisions. This has resulted in the local accountability system failing to accurately portray the successes and failures of schools. Many of the lowest-performing schools make adequate yearly progress through small increases, despite very low levels of performance.

AYP in DC also often does recognize general academic success within schools with special education populations. In 2011, almost all schools that made AYP either were not accountable for special education students because they had so few or exclusively gave the alternative portfolio assessment. A far lower percentage of schools with special education students made AYP.

	Made AYP	Made Safe Harbor	Failed to Make AYP
Special education schools that give the alternative state assessment	3	0	0
Other schools accountable for special education students	0	2	70
Other schools not accountable for special education students	8	12	94

The AYP system has become largely seen as a meaningless indicator of school performance. EL Haynes (a public charter school) and FOCUS (a public charter school advocacy organization) have provided narratives describing this view in the appendices.

Unlike 32 other states, DC does not currently sanction low-performing schools. In general No Child Left Behind gives the responsibility for holding schools accountable for failing to make AYP to the LEA or charter school authorizer. This application intends to strengthen the DC accountability system through supporting the efforts of these groups, establishing a simple but better set of annual performance targets and supporting parent-based accountability.

PARENT-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY

DC has established strength within the school choice system. The vast majority of students select a school of choice. A recent research report by Russ Whitehurst at Brookings on school choice says "Information that is difficult to obtain, confusingly presented, or that doesn't permit easy comparisons among schools interferes with the choice process and promotes choices that do not accurately reflect the parents' intent." Additionally to support quality choices information on school choices should contain other information as described by Whitehurst.

> "This information is useful but falls far short of what parents need and would like to know about schools before they make a choice. Best practice for districts includes the provision of additional information on such things as student and teacher absentee rates, measures of parental satisfaction, and course offerings. Also important in a system of open enrollment is information on school popularity as revealed through the ratio of applications to slots."

Currently, school choice in DC is based on one of four primary, and potentially conflicting, sources of information, none of which currently includes all elements that are important for parents to make decisions.

1. PCSB needed a fair transparent system since the previous accountability system didn't use common measures. Schools chose their assessments and their goals. A low-performing school could meet objectives because they set a low bar, while a **high** performing school could fail to meet the standard if they high goals.

2. The purpose of the scorecard is to give parents, students and community members in the District of Columbia a clear, objective picture of school performance. By incorporating multiple measures of school quality into one tool, the scorecard presents a unique opportunity to compare schools' strengths and weaknesses across the District. Scorecards include information that parents have identified as vital to decision-making about their child's school, including school safety and culture, student achievement and growth, and family involvement in school.

3. Greatschools.net has produced comparable information on public, private, and charter schools in the school chooser document in coordination with OSSE. The current ratings do not match closely with the other reports.

4. FOCUS – a local charter school advocacy organization has created an interactive visualization system for looking at academic performance.

OSSE will obtain additional information that is not currently available in any of the other reports. Many of these are among the most important information for parents on schools – including college success results that can be mapped back to schools the students had previously attended.

Providing parents with higher quality information is a critical issue in DC because parents control one of the strongest accountability systems in the country and the strongest one in DC. Because there are thousands of unfilled slots available in other schools, parents could abandon any school based on a negative perception and in the process eliminate its funding. This has been the cause of the majority of charter school closures since 1996. A similar process has occurred in DCPS – as a notice in the DC register noted it is "severely under-enrolled, and as the smallest elementary school in the system is unable to sustain a viable" [school].

Right now when parents are making these accountability creating decisions they do so without access to the information they care about in readily comparable ways across schools and sector. As a result DC needs access to disseminate standardized reports including broad set of indicators. Public Charter School Board has expressed willingness to adjust their Performance Management Framework to match a unified set of information that can be useful for parents across schools.

MORE ROBUST SCHOOL LEVEL REPORTING FOR ALL SCHOOLS

OSSE will develop cross-sector reports – in collaboration with PCSB, DCPS, FOCUS, and Greatschools.net where possible that can empower all parents to make good educational decisions for their student. Below is a chart that provides the types of data elements we hope to provide in

the near future. It focuses on providing information related to academic achievement as it relates to proficiency, academic growth, school climate, college and career readiness, and special populations. This data will be available for all schools within the District of Columbia.

Student Achievement Total	
DC CAS Reading Proficiency	The percentage of students who scored proficient on the DC CAS
DC CAS Reading Advanced	The percentage of students who scored advanced on the DC CAS
DC CAS Math Proficiency	The percentage of students who scored proficient on the DC CAS
DC CAS Math Advanced	The percentage of students who scored advanced on the DC CAS
DC CAS Biology	The percentage of students who scored proficient and/or advanced on the biology or science DC CAS
DC CAS Composition	The percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced on the composition
Academic Growth	
Academic Growth in Reading	The school wide reading academic growth measure
Academic Growth in Math	The school wide math academic growth measure
Academic Growth lowest 25%	The MGP for the academic growth of the lowest 25% of students on the Math DCCAS in the school
Academic Growth top 25%	The MGP for the academic growth of the highest 25% of students on the Math DCCAS in the school
School Climate	
Re-enrollment	What share of students return on a regular basis
Attendance	The average percent of enrolled students who attended school on a daily basis (ADA)
9th Grade Completion	The percentage of 9th grade students who entered 10th grade at any school
Retention of most effective teachers	How many of the teachers that the school believes are most effective return
College and Career readiness	
Graduation	The percent of students who graduate
On –track to graduate	The percentage of SY2010-11 students who advance to the next grade
SAT/ACT participation	The percentage of students enrolled in 11th grade or higher that have participated in the SAT or ACT
SAT or ACT achievement	The performance of students on the SAT or ACT
AP/IB/college course enrollment participation	The share of students at appropriate grades that participate in AP, IP, or college courses while in high school
AP/IB/college course success	What share of students are successfully completing AP, IB, or college courses
Developmental courses	What share of students need developmental courses after entering a two or four year college
Career preparation	What share of students complete rigorous career preparation programs while in high school
College graduation	What share of students graduate from college

Special Populations (ELL/Special Ed)	
Access Growth	Weighted based on the number of ELL students, this measure is the number of students taking the ACCESS exam who demonstrated adequate growth
Special education quality metrics	How does the quality of the special education programs rate on the quality and compliance metrics

School Choice	
Number of newly enrolled students	The number of newly enrolled students in the previous fall
Number of applicants for enrollment	Number of applications for enrollment out of boundary or through the charter school application process
Mobility	The number of students moving to new schools prior to the final grade in the school

OSSE will collaborate with other organizations to ensure that parents across the entire city have access to comparable information on all schools and support in using that information. In a city of choice where low enrollment makes it financially difficult to continue a school's operation, parent choice serves as an additional accountability mechanism for all schools. To make effective use of this information parents need additional support in understanding the choices available to them and in making good decisions. They don't currently receive this support in a consistent way across sectors. As a result, OSSE will develop a program to provide support to parents in understanding school performance information and making school placement decisions. These decisions will remain the primary accountability system in the District, but DC will use a set of AMOs to identify schools that need support or deserve recognition for achievement.

2.A.ii   Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding information, if any.

Option A	**Option B**
☐ The SEA only includes student achievement on reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools.	☒ If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools, it must: a. provide the percentage of students in the "all students" group that performed at the proficient level on the State's most recent administration of each assessment for all grades assessed; and b. include an explanation of how the included assessments will be weighted in a manner that will result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve college- and career-ready standards.

Assessments Other Than Reading and Math

As a result of LEA feedback, the current science assessment (in place since 2008) will be delayed for inclusion as part of this AMO at half of the weight of reading or math until 2013. The inclusion of science in the accountability system is important because DC has made a significant commitment to science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), science is important for careers in the next century, and LEAs are incentivized to broaden their curricula beyond reading and mathematics. The one-year delay for inclusion allows time to prepare for the raised stakes of the science assessment and avoids pushing mid-year curriculum changes without adequate opportunities for planning. The current science proficiency results show that this may be an area that would benefit from additional attention being a part of the accountability system.

The State Board of Education adopted the current DC Science Standards in 2007. The first DC CAS Science assessment was administered in 2008. The process for designing the assessment and the steps for continued development are as rigorous and valid as with other DC CAS assessments, including reviews by educators and curriculum experts, content and bias reviews, pre and post equating from year to year, and data analysis of the results.

OSSE has made great improvements in the assessment since 2008, and it is in the final stage of peer review, with full approval expected by June 2012. The assessment has been found to be psychometrically sound and results can accurately be compared from one year to the next.

While DC is proud of these accomplishments, we realize the need for continuous improvement. OSSE has committed to consider the Next Generation of Science Standards for adoption once the completed frameworks are available. OSSE is a member of the Council for State Science Supervisors (CSSS) and is actively engaged in the work CSSS is doing to assist states through the adoption process of the new standards. These steps show we are committed to providing the highest quality of standards possible to our students and educators.

DC CAS Proficiency Rates
Grade 8

DC CAS Proficiency Rates
Grade 10

A similar situation exists with the DC CAS Composition assessment. It will be newly aligned with the common core writing standards starting with the 2012 DC CAS administration. The shift will require a student to read a text and respond to the text in writing, a key instructional shift found in the Common Core State Standards. The standards place a premium on students writing to sources, and this will be an important message to the field to increase rigor in the classroom. Also, both informational and literary texts will be represented, requiring the student to possibly contrast arguments, analyze assertions, and otherwise apply critical thinking skills to engage with written material.

Grade 4 Composition

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Below Basic	9.60%	6.85%	11.33%	10.91%
Basic	50.40%	54.96%	56.47%	54.97%
Proficient	31.50%	32.34%	28.01%	25.95%
Advanced	8.50%	5.85%	4.19%	8.16%

Grade 7 Composition

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Below Basic	5.40%	3.33%	6.83%	5.98%
Basic	57.40%	54.60%	47.79%	60.71%
Proficient	30.80%	37.72%	33.84%	27.44%
Advanced	6.40%	4.35%	11.54%	5.88%

Grade 10 Composition

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Below Basic	5.10%	15.66%	17.64%	12.28%
Basic	56.40%	59.75%	53.56%	56.71%
Proficient	34.30%	20.47%	22.41%	22.63%
Advanced	4.30%	4.12%	6.39%	8.38%

As a result of LEA feedback that 2012 will be the first time the newly aligned assessment is given this will become a part of the proficiency AMO starting with the 2012 administration. This will allow LEAs time to get familiar with the assessment and to continue curriculum alterations in response to the DC adoption of the common core curriculum for statewide assessment.

2.B   SET AMBITIOUS BUT ACHIEVABLE ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Select the method the SEA will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. If the SEA sets AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, the AMOs for LEAs, schools, or subgroups that are further behind must require greater rates of annual progress.

Option A	Option B	Option C
☐ Set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group	☐ Set AMOs that increase in annual equal increments and result in 100 percent of students achieving proficiency no later than the	☒ Use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and

and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The SEA must use current proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs. i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.	end of the 2019–2020 school year. The SEA must use the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs. i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.	subgroups. i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs. ii. Provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs in the text box below. iii. Provide a link to the State's report card or attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the "all students" group and all subgroups. (Attachment 8)

ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

As stated previously, we respect the original intent of the federal law and want to build upon it so that we can more effectively measure school success. Like with NCLB, we expect that 100% of our students still meet proficiency in the common core state standards. In our proposed new accountability system, we are now also expecting that 100% of our students show growth each year.

A simple set of Annual Measurable Performance Objectives (AMOs) will be used to identify schools for reward, priority, focus, and other schools showing improvement status. These measures include but are broader than the existing measures based on proficiency. Additionally they are set in a way that is ambitious and achievable. As a result we believe it is critical to switch to a more meaningful set of AMOs to make AYP determinations that not only hold schools to higher standards but also do a better job of identifying which schools are performing and improving.

Simplicity was a key factor in initial conversations about ESEA Flexibility. For this reason the DC statewide accountability identification and AMOs will be based on only three factors. This is not because the selected factors represent the only valued aspects of educational performance, but because they are sufficient to identify a number of schools that can serve as a focus for statewide support. OSSE will explore additional AMOs for inclusion over time including possible statewide

ACT/SAT testing, additional middle school subjects, 2nd and 9th grade DC CAS assessments, and school readiness assessments for lower grade students. Additionally OSSE will seek to benchmark the AMO's to international indicators of academic progress over time.

Proficiency AMO

The first AMO is an annual measurement of proficiency on the statewide assessments. This will include reading and math for SY11-12 and add science and composition at half the weight of reading and math for SY12-13.   This AMO will measure the overall share of all students in a school that are achieving at the proficiency level as well as the share of each individual racial, ethnic, socio-economic status, disability status, and language status group. This is important as will help push closure of achievement gaps by setting high standards for all students. The AMO targets are based on the school year 2010-2011 school proficiency results. The targets for all groups except for special education will be based on the performance of the "all students" group within the school. In DC a minority of schools have substantial representation from multiple racial/ethnic subgroups.   For special education and English language learners the targets will be set based on the current special education and English language learner proficiency within the school respectively. The independent targets are being set out for ELL and special education students because the current proficiency rates are dramatically less than those of other groups. It is therefore important that the targets are differentiated to ensure they are achievable. One historical problem with AYP is that it has not been possible to be successful at achieving school-wide targets in reading English with students who are English language learners.

DC will report whether or not the AMO is met for "all students" within a school and also for each NCLB subgroup. This will ensure that the achievement gap demonstrated in the overview for section two is the emphasis of the accountability system. Additionally, the targets will set out a reduction by half in the share of students who are not proficient over six years, which will hold schools accountable for closing the achievement gap.

Growth AMO

Academic progress or growth is an important indicator in a state with low achievement. Often, when students are so far behind academically it can take multiple years to move them to the proficiency level. Efforts to accomplish this are currently unrecognized within the AYP system. Given that the majority of DC test takers are not yet proficient it is important to recognize and value these efforts to build proficiency. Additionally many critics have expressed concerns over the years that accountability under "No Child Left Behind" incentivizes schools to only focus on students who could end up either below or above the proficiency mark – rather than paying attention to the highest performing students who are likely to continue to exceed the proficiency level or the lowest performing students who are unlikely to be able to achieve proficiency under herculean efforts within one year's time.

Including growth as one of only three indicators properly places the emphasis on academic growth for all students regardless of their starting levels of academic achievement.
DC unveiled a new growth model this year based on the Colorado normed growth system. Median growth percentiles compare the academic growth of students with a similar starting point to determine how a student is growing in comparison to others. This has substantial value but is not appropriate for an AMO growth measure. In the Colorado approach when some schools

improve their growth it will necessarily be reflected in lower growth in other schools – as only 50% of students can exceed the 50th percentile for growth. As a result the DC CAS technical advisory group recommended we adopt an alternative approach to measuring academic growth that other states had found more appropriate for this purpose and was also easier to illustrate.

Many states use a value chart that assigns a value to the academic improvement that a student makes. These value charts are designed so that a school can only be fully recognized based on how many students are showing growth or are staying at the top levels. This type of model uniquely places the emphasis on all students within a classroom as adequate growth of every student is the measurement. OSSE proposes to coordinate the development of such a value-added model prior to the implementation of the new AMOs under the ESEA Flexibility plan.

The targets for the Growth AMO will be set in a similar fashion to the approach for proficiency. This approach is modeled after option A for AMOs that expects the percentage of students not meeting state targets to reduce by half over a period of 6 years. DC will expect each school to show academic growth based on the number of students statewide that demonstrated growth in SY2010-2011. The expectation will be that the share of students not demonstrating academic growth will be reduced by half over a period of six years.

This AMO will be calculated not just for all students within a school but also for all no child left behind subgroups. This will ensure that achievement gaps in academic growth are not tolerated by the accountability system. Additionally because the targets are based on a reduction by half in the share of students who are not growing academically over a period of 6 years subgroups with lower growth rates will be expected to improve the share of students making growth at faster rates than higher growth subgroups – closing the achievement gap.

Graduation AMO

The third measurable objective will be graduation rate. ED Week recently estimated the cohort graduation rate for the District of Columbia at 48%. While the first official calculation of graduation rate by OSSE will not be completed until the end of this month this is clearly an important area of focus for an accountability system.

The current accountability system uses the leaver rate, where a student is only counted as a non-graduate if they have been self-reported by an LEA as a dropout. LEAs may underreport and so this rate is widely considered to be inaccurate. As a result this new graduation AMO will use the cohort graduation as the basis for the accountability system. As with all other AMOs for DC it will be calculated based on the statewide cohort graduation rate baseline year of SY2010-2011 and will have targets based on reducing the portion of students who do not graduate by half over 6 years.

This AMO will be calculated not just for all students within a school but also for all no child left behind subgroups. This will ensure that achievement gaps in academic growth are not tolerated by the accountability system. Additionally because the targets are based on a reduction by half in the share of students who are not graduating over a period of 6 years subgroups with lower graduation rates will be expected to improve the share of students graduating at faster rates than higher graduation rate subgroups – closing the achievement gap.

Attendance AMO

As a third AMO in place of the graduation rate for schools that do not go through twelfth grade OSSE will create an attendance annual measurable objective. As with the other AMOs it will be reported by subgroup but all students will be expected to meet targets set based on the current attendance percentage. This will follow the existing approach to measuring attendance under NCLB, but will use the 2010-2011 school year as a baseline and require schools to reduce the number of absentee students by half over 6 years.

AMO Targets

The annual targets for the AMOs are calculated in a way that is very similar to the approach of option A. For each of proficiency, growth, and graduation rates the state will take a snapshot of school year 2010-2011 performance and expect the percentage of student not achieving the DC expectations to decrease by half over a period of six years.

2.C   REWARD SCHOOLS

2.C.i   Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools.

IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

The identification of schools as reward, priority, focus, or other school not making progress is based on the three AMOs defined above – proficiency, growth, and graduation. Proficiency is a demonstration of whether a student has achieved the grade level expectations for a subject in question – fundamentally can the student demonstrate that they have learned what the school was expected to teach. Even in public charter schools where they school is not required to utilize the DC curriculum this is a way to evaluate if a student has successfully met or exceeded the District of Columbia curriculum standards as they are expected to under the school reform act. Additionally the importance of proficiency has already been recognized and it is included in the current AYP system.

Growth provides a check against the criticisms of proficiency that have been brought out over the last few years. Some critics assert that schools' have chosen to focus their attention on students near proficient status to best help them achieve the proficiency metric – ignoring the districts highest and lowest performing students. Growth measures ensure that learning of all students is considered not just those near the proficiency line when evaluating schools. Additionally growth measures recognize that in some cases it may take multiple years for a student that is far behind academically to catch up – but there is still value when a student is making rapid academic progress even if they have not achieved the state proficiency goal. LEAs provided feedback that growth was amongst the most critical factors for a school and so it has been included as one of only three measures for academic achievement.

Graduation is a precondition in almost all cases to success in college and career. The value of

proficiency and growth measures at the high school level is more limited than their value in elementary and middle school programs as many high schools have only one grade of students making up approximately a third of their students taking the test. Additionally attendance is a reflection of whether a school has engaged the student sufficiently to promote academic improvement. This will be used as an alternative to graduation for schools that do not serve 12th grade students. Additionally the nation has already recognized the importance of all of these measures either through AYP or the ESEA Flexibility application and so it is appropriate to include them as a part of the AYP system.

Department of Education has laid out a template for the identification of schools worthy of reward on January 5th. This system is a natural match to the AMOs in use in DC as well as the academic needs of students in the District. A school will be identified for rewards if it is a Title I school and it is either:

- In the top 10% of schools for growth with its "all students growth" AMO and makes all Growth AMOs; or

- In in the top 5% of schools for proficiency with its "all students proficiency" AMO and makes all proficiency AMOs

2.C.ii   Provide the SEA's list of reward schools in Table 2.

2.C.iii   Describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools.

The DC Office of the State Superintendent of Education will recognize and reward highest-performing and high-progress schools in multiple ways. OSSE developed its current Academic Achievement Awards policy, aligned with the current ESEA requirements, during the 2010-11 school year in consultation with its Committee of Practitioners. OSSE also reserved Title I funds to make financial rewards to Title I schools that made adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years. The plan outlined here builds on the current policy and leverages reserved funds that remain available. The most significant change will be that OSSE will be able to provide financial rewards from reserved Title I funds to highest-performing and high-progress Title I schools according to the identification methodology described above, whereas under current law OSSE can only use funds reserved for financial rewards for Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.

OSSE will identify schools, using the methodology described above, eligible to receive a Superintendent's Award in two categories: Proficiency and Progress. A school may receive both awards in a single year if it meets the criteria for both awards. For both categories, types of recognition may include:

- Letter/s of recognition from the State Superintendent, President of the State Board of Education, Deputy Mayor for Education, and/or the Mayor;
- School visit by the State Superintendent, President of the State Board of Education, Deputy Mayor for Education, and/or the Mayor;
- Certificate identifying the school a recipient of the Superintendent's Award for Proficiency

and/or the Superintendent's Award for Progress, presented to each school at a State Board of Education meeting;

- Press release announcing Superintendent's Award recipients;
- Eligibility for OSSE nomination as National Title I Distinguished School and/or Blue Ribbon School (as a prerequisite; not all award recipients will be nominated);
- Special invitation to nominate one staff person to compete for one of two new "Superintendent's Award Recipient" positions (one for Proficiency and one for Progress) on the DC State Title I Committee of Practitioners;
- Invitation to participate in a Superintendent's Award colloquium to present/discuss practices that drive proficiency and progress within Title I schools;
- Technical assistance from OSSE to prepare a presentation for the next National Title I Conference;
- Invitation to nominate staff to mentor lower-performing and low-progress schools as Superintendent's Ambassadors;
- Eligibility for substantially reduced SEA monitoring; and
- Eligibility for Title I schools to apply for financial rewards, as funding is available and as described in more detail below.

While all schools that meet the criteria to receive a Superintendent's Award for either Proficiency or Progress will receive the same non-monetary recognition, some Award recipients will also be eligible to apply for financial rewards in any year that funding is available from a reservation of Title I funds under Section 1117(c) of the ESEA (either from that fiscal year or carried over from a previous fiscal year), or from some other source.

All Award recipients that meet the following additional criteria, during the school year for which they met the Superintendent's Award criteria, will be eligible to apply for a financial reward:

- Had a poverty rate of at least 35 percent;
- Received a Title I allocation and operated a Title I program; and
- Enrolled students without a selective admission process.

The application will require Award recipient schools to identify the practices that led to their high levels of proficiency and/or progress and to propose uses of funds that either (1) ensure the continuation or expansion of those practices and/or (2) address other practices that need to improve to build on previous success. The Committee of Practitioners will serve as the review panel, after applications are received, advising OSSE on the selection of schools to receive financial rewards.

OSSE will develop and distribute information on a methodology for determining reward amounts for schools selected to receive financial rewards. Based on previous consultation with the Committee of Practitioners, reward amounts will be differentiated based on the size of a school's population, the number of consecutive years the school met the criteria to receive a Superintendent's Award, the poverty rate of the school, exact rates of Proficiency for schools eligible based on Proficiency, and exact rates of Progress for schools eligible based on Progress.

2.D   PRIORITY SCHOOLS

2.D.i   Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying a number of lowest-performing schools equal to at least five percent of the State's Title I schools as priority schools.

Priority schools are the lowest performing schools in the state. While, under the ESEA Flexibility requirements, DC has already fulfilled its obligation to identify 5% of the lowest performing schools – through the title I persistently lowest achieving schools list. These schools will all be automatically identified as priority schools for a 3 year period. However DC has already provided substantial funding and support for school improvement in these programs. Given that this group of schools is already receiving adequate resources and support only designating these schools as the priority schools is insufficient. This is particularly true given the academic challenges and achievement gap demonstrated earlier. As a result DC will identify additional priority schools that demonstrate multiple years of extremely low performance in proficiency, growth, or graduation rate. This will include any school that:

- Is in the bottom 5% of schools in proficiency for the "all students proficiency" AMO for two years in a row and has not made the growth AMO for all subgroups for two years in a row; or

- Is in the bottom 10% of in schools in growth for the "all students growth" AMO for two years in a row and has not made the proficiency AMO for all subgroups for two years in a row.; or

- Has a graduation rate below 60% for two or more years in a row and has not made the proficiency and growth AMOs for two years in a row.

- Has been identified as a focus school for three years in a row

The inclusion of multiple years before identification eliminates the possibility that a school can be identified for one poor year of performance. Additionally it provides an opportunity for schools that are among the lowest in the state for proficiency and showing success in growth to not be falsely identified as underperforming. Finally it complies with the Department of Education parameters that schools that fail to achieve a graduation rate of 60% for multiple years be identified for additional support.

Additionally, while the AMOs could be calculated for previous school years the first results that will be used for identification of schools will be SY11-12, making the end of SY12-13 the first time that a school could meet the criteria for identification as a priority school and SY13-14 the first year that additional schools will be subject to the requirements of priority schools.

2.D.ii   Provide the SEA's list of priority schools in Table 2.

2.D.iii   Describe the meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles that an LEA with priority schools will implement.

SCHOOL CATEGORY:	Reward School	Good Standing School	Continuous Improvement School	Focus School	Priority School
Receives SEA Recognition	Yes	No	No	No	No
Eligible to Receive SEA Financial Reward	Yes	No	No	No	No
Maximum Flexibility in the Use of Funds	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Create Continuous Improvement Plan	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Implement Self-Selected Activities	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Fund/ Receive Quality School Review to Inform Plan	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Work with Continuous Improvement Coach	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Implement One of Four Specific Intensive Intervention Models	No	No	No	No	Yes
Participate in Mandatory SEA Professional Development	No	No	No	No	Yes
Utilize Online Turnaround Planning and Monitoring Tool	No	No	No	No	Yes

The chart above provides a summary of the interventions required for (and recognition/rewards provided to) schools with classifications as priority, focus, and reward schools, along with two other categories (progress schools and watch schools) that differentiate, based on progress, among the schools that are not classified as priority, focus, or reward schools. In Sections 2C, 2D, 2E, and 2F, specifically, further details and explanation are provided related to the information in this chart.

OSSE recognizes the significant value added by supplemental reports that are available to LEAs and schools across DC due to work completed by the District of Columbia Public Schools and the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board. Both the District of Columbia Public Schools' School Report Card and the District of Columbia Public Charter School Board's Performance Management Framework provide comprehensive information on school performance, going beyond the more focused data incorporated into the state education agency's criteria for classifying schools for recognition, accountability, and support. This information should be used by LEAs and schools to more specifically inform the assessment of needs and planning for continuous school improvement. Within the system of interventions outlined, above in chart form and below in narrative form, LEAs and schools retain the autonomy and responsibility for identifying and implementing strategies and activities that will most significantly and positively affect student achievement.

OSSE will require an LEA with priority schools to implement, after a one-year planning period, one of the four School Improvement Grant (SIG) models (see http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/2010-27313.pdf) in each of its priority schools. In addition to providing SIG funding that may be available to support the implementation of these models in schools that meet the federal criteria for receiving SIG funds, OSSE will require an LEA with one or

more priority schools to reserve a necessary and reasonable amount from its Title I allocations during the three-year implementation period, to support the implementation of one of the SIG models in each priority school. Just as under the federal regulations for School Improvement Grants, an LEA with priority schools may only implement one of the SIG turnaround models in fewer than all of its priority schools if it sufficiently demonstrates to OSSE that it lacks the capacity to do so. An LEA with priority schools must submit a full plan for the implementation of the selected model to OSSE for approval.

In addition to implementing each of the components of one of the SIG models in each of its priority schools, OSSE will also require the LEA, supported by the funds mentioned above, to do the following for each of its priority schools, unless the LEA sufficiently demonstrates to OSSE that (1) it lacks the resources to do so and (2) can fully implement the selected model without fulfilling these requirements.

School-Level Requirements

- Provide funding for a quality school review to be conducted by an OSSE-approved team in the year before implementation using a revised version of the "Patterns of Practice" tool originally developed by OSSE with assistance from the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center or, upon request from the LEA and approval by OSSE, another tool that will be used in each of the LEA's priority schools and meets the following criteria:
    - o It uses a research-based framework of indicators of effective practice that cover significant areas of practices such as leadership, professional development, curriculum, assessment, instructional planning, classroom instruction, school culture, and parent and community involvement
    - o It aligns with the LEA's framework and tool used for continuous school improvement planning and monitoring
    - o It requires, and documents the results of, assessment of the school's practices against the indicators of effective practice, with options of "full implementation," "partial implementation," and "no implementation;"
- Provide funding for a quality school review (according to the same requirements described above) in each of the years during implementation of the selected intervention model, except that a quality school review will only be required in the year before implementation for any school for which an LEA implements the school closure model;
- Coordinate with OSSE to schedule the quality school reviews and, in each case, a debrief with school leadership;
- Use the reports from the quality school reviews to select the most appropriate intervention model, plan for its implementation, and make adjustments during the course of implementation, subject to OSSE approval;
- Fully utilize the online turnaround planning and monitoring tool adopted by OSSE for priority schools, which was developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement;
- Fully participate in state professional development for priority schools and LEAs with priority schools;
- Work with an OSSE-approved turnaround coach to provide ongoing support for the full period of implementation, supplementing any staff already supporting turnaround activities within the school and/or LEA. Turnaround coaches will be recruited, hired and trained by OSSE. They will provide support and build capacity in the ability of the school improvement team and team leader to guide and manage the systemic changes that will lead to the desired

educational outcomes for students. Coaches will support school improvement teams as they assess current practices based on indicators of effective practice, develop an aligned school improvement plan, implement the plan, monitoring the plan's implementation and revise the plan. LEAs must ensure that the OSSE-approved turnaround coach is an integral part of the school's leadership team.

LEA-Level Requirements

For any LEA that began implementation of a SIG intervention model in a priority school prior to this ESEA Flexibility request, the above requirements will apply beginning with the first full school year after approval of this request.

Any LEA with more than one priority school must:
- Utilize the CAPStar continuous district improvement planning and monitoring tool, a free online tool customized from the Center on Innovation and Improvement's Indistar system to
  - assess the District's implementation of indicators of effective practice,
  - select priority objectives aligned to those indicators,
  - plan action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives,
  - implement those action steps, and
  - evaluate progress;
- Provide funding for a quality district practice review to be conducted by an OSSE-approved team as soon as practicable after the identification of more than one priority school within the district;
- Provide funding for a quality district practice review (according to the same requirements described above) in each of the three years following the identification within the district of more than one priority school;
- Coordinate with OSSE to schedule the quality district practice reviews and, in each case, a debrief with LEA leadership;
- Use the reports from the quality district practice reviews to inform continuous district improvement, including:
  - the assessment of indicators of effective practice,
  - the selection of priority objectives aligned to those indicators,
  - the planning of action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives,
  - the implementation of those action steps, and
  - the evaluation of progress.

2.D.iv Provide the timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year and provide a justification for the SEA's choice of timeline.

All priority schools that were previously identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools will complete their three-year interventions by the end of the 2012-13 or 2013-14 school years. Having learned the importance of an extended planning period, OSSE will require all newly-identified priority schools to spend at least one half of one school year planning for the implementation of

one of the four SIG turnaround models. Schools listed in 2.D.ii that were not previously identified at persistently lowest-achieving schools will initiate this planning in the 2012-13 school year and begin implementation of the selected model by the beginning of the 2013-14 school year. This means that all newly identified priority schools will be in year two of a three-year intervention model by the 2014-15 school year.

OSSE believes that this timeline aggressively targets persistently low-performing schools for intensive intervention and support by identifying schools beyond the minimum number of schools the state education agency is required to identify at this time, while also providing sufficient time for planning by schools, LEAs, and OSSE to ensure full, effective implementation that will lead to dramatic increases in student achievement within newly-identified priority schools.

2.D.v   Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status and a justification for the criteria selected.

At the end of each school year during the three-year implementation of a SIG intervention model, OSSE will determine if each priority school has made "significant progress," "some progress," or "little/no progress" in three areas: meeting academic goals, progress on U.S. Department of Education-defined leading indicators, and progress toward fully implementing the selected intervention. Based on these three, independent determinations, OSSE will make a summary determination of whether the school is making sufficient progress. In doing so, OSSE will use the same detailed criteria it uses for SIG-served schools to make renewal award determinations; these are inserted below (under "Detailed Criteria for Determinations of Sufficient Progress").

A school will remain identified as a priority school until it demonstrates sufficient progress toward full implementation of its selected intervention model for three years (not necessarily consecutive), subject to revisions each year that it fails to demonstrate sufficient progress. At that time, the school will automatically transition to identification as a focus school for the subsequent three years.

If a school is deemed to be making sufficient progress at the end of each of the originally-planned three years of implementation, then the school will exit priority status at the end of the original three-year implementation period. If, however, a school is deemed not to be making sufficient progress at the end of any year during its three-year implementation, it will be required to adjust its plan and one additional year will be added to its overall intervention timeline. For example, if a school makes sufficient progress in years one and two, but not in year three, a fourth year will be added to its implementation, after which it may exit priority status if it makes sufficient progress during that fourth year.

The chart below shows several examples of exit timelines for priority schools; "Yes" indicates that sufficient progress was made, "No" indicates that sufficient progress was not made, and "Exit" indicates that the school exited priority status at the beginning of the school year.

School	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
School A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Exit		
School B	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Exit	
School C	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Exit

These criteria ensure that the lowest-performing schools in the District of Columbia are held to high standards for fully and effectively implementing selected intervention models to ensure that student achievement improves significantly. Only when this has been demonstrated will a school exit priority status. That said, three full years of "sufficient progress" indicates that the school has built a foundation for academic achievement that justifies a move to "focus school" status. The automatic identification of a former priority school as a focus school ensures continued OSSE and LEA oversight and support.

Detailed Criteria for Determinations of Sufficient Progress:
OSSE's determination of sufficient progress will be based on independent determinations in the following three areas: student achievement results (measured by the DC CAS), data on the leading indicators, and school-level progress of intervention implementation. To receive an overall "sufficient progress" determination, the school must have made "significant progress" in at least one of the three areas or have made "some progress" in at least two of the three areas. Consistent with the U.S. Department of Education's final requirements for SIG, any school that meets its annual student achievement goals will automatically receive a determination of "sufficient progress." For schools that do not make "significant progress" in any area and make "little or no progress" in two or more areas, the overall determination will be "insufficient progress."

- Student achievement results:
  DC CAS results will be compared with the annual goals set in the LEA application. For a school to have made "significant progress," annual goals in both reading/language arts and mathematics must be met. For a school to have made "some progress," it must meet one of its reading/language arts or mathematics goals or increase the percentage of students scoring proficient/advanced by 50-99% of its goals in both reading/language arts and mathematics.

- Data on the leading indicators:
  Each LEA with one or more priority schools will submit data on the leading indicators listed in the U.S. Department of Education's final SIG regulations for each school year it has one or more priority schools. A school will be evaluated on the progress it makes for each leading indicator compared to data from its baseline year. For each leading indicator,

a school will be given one point if it has made "no to little progress," two points if it has made "some progress," or three points if it has made "significant progress" for the leading indicator during the school year. The average scores across the leading indicators will determine overall progress made in the leading indicators area. Schools with an average less than 1.5 will have made "little to no progress," schools with an average between 1.5 and 2.24 will have made "some progress," and schools with an average of at least 2.25 will have made "significant progress."

- School-level progress of intervention implementation:
  Each LEA with one or more priority schools will submit a report at the end of each school year it has one or more priority schools for each school on the progress of the school improvement intervention implementation. From the implementation report and data gathered through on-site and/or other monitoring, OSSE will determine whether a school made "significant progress," "some progress," or "little or no progress" toward full implementation of the intervention. A school will be evaluated on its level of implementation for each of its intervention's required activities. For each required activity, a school will be given one point if it has made "little to no progress," two points if it has made "some progress," or three points if it has made "significant progress" in implementing that required activity during the school year. The average scores from the required activities will determine overall progress for intervention implementation. Schools with an average less than 1.5 will have made "no to little progress," schools with an average between 1.5 and 2.24 will have made "some progress," and schools with an average of at least 2.25 will have made "significant progress."

If a school that was identified as a priority school is again identified as a priority school at the end of its three-year intervention implementation, OSSE will make a recommendation for closure or alternative governance. This aligns with an SEA's authority for state takeover in ESEA Section 1116(b)(8)(B)(iv).

2.E FOCUS SCHOOLS

2.E.i   Describe the SEA's methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State's Title I schools as "focus schools."

The U.S. Department of Education has asked for identification of focus schools as the schools that have performance that is at a level of concern. Additionally the Department of Education envisions this group of schools as the schools that have substantial achievement gaps that are not closing. As a result a school will be identified as a focus school if:
- Is in the bottom 5% of schools in proficiency for the "all students proficiency" AMO and has not made the growth AMO for all subgroups and is not a priority school; or

> - Is in the bottom 10% of in schools in growth for the "all students growth" AMO and has not made the proficiency AMO for all subgroups and is not a priority school; or
>
> - Has a graduation rate below 60% for two or more years in a row.

2.E.ii Provide the SEA's list of focus schools in Table 2.

2.E.iii Describe the process and timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more focus schools will identify the specific needs of the SEA's focus schools and their students and provide examples of and justifications for the interventions focus schools will be required to implement to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind.

> OSSE will require an LEA with focus schools to implement several activities to identify the specific needs of focus schools and their students and to intervene to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind. Separate from all other funding (both federal and non-federal) that may be used to identify and respond to the needs of focus schools and their students, OSSE will require an LEA with one or more focus schools to reserve a necessary and reasonable amount from its Title I allocations each year to support OSSE-required activities and other LEA- or school-selected activities.
>
> OSSE will require the LEA, supported by the funds mentioned above, to do the following for each of its focus schools, unless the LEA sufficiently demonstrates to OSSE that (1) it lacks the resources to do so and (2) can fully develop and implement a plan for identifying and responding to the needs of focus schools and their students without fulfilling these requirements:
>
> **School-Level Requirements**
> - Utilize CAPStar, the District of Columbia continuous school improvement planning and monitoring tool developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement, to assess the school's implementation of indicators of effective practice, select priority objectives aligned to those indicators, plan action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives, implement those action steps, and evaluate progress. An LEA with more than one priority school and no more than one focus school may request approval from OSSE to use another tool in each of its focus schools only if it meets the following criteria:
>   - It is web-based, providing real-time viewing access to District staff, OSSE staff, and others upon view-only invitation;
>   - It requires the development and/or maintenance of a school/district (as applicable) leadership team with responsibility for continuous school improvement;
>   - It uses a research-based framework of indicators of effective practice;
>   - It requires, and documents the results of, assessment of the school's/district's (as applicable) practices against the indicators of effective practice, with options of "full implementation," "partial implementation," and "no implementation;"
>   - It allows school/district (as applicable) leadership teams to prioritize indicators that are not fully implemented for the development of action plans;

- Provide funding for a quality school review to be conducted by an OSSE-approved team in the year before implementation using a revised version of the "Patterns of Practice" tool originally developed by OSSE with assistance from the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center or, upon request from the LEA and approval by OSSE, another tool that will be used in each of the LEA's priority schools and meets the following criteria:
  - It uses a research-based framework of indicators of effective practice that cover significant areas of practices such as leadership, professional development, curriculum, assessment, instructional planning, classroom instruction, school culture, and parent and community involvement;
  - It aligns with the LEA's framework and tool used for continuous school improvement planning and monitoring
  - It requires, and documents the results of, assessment of the school's practices against the indicators of effective practice, with options of "full implementation," "partial implementation," and "no implementation;"
- Provide funding for a quality school review (according to the same requirements described above) in each of the three years following the identification as a focus school;
- Coordinate with OSSE to schedule the quality school reviews and, in each case, a debrief with school leadership;
- Use the reports from the quality school reviews to inform continuous school improvement, including
  - the assessment of indicators of effective practice,
  - the selection of priority objectives aligned to those indicators,
  - the planning of action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives,
  - the implementation of those action steps, and
  - the evaluation of progress;
- Specifically implement activities, documented through the action steps referred to above, to address deficiencies in school-based practices, which may include:
  - supplemental, research-based, job-embedded professional development,
  - supplemental instruction to school-selected students through providers, which may include "SES" providers, schools, or local educational agencies,
  - any activity that is required within one of the SIG intervention models for priority schools, and/or
  - any other activity that is specifically required by an action step included in the CAPStar plan in support of an objective included by the leadership team;
- Work with an OSSE-approved continuous school improvement coach to provide ongoing support for the full period of focus school status, supplementing any staff already supporting continuous school improvement activities within the school and/or district. The continuous school improvement coaches will be recruited, hired and trained by OSSE. They will provide support and build capacity in the ability of the school improvement team and team leader to guide and manage the systemic changes that will lead to the desired educational outcomes for students. Coaches will support school improvement teams as they assess current practices based on indicators of effective practice, develop an aligned school improvement plan, implement the plan, monitor the plan's implementation, and revise the plan. LEAs must ensure that the OSSE-approved

turnaround coach is an integral part of the school's leadership team.

LEA-Level Requirements

Additionally, any LEA with more than one focus school must:
- Utilize the CAPStar continuous district improvement planning and monitoring tool to:
  - assess the district's implementation of indicators of effective practice,
  - select priority objectives aligned to those indicators,
  - plan action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives,
  - implement those action steps, and
  - evaluate progress;
- Provide funding for a quality district practice review to be conducted by an OSSE-approved team as soon as practicable after the identification of more than one focus school within the district;
- Provide funding for a quality district practice review (according to the same requirements described above) in each of the three years following the identification within the district of more than one focus school;
- Coordinate with OSSE to schedule the quality district practice reviews and, in each case, a debrief with LEA leadership;
- Use the reports from the quality district practice reviews to inform continuous district improvement, including
  - the assessment of indicators of effective practice,
  - the selection of priority objectives aligned to those indicators,
  - the planning of action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives,
  - the implementation of those action steps, and
  - the evaluation of progress.

2.E.iv Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status and a justification for the criteria selected.

OSSE will determine its list of focus schools anew each year. A school identified as a focus school will exit focus status if it is not re-identified as a focus school in any subsequent year, including the first year after its initial identification. If a school meets the criteria in Section 2.E.i to be classified as a focus school for a fourth consecutive year, the school is then identified as a priority school. This plan ensures both that (1) a school remains in focus status as long as it meets the criteria set by OSSE and (2) a school that improves enough to no longer meet the criteria is removed from focus status as soon as possible.

TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS

Provide the SEA's list of reward, priority, and focus schools using the Table 2 template. Use the key to indicate the criteria used to identify a school as a reward, priority, or focus school.

TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOL

LEA Name	School Name	School NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
TBD					
TOTAL # of Schools:					

Total # of Title I schools in the State: <u>TBD</u>
Total # of Title I-participating high schools in the State with graduation rates less than 60%: <u>TBD</u>

Key	
Reward School Criteria: **A.** Highest-performing school **B.** High-progress school **Priority School Criteria:** **C.** Among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the proficiency and lack of progress of the "all students" group **D.** Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years **E.** Tier I or Tier II SIG school implementing a school intervention model	**Focus School Criteria:** **F.** Has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate **G.** Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate **H.** A Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school

2.F   PROVIDE INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS FOR OTHER TITLE I SCHOOLS

2.F   Describe how the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system will provide incentives and supports to ensure continuous improvement in other Title I schools that, based on the SEA's new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps, and an explanation of how these incentives and supports are likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

All schools that are not already identified as priority or focus schools and fail to meet their annual measurable objectives will be identified as continuous improvement schools. Continuous improvement schools will be required to identify and respond to the needs of their students using many of the same strategies implemented by focus schools, except these schools will do so with more flexibility and less-directed SEA support.

OSSE will require the LEA to do the following for each of its continuous improvement schools unless the LEA sufficiently demonstrates to OSSE that (1) it lacks the resources to do so and (2) can fully develop and implement a plan for identifying and responding to the needs of these schools and their students without fulfilling these requirements:

- Utilize CAPStar, the District of Columbia continuous school improvement planning and monitoring tool developed by the Center on Innovation and Improvement, to assess the school's implementation of indicators of effective practice, select priority objectives aligned to those indicators, plan action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives, implement those action steps, and evaluate progress. An LEA with more than one priority school and no more than one focus school may request approval from OSSE to use another tool in each of its focus schools only if it meets the following criteria:
    o   It is web-based, providing real-time viewing access to District staff, OSSE staff, and others upon view-only invitation;
    o   It requires the development and/or maintenance of a school/district (as applicable) leadership team with responsibility for continuous school improvement;
    o   It uses a research-based framework of indicators of effective practice;
    o   It requires, and documents the results of, assessment of the school's/district's (as applicable) practices against the indicators of effective practice, with options of "full implementation," "partial implementation," and "no implementation;"
    o   It allows school/district (as applicable) leadership teams to prioritize indicators that are not fully implemented for the development of action plans;

- Specifically implement activities, documented through the action steps referred to above, to address deficiencies in school-based practices, which may include:
    o   supplemental, research-based, job-embedded professional development,
    o   supplemental instruction to school-selected students through providers, which may include "SES" providers, schools, or local educational agencies,
    o   any activity that is required within one of the SIG intervention models for priority schools, and/or

- o any other activity that is specifically required by an action step included in the CAPStar plan in support of an objective included by the leadership team;

Additionally, any LEA with more than one continuous improvement school must:
- Utilize the CAPStar continuous district improvement planning and monitoring tool to:
  - o assess the district's implementation of indicators of effective practice;
  - o select priority objectives aligned to those indicators;
  - o plan action steps to address deficiencies related to those objectives;
  - o implement those action steps; and
  - o evaluate progress.

Without the "intensive interventions" required for priority schools, "targeted interventions" required for focus schools, and "guided interventions" required for continuous improvement schools, schools that are making progress (reward schools and "good standing" schools have the incentive of maximum flexibility in how Title I and other federal funds are used to support continued performance and growth. Many OSSE supports, including support around common core implementation and statewide professional development, remain available to these schools as the schools choose to use them.

2.G   BUILD SEA, LEA, AND SCHOOL CAPACITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

2.G   Describe the SEA's process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, including through:
  i.   timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools;
  ii.   holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their priority schools; and
  iii. ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources).
  Explain how this process is likely to succeed in improving SEA, LEA, and school capacity.

OSSE believes strongly that those professionals who work most directly with students each day are in the best position to identify and respond to the needs of those students. OSSE also believes that the state education agency must provide the tools necessary for school-based teams to assess needs, develop continuous school improvement plans, and implement action steps to ensure that student learning improves in all schools, particularly low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps.

OSSE's framework for intervention and support for priority schools, focus schools, and other schools not making progress stems from these beliefs. OSSE has adopted the CAPStar tool, initially developed as "Indistar" by the Center on Innovation and Improvement, to guide continuous school and district improvement. This tool is provided to all schools and districts to guide their identification of, and response to, deficiencies in school- and district-based practices, judging against research-based indicators in a clear framework for effectiveness. OSSE's intensive, targeted, and guided interventions are therefore based on the same process that CAPStar facilitates. While the levels of flexibility change from one category of schools to another, OSSE seeks to maximize the flexibility at the district and school level to plan and implement activities that are deemed most appropriate by the professionals working with those schools. For priority and focus schools, OSSE will require a quality review process and OSSE-approved, part-time coaches in order to ensure—and support—the most effective use of Title I funds.

All of OSSE's work is supplemental to two very active agencies in oversight of student achievement in the District of Columbia: the DC Public Charter School Board and the District of Columbia Public Schools. In the plans outlined here, OSSE does not seek or implement authority to require school closure. Both the PCSB and DCPS have policies in place to ensure that schools that fail to improve over a significant number of years are closed.

Differentiated Interventions and Supports

Priority
Schools

Focus
Schools

Continuous Improvement
Schools

Good Standing
Schools

Reward
Schools

	SEA Engagement	**LEA/School Autonomy** over Continuous School Improvement Activities	**LEA/School Flexibility** in Use of Federal Funds
Priority Schools	Very High	Lower	Lower
Focus Schools	High	Moderate	Moderate
Watch Schools	Moderate	High	High
Progress Schools	Low	Very High	Very High
Reward Schools	Very Low	Very High	Very High

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

3.A DEVELOP AND ADOPT GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding description and evidence, as appropriate, for the option selected.

Option A	Option B	Option C
☐ If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: i. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year; ii. a description of the process the SEA will use to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines; and iii. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 14).	☒ If the SEA has already developed and adopted one or more, but not all, guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: i. a copy of any guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students; ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); iii. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt the remaining guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year; iv. a description of the process used to involve teachers and principals in the development of the	☐ If the SEA has developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: i. a copy of the guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students; ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); and iii. a description of the process the SEA used to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines.

	adopted guidelines and the process to continue their involvement in developing any remaining guidelines; and v. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the remaining guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 14).	

OSSE is selecting Option B because we have existing state teacher and leader evaluation requirements for Race to the Top (RTTT) participating LEAs. RTTT LEAs are about 57% of the District's LEAs and these LEAs enroll about 90% of the city's students. OSSE will modify these requirements to meet all of the ESEA Flexibility Request requirements, and require that all Title I LEAs meet them.

i. A copy of any guidelines the SEA has adopted and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students

See Attachment 10: Race to the Top, Teacher and Principal Evaluation System Requirements, June 16, 2011

Increasing teacher and leader effectiveness was a cornerstone of DC's Race to the Top application because DC understands that effective teachers and leaders are the foundation for a high-performing educational system. One of RTTT's primary strategies for increasing teacher and leader effectiveness is to improve the quality and rigor of educator evaluation systems and professional development to provide teachers and leaders with clear expectations, a common vision of effective instruction, and meaningful feedback about how to improve their practice. RTTT staff worked with the Human Capital Task Force to develop evaluation requirements that improve instructional practice and therefore student achievement in RTTT participating LEAs. If this ESEA Flexibility application is approved, OSSE will modify these requirements to meet the guidelines in the U.S. Department of Education's ESEA Flexibility Request and adopt them for all LEAs.

OSSE's Race to the Top evaluation requirements stipulate that school leader evaluations include student growth to a significant extent and that teacher evaluations include the DC teacher value added model as 50% of the evaluation rating for teachers in English/Language Arts and mathematics in grades 4-8. Including student growth in educator evaluations ensures that educators are focused on improving student achievement. RTTT LEAs must also provide timely and specific feedback to educators about their performance. Continuous and constructive feedback is critical to improving instructional practice, and feedback is most useful if it is

immediate. In addition to providing specific feedback, LEAs are required to provide targeted professional development based on evaluation findings to ensure that professional development focuses on the needs of educators in their schools. LEAs will gauge educator performance using a variety of measures to provide a holistic picture of educator performance. Finally, evaluation results are only meaningful if they are used to improve teacher practice and to inform personnel decisions. OSSE requires that LEAs use these results to inform personnel decisions, such as those about compensation, retention, and promotion.

ii. Evidence of the adoption of the guidelines

See Attachment 11: Race to the Top, Teacher and Principal Evaluation System Requirements, June 16, 2011

iii. The SEA's plan to develop and adopt the remaining guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011-2012 school year

Modifying State Requirements
OSSE will modify the RTTT evaluation requirements (see Appendix A) to address the U.S. Department of Education's ESEA Flexibility guidelines, to reflect lessons learned from the first year of implementation of the requirements, to allow maximum LEA flexibility for non-Race to the Top-participating LEAs, and to ensure alignment between teacher and leader evaluation systems and common core standards. These guidelines will reflect the idea that evaluation systems are not solely intended for informing personnel decisions, but also about providing support to teachers and opportunities for professional growth. OSSE will then adopt these requirements for all Title I LEAs in the District in January 2013. Non-RTTT LEAs will develop evaluation systems that meet these requirements and will pilot these systems for one year before full implementation. In the revised requirements, OSSE will need to address the following issues: ensuring validity of measures; training for evaluators; providing student growth for all teachers; and involving teachers and principals in the development and revision of teacher and principal evaluation systems. Race to the Top LEAs will only need to modify their evaluation plans to address the new criteria:

- **Ensuring validity of measures**. OSSE will require that LEAs analyze the relationship between student achievement and the other components of their evaluation systems and demonstrate that there is a positive relationship between them. In other words, LEAs will be expected to demonstrate that on average, teachers that are effective or highly effective have greater student achievement gains than teachers who are minimally effective or ineffective. If LEAs find that their evaluation systems are not valid, they will have to modify their systems. OSSE will also provide exemplars of valid observation rubrics that LEAs can choose to adopt.

- **Training for evaluators**. OSSE will require that LEAs provide training to all of their evaluators and develop plans to work towards inter-rater reliability among evaluators.

- **Student growth for all teachers**. OSSE will require that LEAs include a measure of student growth as a significant component of all teacher and principal evaluations. OSSE will require that LEAs use standardized measures where they are available, but will

otherwise grant LEAs flexibility to propose their own assessments. The SEA will hire a contractor to put together a list of possible assessments that could be used for the various subject areas. The contractor will also work with OSSE to explore assessments for potential use in early childhood and adult education classrooms in future years. OSSE will also allow all LEAs to voluntarily participate in the statewide teacher value-added model (see Appendix C). Finally, OSSE will offer the schoolwide growth measure (see Appendix B) as an option for teacher and/or principal evaluation. LEAs may choose to use the schoolwide growth measure as a portion of the evaluation rating of all teachers in a school, rather than having subject specific growth measures.

- **Review and revision**. OSSE will require that LEAs describe how they will include teachers and principals in reviewing and revising teacher and principal evaluation systems and making revisions as needed.

- **Alignment with common core.** OSSE will encourage LEAs to consider how their evaluation systems ensure that the skills and content that are being taught meets or exceeds common core standards.

OSSE will also adopt voluntary teacher, leader, and professional development performance standards by December 2012 with stakeholder involvement, in order to provide guidance to the LEAs that are developing new evaluation systems. The standards will reflect the skills that teachers are expected to have in order to teach Common Core Standards. OSSE will develop teacher performance standards based on the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards (InTASC), promising models from other states, Common Core Standards, and existing LEA standards. OSSE will develop school leadership performance standards based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), New Leaders for New Schools, and promising models from other states as well as LEA standards. For the professional development standards, OSSE will draw from Learning Forward's professional development standards.

Guidance and Technical Assistance
OSSE will have a staff member devoted to providing and facilitating technical assistance for developing and implementing evaluation and support systems. OSSE will provide guidance and technical assistance in aligning common core standards with teacher and leader evaluation systems. OSSE can use discretionary grant funds to provide technical assistance from national providers to LEAs in developing their systems.

OSSE will identify exemplary evaluation systems that national organizations have determined are research-based and have evidence of validity. These exemplars will provide guidance to LEAs in developing or modifying their evaluation systems.

OSSE will develop a web page that is the source of information about teacher and leader evaluation requirements, standards, and evaluation systems. This web page would include OSSE policy, information about best practices, and presentation materials that LEAs can use in their communications with teachers and leaders. OSSE will also create forums for LEAs to share

information about their challenges and successes in implementing teacher and leader evaluation systems.

iv. A description of the process used to involve teachers and principals in the development of the adopted guidelines and the process to continue their involvement in developing any remaining guidelines

Stakeholder Input
OSSE has received input from the RTTT Human Capital Task Force on revisions to the Evaluation System Requirements and will also seek feedback from other key stakeholders. Beginning in the 2012-13 school year, the Human Capital Task Force will be expanded to include non-RTTT LEA representatives. OSSE will also create two new advisory groups—a group of teachers and a group of leaders from both public charter and DC public schools—that will provide input on the evaluation requirements and development of Teacher, Leader, and Professional Development standards. These groups will meet to review drafts of these documents and provide feedback. They will reconvene any time major modifications to the documents are proposed. Finally, OSSE will post the final requirements for all teacher and principal evaluation systems in January 2013 and will conduct webinars and meetings to educate LEAs about the new standards and requirements.

LEAs will submit evaluation plans that provide responses to each of the requirements by June 1, 2013. Race to the Top LEAs will only need to submit responses to the new or modified requirements. OSSE will then conduct a review process and approve all plans by August 1, 2013, so LEAs are ready to implement the pilot year of their evaluation system (or second year of full implementation for RTTT LEAs) in 2013-2014. Finally, OSSE will require the submission of individual teacher and leader ratings from all LEAs through the Employed Educator Report. Individual ratings will not be published in any way, but will be used to track progress in improving teacher effectiveness and to respond to federal reporting requirements. Ratings will only be published in aggregate form. Moreover, OSSE will disseminate a data policy this spring that indicates that OSSE will not report individual teacher data.

Appendix A: Race to the Top Teacher and Leader Evaluation Requirements (For the full requirements document, please see Attachment 10/11)

<u>**Teacher Evaluation System Requirements**</u>
1. **Student growth counts for at least 50% of a teacher's evaluation.** LEAs will report on the components of their evaluation systems and the percentages assigned to each component using the Teacher Evaluation Template. LEAs should indicate that the common, value-added measure adopted by RTTT-participating LEAs will account for 50% of the evaluation rating for English/language arts and mathematics teachers in grades four through eight.

2. **The LEA has an annual evaluation process.** The LEA will reference its unique evaluation documents, which indicate that the LEA has an annual evaluation process for every teacher and will make available evidence that evaluations have occurred during the monitoring process.

3. **Use evaluations to support individualized professional development.** LEAs will provide a narrative explanation that demonstrates that evaluation information informs professional development. LEAs may reference an evaluation document that includes an area for next steps or action items to address teachers' areas of weakness, documentation of verbal feedback and next steps or action items, an individual professional development plan template, or an aggregate professional development plan for the school that is informed by the individual needs of teachers. An LEA may offer other evidence that demonstrates that evaluations are informing professional development.

4. **Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, retention, tenure and/or full certification, and removal.** LEAs will explain how evaluation information will inform decisions about compensation, promotion, retention, tenure/certification, and/or removal.

    a. The annual evaluation must include the common student value-added measure as 50% of the evaluation rating for English/language arts and mathematics teachers in grades four through eight. Because the value-added results will likely be available in the summer, LEAs have flexibility in demonstrating how they are using the complete evaluation to inform compensation, promotion, retention, etc. For example, an LEA may indicate that it is providing both preliminary decisions about hiring in the spring and final evaluation reports in the summer. Or an LEA may demonstrate that it is using both current and prior year evaluations (including prior evaluations that include student growth) to inform human capital decisions. However, all LEAs will have to demonstrate that the annual evaluation is used to inform all of these human capital decisions.

    b. LEAs will also indicate on the Teacher Evaluation Template how individual teachers are rated (using unique teacher identifiers) and the decisions made about that teacher with respect to compensation, promotion, retention, and/or removal. During the monitoring process, OSSE will question a significant disconnect between teacher ratings over time and these decisions (e.g., if many teachers receiving the lowest rating ("1") are retained).

5. **Includes multiple measures for performance besides the growth measure.** LEAs will report on the components of their evaluation systems and the percentages assigned to each component using the Teacher Evaluation Template. The components must include the common teacher value added measure as 50% of the rating for English/language arts and mathematics teachers in grades four-eight and an observation rubric that measures more than one area of performance. Other measures of performance may be included as well. Evaluation systems may address the following areas of performance:

    a. **Commitment to school community, mission, and values**. Includes professional norms and expectations, collaboration with other school staff,

character, commitment to the school community, and parent engagement.

    b. **Effective lesson planning and instructional delivery**. Includes planning, instructional practices, assessment, and use of data.

    c. **Fostering a positive environment for student learning**. Includes classroom management, student/teacher interactions, and student engagement.

6. **Divides effectiveness into four tiers.** LEAs will provide narratives for each tier that describes the full spectrum of performance. The narrative will describe the competencies and skills a teacher at each level is expected to master. LEAs will also describe how a teacher's evaluation score translates into a tier using their evaluation rubric. Finally, after a year of implementation, LEAs will complete the Teacher Evaluation Template, indicating how individual teachers are rated. LEAs should consider the following general guidance in their ratings:

   - Highly-effective teachers consistently achieve high scores on all elements of an LEA's evaluation system;
   - Effective teachers are proficient on almost all elements of a school's evaluation system;
   - Minimally-effective teachers are those who need additional support in several of the elements of a school's evaluation system; and
   - Ineffective teachers are those who are struggling in most of the elements of a school's evaluation system.

7. **Is used to provide teachers with timely and constructive feedback.** LEAs will provide evidence of an evaluation process that includes multiple observations and regular feedback. The feedback will reference the language of the LEA's observation rubric. Evidence of timely and constructive feedback may reference evaluation documents that describe multiple formal and/or informal observations, and a post-observation feedback process or another process for providing written or verbal feedback. Other evidence of timely and constructive feedback may be included, as long as it demonstrates that teachers are receiving specific feedback throughout the school year.

Principal Evaluation System Requirements

1. **Student outcome metrics account for a significant proportion of a principal's evaluation.** LEAs will report on the components of their evaluation systems and the percentages assigned to each component using the Principal Evaluation Template. LEAs will demonstrate that student outcome metrics (e.g. student growth, student performance, student attendance) account for a significant proportion of a principal's rating. LEAs will explain how their student outcome metrics and the weights assigned to them are

consistent with their school mission, values, and goals.

2. **The LEA has an annual evaluation process.** The LEA will reference its unique evaluation documents that indicate that the LEA has an annual evaluation process for every principal and will make available evidence that evaluations have occurred during the monitoring process.

3. **Use evaluations to inform human capital decisions.** LEAs will explain how evaluation information will inform human capital decisions such as decisions about principals' professional development, compensation, promotion, retention, and/or removal. For example, an LEA might indicate that principals who are highly effective will be considered for a bonus and those who are rated ineffective will be coached by a mentor. During the monitoring process, OSSE will question a significant disconnect between principal ratings over time and these decisions (e.g., if many principals receiving the lowest rating ("1") are retained).

4. **Includes multiple, qualitative measures of performance.** LEAs will report on the components of their evaluation systems and the percentages assigned to each component using the Principal Evaluation Template. The components must include more than one qualitative measure. Evaluation systems may include the following qualitative measures of performance:

   a. Parent, staff, and/or student surveys;
   b. Compliance with state or federal regulations;
   c. Compliance with special education requirements;
   d. Principal leadership and competencies; and/or
   e. Measures of teacher practice.

5. **Includes school-specific goals.** LEAs will include more than one measurable, school-specific goal. These goals may also be the system's student outcome metrics. For example, if an LEA includes DC CAS scores as its student outcome metric and gives principals a score of one to four based on growth, they may also have a DC CAS school-specific goal to increase student growth by 10%. Following are examples of school-specific goals:

   a. Student performance will increase by 5% on the DC CAS;
   b. Parent participation in the school survey will increase by 20%;
   c. Achievement gap will close by at least three points;
   d. Graduation rates will increase by 10%;
   e. Attendance rates will average 95%; or
   f. Detentions will decrease by 10%.

6. **Divides effectiveness into four tiers.** LEAs will provide narratives for each tier that describe the full spectrum of performance and outline the competencies and skills a

principal at each level is expected to master. LEAs will also describe how each tier is translated into a score using their evaluation rubric. Finally, after a year of implementation, LEAs will complete the Principal Evaluation Template, indicating how individual principals are rated. LEAs should consider the following general guidance in their ratings:

- Highly-effective principals consistently achieve high scores on all elements of an LEA's evaluation system;
- Effective principals are proficient on almost all elements of a school's evaluation system;
- Minimally-effective principals are those who need additional support in several of the elements of a school's evaluation system; and
- Ineffective principals are those who are struggling in most of the elements of a school's evaluation system.

Appendix B: DC Schoolwide Growth Model

Definitions

What is the DC schoolwide growth model?

The DC schoolwide growth model is used to compute each student's progress on the DC Comprehensive Assessment System (CAS) from one grade to the next compared to students with similar prior test scores. It is based on a statistical method called quantile regression and is sometimes called a "student growth percentile" (SGP) or "median growth percentile" (MGP) model.

The DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) voted to adopt this model and a Race to the Top advisory group, including educators, district-level staff, and representatives from OSSE and PCSB also selected the same model for use across the District. A Student Growth Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from local education agencies (LEAs) and a charter advocacy group provided input on the specifics of the model design and implementation.

What is growth?

Generally speaking, *growth* refers to a change in performance on the DC CAS over time. Using a measure of growth allows schools whose students enter at different levels of performance to be compared fairly.

What is a student growth percentile?
A student growth percentile (SGP) describes a student's growth compared to other students with similar prior test scores. Comparing a student's growth to the growth of similar students helps provide some understanding of his or her progress.

A SGP describes a student's growth as a number from one to 99, with higher numbers indicating greater growth compared to similar students. For example, a student whose SGP is 80 showed more growth than 80 percent of the students with similar prior test scores.

Calculating Median Growth Percentiles

The DC schoolwide growth model is a statistical model that computes each student's progress on the DC CAS from one grade to the next compared to students with similar prior test scores. Individual SGP scores are then summarized for a school to create an MGP. The MGP indicates how much the students in a school are growing academically compared to similar students in other schools. The following table provides an example of how SGPs and MGPs are generated (note, however, that the DC model uses two prior test scores when available).

Computing Student Growth Percentiles

Student Year 1 Score	Student Year 2 Score	SGP
330	440	50
330	450	60
330	460	70
330	470	80
330	480	90

Finding the median of the student SGPs produces the school's MGP score—in this case, 70.

Students with similar *current* test scores can have very different SGPs if they have different *prior* test scores. Students who have very low current test scores can have very high growth percentiles; conversely, students who have very high current test scores can have very low growth percentiles. So, two different students with an SGP of 90 may have very different growth rates.

What are median growth percentiles?

The median growth percentile (MGP) summarizes student growth for a school. It tells us how much the students in a school are growing academically compared to similar students in other

schools. For example, an MGP score of 75 means that, overall, the students in that school grew faster than 75 percent of similar students in other schools.

Calculations

How are student growth percentiles calculated?
SGPs are computed using a statistical model that describes the relationship between each student's current test score (the outcome variable) and one or two years of his or her prior scores (called predictors). Two years of data are used if available. For example, a student in Grade 4 will only have one prior year of scores available (for Grade 3), and students new to DC may not have two years of prior DC CAS scores.

The model does not include any student or school characteristic other than test scores and an indicator for missing test scores—this indicator ensures that students who have only one year of prior scores are not excluded from the analysis.

Data are analyzed separately for each grade and subject. For example, one model uses Grade eight mathematics scores as the outcome variable and Grades six and seven mathematics scores as predictors; another model uses Grade ten reading scores as the outcome variable and Grades eight and seven reading scores as predictors.

How are median growth percentiles calculated?

Because averages cannot be computed using percentiles, the median is used as an aggregate measure of school growth. Medians also provide a measure that is less influenced by outliers than an average. Taking the median of all student SGPs in a school gives the median growth percentile score for the school.

Are all students included in median growth percentile calculations?

To be included in the MGP calculations, students must have at least two test scores (one outcome score, and one or two prior year scores—two if available, including scores from up to four years prior). Students without any past score, such as those in Grade three, are excluded. In addition, students who are excluded from reporting in DC's adequate yearly progress (AYP) reports are not included in MGPs. These may include, for instance, DC students who have been placed in alternative or private programs. For more information about AYP, please visit http://seo.dc.gov/service/adequate-yearly-progress.

Interpreting Results

What is a low median growth percentile score? What is a high median growth percentile score?

MGP scores indicate where a school stands in terms of student growth in relation to other schools. A MGP of 60 means that a school's students, on average, outperformed 60 percent of similar students in DC.

What if a school has a bad year because of a sudden influx of low-performing students?

A school's MGP is affected by the academic growth that its students achieve, not by students' single-year performance. Schools receive credit for all students whose academic growth is

positively affected.

Using Results

How are education agencies in DC using median growth percentiles and why?
As part of its Race to the Top grant, OSSE is providing student- and school-level growth data to all LEAs. These data can be used at the LEA level to analyze schoolwide performance, program performance, performance within grades, or the performance of subgroups of students. They are intended to inform instructional practices and program design. However, it is important to note that student-level SGPs should not be used on their own to make decisions about individual students.

The DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB) will incorporate the MGP data into its Performance Management Framework, which also includes data on student achievement, and indicators like attendance, re-enrollment, graduation rate, and college acceptance rate.

DC Public Schools will report MGPs on its School Scorecard. The purpose of the DCPS School Scorecard is to give parents, students, and community members a clear, objective picture of school performance. By incorporating multiple measures of school quality into one tool, the Scorecard presents a unique opportunity to compare schools' strengths and weaknesses across the District. The DC median growth percentile metric is included in the 2011–12 Scorecard for informational purposes but is not used to rate or rank individual schools.

Do all schools get a score? Why or why not?
Very small schools (those with 10 or fewer full academic year students) will not receive an MGP.

For the purposes of the PCSB Performance Management Framework, charter schools without two tested grades with DC CAS results will not receive an MGP. This includes early childhood programs, adult education GED programs, schools that administer the DC CAS Alternative Assessment, and new schools.

DCPS will display median growth percentiles for elementary and high schools on the School Scorecard, but the metric will not appear for alternative high schools, special education centers, placement programs (such as Youth Services Center), or STAY schools with evening programs.

Can I directly compare median growth percentile scores across schools?
Yes, the metric is comparable across schools.

Can scores be disaggregated by grade, subject, and/or subgroup of students?
Each LEA will receive MGPs for each of its schools as well as the individual SGPs for the students in its schools. These SGPs can be aggregated in different ways to report on the median growth for relevant subgroups if desired. For example, a LEA could choose to examine academic growth of boys compared to girls.

Are median growth percentiles used to determine adequate yearly progress? What is the relationship between median growth percentile and school proficiency?
No, MGPs are not used to determine adequate yearly progress (AYP). AYP and school

proficiency are different measures than the schoolwide growth MGP measure. The MGP measures the *growth* of students in each school. AYP and proficiency pertain to the *level* at which students achieve.

How can I help raise my school's median growth percentile score?

Educators can contribute by helping all students improve on the DC CAS, whether they are low- or high-achieving students. When student growth from year to year in a school improves more quickly than in other schools, that school's MGP goes up.

When will scores be made public and how?

School-level MGPs will be made available to the public through the OSSE, PCSB, and DCPS websites in the coming months.

Where can I get more information?

Please visit:

OSSE website*:* http://osse.dc.gov/

PCSB website*:* http://www.dcpubliccharter.com/

DCPS website*:* http://profiles.dcps.dc.gov/

3.B   ENSURE LEAS IMPLEMENT TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

3.B   Provide the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, including mechanisms to review, revise, and improve, high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines.

In order to ensure that LEAs are meeting the new Evaluation System Requirements, OSSE will review and approve LEA teacher and leader evaluation systems. The OSSE review will focus on whether LEA-proposed systems meet state requirements, including whether growth measures are proposed for all teachers and leaders and whether standardized assessments are used where feasible.

Key Milestone or Activity	Detailed Timeline	Party or Parties Responsible	Evidence (Attachment)	Resources (*e.g.*, staff time, additional funding)	Significant Obstacles
Solicit members for advisory groups	February 2012	OSSE staff	List of members	One staff member to solicit volunteers	Finding effective educators who have the time to

					participate
Develop Voluntary Teacher, Leader, and Professional Development Standards	March-July 2012	OSSE Staff, Teacher Task Force, Leader Task Force, Human Capital Task Force	Draft Standards	Two staff members to review model standards and draft DC standards and then manage the process for getting input and revising the standards	This will be a time-consuming process. We will have to find the staff capacity to do this or contract it out.
Revise Evaluation System Requirements	August-December 2012	OSSE Staff, Teacher Task Force, Leader Task Force, Human Capital Task Force	Draft of Revised Evaluation System Requirements	Two staff people to convene meetings to get input and make revisions to the document	None
Adopt Educator Performance Standards	December 2012	OSSE staff	Performance Standards	One staff member to finalize performance standards	None
Adopt Evaluation Requirements for all Title I LEAs	January 2013	OSSE staff	Evaluation Requirements	One staff member to finalize evaluation requirements	None
Conduct trainings on Evaluation Requirements	February-March 2013	OSSE staff	Training materials and attendance lists	One staff member to conduct trainings	None
Conduct review process of teacher and leader evaluations	June 1-August 1, 2013	OSSE staff	Evaluation Review Tracking Sheet	Two staff members to conduct the review process	Allocating staff time to this activity
Non-Race to the Top LEAs pilot evaluation systems/Full implementation for Race to the	School year 2013-2014	LEAs/OSSE staff	Approved Evaluation Plans, Title I monitoring visits	Staff members to conduct monitoring visits	None

Top LEAs					
Full implementation of evaluation systems for all Title I LEAs	School year 2014-15	LEAs/OSSE staff	Title I monitoring visits	Staff members to conduct monitoring visits	None

Principle 4: Reduce Unnecessary Duplication and Burden

Currently, OSSE fiscal and programmatic monitoring and data collection are often performed by the individual grant management teams within OSSE. This means that a subrecipient receiving multiple grants from OSSE is subject to multiple monitoring and data collection activities by each grant management groups that may lead to redundant requests of information from each of these OSSE entities. In order to reduce this burden on our LEAs and subrecipients, OSSE is currently moving towards consolidated fiscal and programmatic monitoring and data collection models.   In the upcoming year, OSSE will be piloting monitoring and data collection models that include consolidating the overlapping aspects of each grant's fiscal and programmatic monitoring and data collection systems and tools that include aspects common to all or most grants.   This consolidation effort will streamline monitoring and data collection processes for the LEAs and other subrecipients by reducing the paperwork burden of reporting information multiple times to various OSSE entities. Centralized tracking of this "common" information will also help OSSE target its technical assistance efforts, saving both OSSE program staff and subrecipients' time.

In addition, OSSE is looking to procure a grants management software system that will provide a gateway to LEAs and subrecipients for grant application, reimbursements, fiscal information, etc. By moving into a single grants management system, OSSE will streamline grant management information making it more efficient for LEAs to access information and reduce the burden by managing all grant applications in one single source.