

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ESEA FLEXIBILITY
Extension/Amendment Submission
May 12, 2014

Dear Secretary Duncan:

I am writing on behalf of the District of Columbia Office of the State Superintendent of Education (DC OSSE) to request approval to amend the District of Columbia's approved ESEA flexibility request. The relevant information, outlined in the Department's *ESEA Flexibility Amendment Submission Process* document, is provided in the table below.

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
Overview	Provided a description of how implementation of DC's ESEA Flexibility Request in 2012 would support reforms already in place in DC.	Historical updates explain how the reforms have been implemented since 2012.	Updating to provide current information	Posted on website for public comment and promoted comment period on social media.
Principle 1B	Described DC's adoption and implementation of CCSS.	Contains timeline updates since the adoption to include other standards since adopted such as NGSS, English language development standards, and early learning standards.	Updating historical information	Posted on website for public comment and promoted comment period on social media.
Principle 1B Principle 2Aii	Originally planned for the inclusion of the SY 2013-2014 DC science assessments into the statewide accountability system and school classifications in the SY 2014-2015.	Now the request has been amended to state that the NGSS assessment will be included in the SY 2016-2017 accountability system and classifications for the first time using the SY 2015-2016 assessment results.	DC SBOE formally adopted the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) in December 2013 paving the way for aggressive realignment of the DC science assessment. The delayed inclusion is in response to LEA requests to allow time for more District educators to be involved in the blueprint development, item review, data analysis, and professional development related to teaching to the	Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website. We invited discussion at a public State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE. We also discussed the issue at three

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
			<p>newly adopted Next Generation Science Standards.</p> <p>This timeline will facilitate a positive transition plan for including new subjects while supporting schools and educators through the transition.</p>	<p>LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice.</p> <p>Included in LEA newsletter and memo to LEA leaders.</p>
Principle 2Bii	Originally the section omits composition from the index scores in the tables although it was a part of the rollout to include composition in accountability in other parts of the waiver application.	Clarifies that composition is in fact a component in the accountability system and index scores, but it was added as a factor for the first time in the 2013-2014 classifications.	<p>The school index score is a weighted average of the value-table points assigned in reading, composition, and mathematics combined. The addition of “composition” to the table clarifies that composition was to be added and was added to the accountability system in the 2013-2014 SY. It was described in the text, but was accidentally omitted from the table on page 72. This change adds it as a factor in that table.</p> <p>This combined index score factors into the identification of priority, reward, developing and rising schools.</p>	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p>
Principle 2Div	<p>Originally the table for Priority schools does not show a planning year and does not clearly articulate each year of implementation for each cohort of Priority schools.</p> <p>Originally states that Priority schools will have between 6</p>	<p>Amended to reflect a year of planning following identification of priority status in the chart and the narrative.</p> <p>Amended to clarify expectations around the start of implementation after one full school year of planning.</p>	<p>Clarifies that a planning year is a necessary component of the school improvement process and is not a part of the implementation year.</p> <p>The first full year of implementation starts after the full school year spent in planning.</p> <p>Clarifies the theory of action of OSSE’s</p>	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE.</p>

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
	and 12 months of planning.		direct approval and review of plans in of the third year of implementation if sufficient progress is not made. This is after two full years of implementation and one planning year.	<p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice.</p>
Principle 2Eiii	Originally, waiver states that Focus schools will begin implementation no later than 60 days from the start of the school year.	<p>Amends timeline for start of implementation for Focus schools. Now states that they will be required to begin implementation no later than January of that academic year or 90 days after identification, whichever comes later.</p> <p>If the school’s identification was after November, they can elect to begin implementation the following school year.</p>	<p>Based on feedback from LEAs and other education stakeholders and experience in implementation, there are many factors that can affect the start of implementation, including how early or late notification takes place.</p> <p>Also we understand that Focus schools require a set amount of planning time and the start of implementation should not be fixed by the start of the school year.</p> <p>For instance, in cases of test integrity investigation related identifications late in the school year, the Focus schools would start implementation the following academic year.</p>	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p>
Principle 2F	The current language states that LEAs must dedicate a portion of the 20% Title I set-aside for schools that missed AMOs.	<p>Removes the requirement to dedicate the set-aside to schools that missed AMOs.</p> <p>Outlines additional supports available to these schools from OSSE.</p>	<p>LEAs expressed a desire to target the 20% set aside to schools that need it the most—Priority and Focus schools.</p> <p>Including AMO schools would result in this portion of Title I funds being dispersed too broadly in districts with</p>	<p>Posted on website for public comment. We sent an email to all LEAs and PCSB inviting comment and posted a public notice on our website.</p> <p>We invited discussion at a public</p>

Flexibility Element(s) Affected by Amendment	Brief Description of Element as Originally Approved	Brief Description of Requested Amendment	Rationale	Process for Consulting with Stakeholders, Summary of Comments, and Changes Made as a Result
			high numbers of low-performing schools.	<p>State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting. Also held working sessions with SBOE.</p> <p>We also discussed the issue at three LEA/PCSB stakeholder meetings, a science state leadership meeting, and a state assessment working group meeting.</p> <p>We discussed this with the Title I Committee of Practitioners and Title III Community of Practice.</p>

Attached to this chart is a redlined version of the pages from our approved ESEA flexibility request that would be impacted with strikeouts and additions to demonstrate how the request would change with approval of the proposed amendments.

Please contact Iris Bond Gill at iris.bond-gill@dc.gov or by phone at 202-340-2905 if you have any questions about these proposed amendments.

DC OSSE acknowledges that the U.S. Department of Education may request supplementary information to inform consideration of this request.

Chief State School Officer

Date