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Key Differences:

- States now in the driver’s seat
  - Much more authority to make decisions, choose standards and assessments, goals, and means of accountability
  - States also responsible for enforcing many requirements
  - (though subject to ED regulation)
- The “big acronyms” have been eliminated
  - No more AYP, HQT, or SES
- New limitations on Secretarial authority
  - Especially around State plans, waivers
- Consolidates/eliminates a number of smaller grant programs
Timeline for Implementation

- ESEA waivers terminate August 1, 2016
- New law effective for competitive grants (at federal level) on October 1, 2016
- New law effective for non-competitive formula grants (at federal level) on July 1, 2016 per ESSA, **BUT:**
  - *Omnibus appropriations bill passed December 18**th** says:)*
    - “SEC. 312. Notwithstanding section 5(b) of the Every Student Succeeds Act, funds provided in this Act for non-competitive formula grant programs authorized by the ESEA for use during academic year 2016–2017 shall be administered in accordance with the ESEA as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Every Student Succeeds Act.”
    - So....NCLB in effect for another year!

Timeline for Implementation

- New State accountability systems (and related interventions) take effect in school year 2017-18 per law
- State accountability systems effective until August 1, 2016 (but continue to support priority/focus schools and those in improvement)
  - *ED guidance: waiver States may choose to either:*
    - (1) pause identification of school, or
    - (2) identify a new group of schools for improvement
Timeline for Implementation

- Changes to Impact Aid effective in FY 2017
- All other changes effective upon enactment (December 10th, 2015)
- Program transition:
  - Programs not substantively similar to something else in this bill will continue to receive funds until September 30, 2016
  - Programs no longer authorized but substantively similar to programs in the bill may finish out multi-year grants in accordance with grant terms
  - Programs still authorized as in previous law may use funds awarded prior to enactment under those terms, then transition to new requirements
State Plans
Sec. 1111

■ Consultation with key stakeholders
■ State plans must be peer-reviewed
  - List must be public; same reviewers cannot review all plans
■ State plans must be approved within 120 days unless Secretary presents research which demonstrates it does not meet req.
  - Must notify State of rejection, provide opportunity to revise and resubmit, public hearing
  - Changes to State plans subject to approval/disapproval within 90 days (no peer review)
■ States must provide an assurance that they have adopted:
  - Challenging academic content standards and aligned academic achievement standards (referred to in this Act as ‘challenging State academic standards’)

State Plans: Contents

■ Standards & Assessments
■ Accountability
■ School Support
Standards and Assessments

- States must:
  - *Adopt challenging academic standards*
    - Secretary may not require standards to be submitted for approval
  - *Implement aligned assessments*
    - ED has indicated it will continue with peer review of assessments
    - Assessments must occur in:
      - Grades 3-8 and once in high school for math and English
      - At grade-span intervals for science
    - 1% limitation on alternate assessments tied to alternate standards
      - At State level only – cannot cap at district level

(assessments, cont.)

- Must *disaggregate data by NCLB subgroups for purposes of accountability*
- May allow locally-selected assessments for high schools
- Requires 95% participation in assessments overall and by subgroup
  - States determine how to incorporate into accountability system
Accountability

- States must develop an accountability system that rates schools based on metrics including:
  - Academic achievement for all subgroups
  - For K-8, growth or other indicator
  - For high schools, graduation rates
  - Progress in achieving English language proficiency
  - At least one “valid, reliable, comparable, and Statewide” indicator of school quality
  - Other factors as determined by the State

  *Most weight* must be given to academic indicators

Accountability

- Two levels of intervention: targeted and comprehensive
- Targeted (LEA-directed) interventions:
  - State must notify LEAs of any schools (not just Title I) with subgroups which are consistently underperforming
  - School must develop improvement plan, LEA must approve improvement plan and monitor implementation
  - If subgroups fail to improve within State-determined number of years, State steps in
Accountability

- Comprehensive (State-directed) Interventions:
  - **State must identify for comprehensive intervention:**
    - Title I schools in the bottom 5% according to the State’s performance metric
    - All public high schools with graduation rates of less than 2/3
    - Title I schools in which any subgroup, on its own, would be in the lowest-performing 5% and has not improved in a State-determined number of years
  - **LEA must develop and implement, with State supervision, an evidence-based improvement plan**
  - **State must step in if there is no improvement in a State-determined number of years (up to 4)**

Identifying Schools For Comprehensive Support Sec. 1111(c)(4)(D)

- (NEW) Use that meaningful differentiation to conduct an annual evaluation on the performance of LEAs, schools and subgroups
  - Applies to all public schools
  - Includes charterschools
- (NEW) Beginning 2017-2018, must identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement at least once every 3 years
  - States must use meaningful differentiation for this determination
  - **Does the omnibus delayed effective date change this?**
  - **How does this transition work?**
    - Best guess?
      - For 2017-2018, use 2016-2017 scores
      - Do you then follow NCLB or ESSA improvement activities? Not sure – waiting for guidance from USDE!
Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plan
Sec. 1111(d)

■ (NEW) Upon notice that a school has been identified, the LEA must (in partnership with stakeholders) develop and implement a comprehensive support and improvement plan for each identified school.

■ The plan must:
  - Include information on student performance against all indicators;
  - Include evidence based interventions;
  - Be based on school-level needs assessment;
  - Identify resource inequities to be addressed through implementation; and
  - Be approved by the school, LEA and SEA.

Public School Choice
Sec. 1111(d)(1)(D)

■ (NEW) A LEA may provide all students enrolled in a school identified for support the option to transfer to another public school.
  - Priority given to lowest-achieving children from low income families.
    ■ Remain in that school until he/she has completed the highest grade
  - 5% of Title I, A Allocation for Public School Choice Transportation
Public School Choice
Sec. 1003A(e)

■ (NEW) 1003(A) funds may be used for school choice transportation only if the LEA does not reserve 5% for 1111(d) transportation.

■ A State that received 1003A funds shall:
  - Ensure each LEA that receives and subgrant and intends to provide public school choice can provide a sufficient number of options to provide a meaningful choice for parents.

Targeted Support and Improvement
Sec. 1111(d)(2)

■ (NEW) Each SEA must:
  - Notify each LEA of any school in which any subgroup of students is consistently underperforming; and
  - Ensure the LEA provide notification to the school re: subgroup(s) identification.

■ Applies to all school, not only Title I schools
  - Includes charter schools
School-level Targeted Support and Improvement Plan
Sec. 1111(d)(2)(B)

■ (NEW) Upon notice that a school has been identified, the school must (in partnership with stakeholders) develop and implement a comprehensive support and improvement plan for each identified school.

■ The plan must:
  - Include information on student performance against all indicators;
  - Include evidence based interventions;
  - Be approved by the LEA prior to implementation; and
  - Identify resource inequities to be addressed through implementation if a subgroup, on its own, would lead to identification.

■ Monitored by the LEA and results in additional action if there is unsuccessful implementation

Continued Support and Improvement
Sec. 1111(d)(3)

■ (NEW) The State must:
  - Establish statewide exit criteria;
    ■ For schools identified for comprehensive support:
      - If exit criteria is not satisfied after a number of years (not to exceed 4 years) the State must apply more rigorous interventions; and
    ■ For schools identified for targeted support:
      - If the exit criteria is not satisfied after a number of years (determined by the State) shall result in the identification of the school for comprehensive support.
  - Periodically review resource allocation and provide technical assistance to LEAs serving significant identified schools
Continued Support and Improvement (cont.)
Sec. 1111(d)(3)

(NEW) The State may take action to initiate improvement in any LEA with a significant number of schools:
- that are consistently identified for comprehensive support that do not meet the exit criteria; or
- identified for targeted support and improvement.

Improvement Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comprehensive Support and Improvement</th>
<th>Targeted Support and Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td>This year, and at least once every 3 years, the SEA identifies schools for comprehensive support.</td>
<td>Annually, the SEA identifies schools for targeted support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State develops exit criteria (no more than 4 years).</td>
<td>State develops exit criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meet Exit Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Exit Improvement Identification.</td>
<td>Exit Improvement Identification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Improvement</strong></td>
<td>SEA applies more rigorous interventions.</td>
<td>Schools are identified by the SEA for comprehensive support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Plans (cont.)
Sec. 1111(g)

■ (NEW) In addition to how the State will comply with Assessment requirements, the plan must describe:
  - Steps to be taken to provide assistance to LEAs and schools supporting early education programs
  - How low-income and minority students are not served at disproportionate rates by underqualified teachers (and plans for addressing this)

Report Cards

■ Must be prepared and disseminated every year at State and local levels
■ Must include:
  - Academic achievement by subgroup
    ■ Including homeless, foster, military-connected children
  - Percentage of students assessed/not assessed
  - Descriptions of States’ accountability system
  - Graduation rates
  - Information on indicators of school quality
  - Professional qualifications of teachers
  - Per-pupil expenditures for federal, State, and local funds
  - NAEP results
Title I - Funding

- Title I funding formula remains the same
- Keeps 1% cap on State administrative funds
- New set-asides
  - **Mandatory** 7% set-aside for School Improvement interventions and technical assistance
    - Formula or competitive to LEAs
  - **Optional** 3% set-aside for Direct Student Services
Title I - Fiscal Requirements

- Maintenance of Effort preserved throughout
  - BUT LEA not subject to sanctions for failing to maintain 90% effort for one year provided that it has not failed to meet MOE for one or more of five immediately preceding fiscal years
  - Secretary may waive MOE requirements in case of change in organizational structure of LEA.

- Supplement, not supplant (Title I only!)
  - LEA must demonstrate that methodology used to allocate funds is the same as it would be in the absence of Title I funds
  - Secretary cannot require an LEA to:
    - Identify an individual cost or service as supplemental
    - Provide services through a particular method of instruction

Title II - Formula

- Makes adjustments to formula to focus more heavily on poverty
  - On both State and LEA-level allocations
  - Transitions to 20% population, 80% poverty by 2020

- Phases out hold-harmless by 2023

- CRS projects small increase ($475,000, or 4.4%) for AK between now and 2023
Title II Grant Programs

- Eliminates Mathematics and Science Partnership Grants
- Teacher Incentive Fund → Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program
- American History and Civics Education Program
  - *Intended to improve quality of instruction*
- Supporting Effective Educator Development Grants
  - To non-profits, IHEs, or consortia for preparation and professional development
- STEM Master Teacher Corps
- Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation
  - Competitive grants to States to develop literacy instruction
  - Divided by age group – separate grants for grades K-5, 6-12
Title III - Major Changes

- Moves accountability provisions to Title I
- Replaces references to “limited English proficient” with references to “English Learners” throughout
- Requires uniform exit criteria for ELs

Title IV - Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

- New block grant-type program
- Formula granted to States based on share of Title IA
  - State may reserve up to 1% for administration, 4% for State activities
- Subgranted to LEAs based on share of Title IA
  - LEA may spend up to 2% on administration
  - LEAs must spend:
    - At least 20% of funds on at least one “well-rounded educational opportunities” activity
    - At least 20% on at least one “safe and healthy students” activity
    - Some portion funds to support effective use of technology (no more than 15% on technology infrastructure)
Other Title IV Programs

- Maintains as separate funding streams:
  - 21st Century Community Learning Centers
  - Charter Schools grants (including facilities financing assistance)
  - Magnet schools program
  - Family engagement grants
  - Promise Neighborhoods
  - Full-Service Community Schools
  - Ready-to-Learn Programming
  - Javits Gifted and Talented Program

New Preschool Grants

- Preschool Development Grants jointly administered by ED and HHS
  - Competitive to States
  - One-year grant for planning, coordination, and improvement
    - Three-year renewal grant
    - Increasing amounts of funds must be used to improve early education
  - 30% non-federal match
Secretarial Prohibitions

- Strictly prohibits Secretary from doing anything to:
  - Require/incentivize certain standards or assessments, instructional content, programs of instruction, curricula, etc..
  - Deny approval of State plans without good reason
  - Deny approval of waivers without good reason
  - Set new criteria through regulation or requiring adoption of certain policies in exchange for flexibility or approval of State plans
  - Specify additional pieces of accountability system
  - Endorse a specific curriculum or develop a federally sponsored assessment

QUESTIONS?
Disclaimer

This presentation is intended solely to provide general information and does not constitute legal advice. Attendance at the presentation or later review of these printed materials does not create an attorney-client relationship with Brustein & Manasevit, PLLC. You should not take any action based upon any information in this presentation without first consulting legal counsel familiar with your particular circumstances.