

Harkin-Enzi ESEA bill (1) Oct 2011 –

Sec. 1002 and 1111. State and Local Req

1002.

“(b) Accountability and Support.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State may reserve 4 percent of the amount the State receives under subpart 2 of part A to carry out paragraph (2) and to carry out the State and local educational agency responsibilities under sections 1116, which may include carrying out a statewide system of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies.

“(2) USES.—Of the amount reserved under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year, the State educational agency—

“(A) shall use not less than 90 percent of that amount by allocating such sums directly to local educational agencies for activities required under section 1116; or

“SEC. 1111. STATE AND LOCAL REQUIREMENTS. [p.31]

“(a) ACADEMIC STANDARDS, ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS, AND ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENTS FOR COLLEGE AND CAREER READY STATE STANDARDS.—In order to receive a grant under this part, each State shall demonstrate that the State meets the following requirements:

“(A) COLLEGE AND CAREER READY ALIGNED STANDARDS FOR READING OR LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The State shall—

“(I) not later than December 31, 2013, adopt college and career ready academic content standards in reading or language arts, and mathematics, that meet the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iii);

“(II) not later than the beginning of the 2015–2016 school year, adopt college and career ready student academic achievement standards in reading or language arts, and mathematics, that meet the requirements of clauses (ii) and (iv).”

[Then discussion of alignment, other issues; then academic content standards then academic proficiency standards for these subjects.]

“(B) SCIENCE STANDARDS.- and <snip>

“(C) STANDARDS FOR OTHER SUBJECTS.— states must have them [date?], can use them for accountability if they want.

“(D) ALTERNATE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES.— [allowed, not capped, must be tied to main standards and be professionally determined – pp 36-37]

“(E) ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS.—[read later] p 37

“(F) NO FEDERAL CONTROL.— [p 38 – over standards or content]

“(2) ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS.— [p 38 – pretty similar to NLCB, allows multiple statewide assessments during a year (consortia) if can be shown summatively accurate; allows growth for some states described at subsection (b)(1)(B) – at which there is little content.]

Science once each in 3-5, 6-9, 10-12, similar criteria as ELA and math.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSESSMENTS.— [p41]

“(i) be the same academic assessments used to measure the achievement of all students;” [must be statewide tests - ? a portfolio structure? I suppose in theory, tho not certain]

“(iv) involve multiple measures of student academic achievement, including measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding;”

ELA can be exempt for 2 years as they learn English; assess to “extent practicable” in language most likely to produce accurate results. – 3 year time limit of being in a US school (except PR), exceptions allowed.

(ix) – disaggregation (p45)

“(x) be consistent with widely accepted professional testing standards and objectively measure academic achievement, knowledge, and skills;”

“(xiii) produce student achievement and other student data that can be used to inform determinations of individual principal and teacher effectiveness for purposes of evaluation and for determining the needs of principals and teachers for professional development and support;” [p. 46]

(x) administer to 95% [or what happens if no AYP?]

“(D) ASSESSMENTS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY.—P 48
– by 2015 have English Language Acquisition assessments ready based on state standards of language proficiency – described ff in some detail

“(E) ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS FOR STUDENTS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES.—[48 ff]

P 50- adaptations and accommodations

“(F) MANAGING AND UPDATING ASSESSMENTS.—The State shall include, in the State plan under subsection (b), a description of how the State will regularly conduct an inventory of State and local educational agency student assessments, including an analysis of assessment and accommodations practice and use, and reduce duplicative assessment. [sounds nice on paper]

“(3) STATE-DESIGNED ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS.” [p 52]

(a) By start 2013-14 school year – 1 year and maybe a bit to implement a new system
Lays out some details on this system (i.e., uses the assessment system and adds HS grad for high schools; expect “continuous improvement”; identify schools with problems, plan for support and interventions as needed; develops local capacity;]; must be ELA/read and math, can use science and other subjects if want and if have statewide assessments in those other subjects.

No more than 1% be included in ‘most severe cognitive disabilities.’[54]

Allows voluntary consortia and partnerships among states [55]

“1111(b) STATE PLANS.— [55]

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

A and following - various assurances including

(B) reference to if state uses growth [at p56], which refers to 9101(44)(B) [definition of ‘on track to college and career readiness’], which refers back to 1111(b)(1)(B) [this section – that is all I have seen on ‘growth’ as an option for states, could well have missed something

“(I)” describes—

“(i) how, during the period beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Act of 2011 and ending on the date that is 5 years after such date of enactment or the date by which all local educational agencies in the State have implemented teacher and principal evaluation systems that meet the requirements of section 2123, whichever is sooner—

“(I) the State educational agency will provide for the equitable distribution of teachers in the State...using data on the percentage and distribution of more than 1, or an index that incorporates more than 1, of the categories of teachers described in subparagraph (J) as transitional measures of teacher quality;

“(II) the State will report to the Secretary the percentage and distribution of teachers in the State, based on the transitional measures used in the State, for each quartile of schools

based on school poverty level, for high-minority schools, and for low-minority schools;

“(ii) how, for each year following the time period described in clause (i), the State educational agency will provide for the equitable distribution of teachers within local educational agencies and the State so that low-income and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other children by teachers in the lowest rating category of the State teacher evaluation system, consistent with section 2123;

and...

[The first point mandates the construction and implementation of teacher and principal evaluations; the details of building this system are at 2123; see my notes and comments to that section.]

“(J) describes how the State will annually submit to the Secretary, for each quartile of schools in the State based on school poverty level and for high-minority schools and low-minority schools in the State, data regarding the percentage and distribution of the following categories of teachers:

“(i) Teachers who are not classified as highly qualified teachers.

“(ii) Teachers who are inexperienced.

“(iii) Teachers who have not completed a teacher preparation program.

“(iv) Teachers who are not teaching in the subject or field for which the teacher is certified or licensed.”

[Note that elsewhere the bill says people with a BA who have passed a “rigorous” test are to be considered ‘highly qualified’ – the Teach for America provision, we might call it, though TFA is by no means the only one; again, see separate notes under 9101 ‘definitions.’

“(c) PARENT AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT. [64]—Each State plan shall include a description of how the State will strengthen engagement of the parents and families in education (referred to in this subsection as the ‘parent and family engagement plan’) in accordance with the following:

“(1) STATEWIDE PARENT AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY.—

Pages of options for which some money, I would think, can be used; includes ‘parent report cards’ with lots of test-based requirements for info (67ff) and grad rates (which are at 1110(3)); data on college enrollment and % of college students needing remediation;

Note that adding to report cards info on school violence, bullying, expulsions, suspensions, etc., is only an option (p73), as are indicators of school climate and school readiness for Kindergarten – is there more on this elsewhere?

And at “(g) PARENTS’ RIGHT-TO-KNOW. [78]— includes info about teacher “(1) qualifications” (licensure and certification vs emergency credentials, etc.