

From: Patricia Levesque (Patricia@excelined.org) <patricia@excelined.org>
Sent time: Friday, February 24, 2012 3:06:21 PM
To: Cooper, Tanya; Costin, Loretta
Cc: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org) <MaryLaura@excelined.org>; drecicsmith@gmail.com
Subject: FW: Ed Trust Waiver Accountability Summary for Your Review

Tanya, Loretta,

Fyi – Chris Cerf got the email below on Ed Trust’s review of NJ’s waiver.

Did Gerard get his copy of their review? We would like to help respond.

Please see Chris’ very strong response.

Patricia

From: Cerf, Chris [mailto:chris.cerf@doe.state.nj.us]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 12:54 PM
To: Chris Cerf; Pastorek, Paul; Tony Bennett; Huffman, Kevin; Patricia Levesque (Patricia@excelined.org); drecicsmith@gmail.com; Skandera, Hanna; gerard.robinson@fldoe.org
Subject: RE: Ed Trust Waiver Accountability Summary for Your Review

Thought you might be interested in how I am responding to the EdTrust inquiry.

From: Cerf, Chris
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 12:32 PM
To: 'Kati Haycock'
Subject: RE: Ed Trust Waiver Accountability Summary for Your Review

Kati,

Always good to hear from you. You know how much I respect you and your work.

As for this request, unfortunately there are many factual errors. In many respects, moreover, this summary completely misses the overall thrust of the work. You are more than free to publish this email, but I am very reluctant to devote senior staff time to addressing your letter in any greater detail on the tight timeline you demand. For whatever reason, this waiver process has generated a cottage industry of second guessers and Monday morning quarterbacks, many of whom haven’t the first clue about running a reform oriented State Department or the immense complexities of the negotiation process with USDOE. We are engaged in a truly radical reform agenda on virtually every imaginable front and deeply believe that the substitute accountability system we built to replace NCLB will be instrumental in achieving it. New Jersey has among the largest achievement gaps in the nation yet is one of the top performers on the NAEP when viewed in the aggregate. We have quite consciously devised a differentiated intervention strategy that reflects these distinctive circumstances. I am more than happy to hear from others express their views on our work, but have limited appetite for engaging the process.

Best regards,

Chris

From: Kati Haycock [mailto:KHaycock@edtrust.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 23, 2012 2:53 PM
To: Cerf, Chris
Subject: Ed Trust Waiver Accountability Summary for Your Review

Dear Acting Commissioner Cerf:

As you know, there is a lot of interest in the content of the waiver plans recently approved by the Secretary of Education. Not surprisingly, we’ve been asked by a variety of parties—from advocacy organizations to journalists to members of Congress—for brief, third-party analysis.

Accordingly, we’ve drafted summaries of each state’s accountability system. Before making these publicly available, though, we want to give you a chance to correct any factual errors that might have crept in. As always, our staff has worked very hard to be clear and accurate. But the sheer volume of materials, not to mention the format required by the Education Department, made that a challenge.

We plan to make these summaries available to the public beginning on Wednesday, Feb. 29, 2012. If you spot any errors before **9:00 a.m. Eastern Time on Monday, Feb. 27**, please call or e-mail Daria Hall, director of K-12 policy at 202-293-1217, ext. 349 or dhall@edtrust.org. If we don’t hear from you by that time, we will assume that there are no factual errors and will release the summary as is. In the meantime, please do not share this draft.

Also, we will send similar summaries of the standards implementation and educator evaluation plans for your review soon. Our apologies in advance for the multiple e-mails, and thanks for your attention to this matter.

Cordially,

Kati Haycock

President

Enclosure

