

From: Lenti, Leighann, PED
Sent time: Monday, August 22, 2011 4:13:23 PM
Bennett, Tony; Robinson, Gerard; Lenti, Leighann, PED; Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org); Barresi, Janet; Barresi, Janet Asst Becky Woodie; Barresi, Janet Comm Dir Damon Gardenhire; Barresi, Janet COS Jennifer Carter; Robinson, Gerard scheduler Joseph Morgan; Bennett, Tony Asst Debbie Downing; Bennett, Tony Asst Jennifer Outlaw; Bowen, Stephen; Bowen, Stephen; Cerf, Chris; Cerf, Chris Asst Helene Leona; Cerf, Chris Dep Comm Sp Asst Mamie Doyle; Cerf, Chris Special Asst Andrew Smarick; Gist, Deborah; Huffman, Kevin; Huffman, Kevin COS Emily Barton; Pastorek, Paul; Pastorek, Paul Asst Christina Rose; Carothers, Cathie, PED; Chris Meyer; Skandera, Hanna, PED; Robinson, Gerard Scheduler Nyla Benjamin; Smith, Eric; Bennett, Tony COS Heather Neal; Tennyson, Bernadette, PED
To:
Cc: Kant, Nick; Erlichson, Bari; Emigholz, Christopher; Gantwerk, Barbara; Patricia Levesque (patricia@excelined.org); Chris Meyer; mbrown@doe.in.gov; David DeSchryver
Subject: RE: working document for ESEA waiver call
Attachments: 2011 C4C Flexibility for Reform Framework Questionnaire.docx

And the attachment.

Sorry about that!

L

From: Lenti, Leighann, PED
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 2:09 PM
To: 'Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org)'; Barresi, Janet; Barresi, Janet Asst Becky Woodie; Barresi, Janet Comm Dir Damon Gardenhire; Barresi, Janet COS Jennifer Carter; Bennett, Tony; Bennett, Tony Asst Debbie Downing; Bennett, Tony Asst Jennifer Outlaw; Bennett, Tony COS Heather Neal; Bowen, Stephen; Bowen, Stephen; Cerf, Chris; Cerf, Chris Asst Helene Leona; Cerf, Chris Dep Comm Sp Asst Mamie Doyle; Cerf, Chris Special Asst Andrew Smarick; Gist, Deborah; Huffman, Kevin; Huffman, Kevin COS Emily Barton; Pastorek, Paul; Pastorek, Paul Asst Christina Rose; Robinson, Gerard; Robinson, Gerard scheduler Joseph Morgan; Robinson, Gerard Scheduler Nyla Benjamin; Skandera, Hanna, PED; Carothers, Cathie, PED; Tennyson, Bernadette, PED; Smith, Eric
Cc: Erlichson, Bari; Kant, Nick; Emigholz, Christopher; Gantwerk, Barbara; Patricia Levesque (patricia@excelined.org); Chris Meyer; mbrown@doe.in.gov; 'David DeSchryver'
Subject: RE: working document for ESEA waiver call

Good Afternoon!

Attached is an updated questionnaire that reflects our conversation this morning.

Huge thanks to David for making the edits.

Please send me your responses by COB Wednesday and David and I will work to compile them to share back with the larger group.

Also, feel free to call (505-412-2285) or email with any questions.

Thanks!

Leighann

Leighann C. Lenti
Director of Policy
New Mexico Public Education Department
505-412-2285 (M)

From: Mary Laura Bragg (MaryLaura@excelined.org) [mailto:MaryLaura@excelined.org]
Sent: Sunday, August 21, 2011 7:21 AM
To: Barresi, Janet; Barresi, Janet Asst Becky Woodie; Barresi, Janet Comm Dir Damon Gardenhire; Barresi, Janet COS Jennifer Carter; Bennett, Tony; Bennett, Tony Asst Debbie Downing; Bennett, Tony Asst Jennifer Outlaw; Bennett, Tony COS Heather Neal; Bowen, Stephen; Bowen, Stephen; Cerf, Chris; Cerf, Chris Asst Helene Leona; Cerf, Chris Dep Comm Sp Asst Mamie Doyle; Cerf, Chris Special Asst Andrew Smarick; Gist, Deborah; Huffman, Kevin; Huffman, Kevin COS Emily Barton; Pastorek, Paul; Pastorek, Paul Asst Christina Rose; Robinson, Gerard; Robinson, Gerard scheduler Joseph Morgan; Robinson, Gerard Scheduler Nyla Benjamin; Skandera, Hanna, PED; Carothers, Cathie, PED; Lenti, Leighann, PED; Tennyson, Bernadette, PED; Smith, Eric
Cc: Erlichson, Bari; Kant, Nick; Emigholz, Christopher; Gantwerk, Barbara; Patricia Levesque (patricia@excelined.org); Chris Meyer; mbrown@doe.in.gov
Subject: working document for ESEA waiver call

Attached please find the working draft documents for Monday's call. The spreadsheet is just an example -- the authors wanted to make sure you knew that!

If you are not participating in the call, please ignore this message.

Thanks!

Memorandum

Re: C4C Monday August 22 Call. Developing the Flexibility for Reform Framework
From: David DeSchryver, Whiteboard Advisors
Date: August 19, 2011

During the Chiefs for Change conference call of Friday, August 19, the attendees agreed to host a call on Monday, August 22 to further develop the “flexibility for reform framework.”

The framework is based on the letter that the Chiefs sent Sec. Duncan on July 28. In it, the Chiefs outline key reform priorities and discuss needed flexibility from current federal requirements. The document is the basis of ongoing discussions with the Secretary of Education regarding the ESEA waivers.

The Chiefs for Change have a remarkable opportunity to emerge as a national leader for education reform. To capitalize on the opportunity, the Chiefs need to present a clear vision for the group while also supporting the unique challenges that each chief faces. To do that, we need to better understand what is and what is not a priority/feasible for each chief.

This document begins to collect that information. It organizes the reform framework (from the July 28 letter) into six categories. Within each category there are more specific issues. For each of these issues, we are collecting responses - brief responses – to five questions. The questions are designed to help us think through these issues priorities relative to the reform framework and the waiver request. It should provide more clarity on where we agree, where we don't, and how we can work together.

Accountability:

- Common standards/ assess. & its implementation
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

- Improving the identification of schools/districts for intervention
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?
(AYP flexibility is a given, but we should also address how to better diagnose, classify and intervene in the schools. Building on that thought, let’s consider where we do not want any Federal role. Let’s not invite Federal intrusion if it’s not necessary).

- Implementing aggressive & differentiated Intervention
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?
(In addition to addressing flexibility from NCLB’s 7 year cascade of consequences – choice, SES, corrective action, alternative governance – we should propose a more flexible SIG model, beyond just the 4 models identified in current SIG grant. We should also address the nexus of performance measures and gain measures. How to reward low performing schools with high gains. It may be useful to look at the [CO growth model](#) on this matter.).

- Providing clear and thorough parental/ community information
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Funding

- District allocation of funding utilizing student based budgeting
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?
(NCLB, Title I ranking and serving requirements limit how districts distribute the funds).

- rewording fiscal transparency with additional fiscal flexibility/transferability
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

- Analyzing school level fiscal w/ academic growth to develop ROI measures
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Human Capital

- Teacher and principal evaluations based, in significant part, on student academic growth
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?
(Current HQT requirements focus on the wrong, or at least insufficient, indicators).

- Staffing decisions based on evaluations
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

- Development of strategic human capital management practices based on evaluations & strategic PD support
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Options

- Charter schools
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.

- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

➤ virtual schools

- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

➤ Tax credits

- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

➤ Choice

- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

➤ Tutoring/SES

- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?
(20% set aside and very structured state approval process may be problematic).

Reports

➤ Single federal report

- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Data

➤ Development of state longitudinal data systems

- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.
- What is the state's key policy objective?
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?