

From: John Bailey <john.bailey@dutkograyling.com>
Sent time: Tuesday, February 07, 2012 7:59:05 PM
To: MaryLaura@excelined.org; Janet Barresi; Bennett, Tony <drtonybennett@gmail.com>; Bowen, Stephen <stephenbowen@myfairpoint.net>; Cerf, Chris <cdcerf@gmail.com>; Gist, Deborah <Deborah.Gist@ride.ri.gov>; Huffman, Kevin <kevin.s.huffman@tn.gov>; Pastorek, Paul <pastorekpg@gmail.com>; Robinson, Gerard <gtr924@aol.com>; Skandera, Hanna <hannaskandera@yahoo.com>; Smith, Eric <drrericjsmith@gmail.com>; White, John <jcw4d@hotmail.com>
Cc: drericjsmith@gmail.com; Jaryn Emhof (Jaryn@excelined.org) <jaryn@excelined.org>; Patricia Levesque (Patricia@excelined.org) <patricia@excelined.org>
Subject: Waiver and ESEA Update
Attachments: ESEA Side by Side.pdf

Two items for you:

- (1) We're hearing that ED will announce their waiver approvals this week. Most likely tomorrow or Thursday.
- (2) Rep. Kline is scheduled to deliver a speech at AEI Thursday morning where he'll present his plan for ESEA Reauthorization. We're hearing that they may formally introduce the bills that day too. Staff are still working on the details so I'm not entirely sure how the final product will differ from the draft documents released last month. Keep in mind that this is not a bipartisan bill and thus does not reflect Rep. Miller's input/priorities. We'll summarize the bill for you as soon as we have copies. In the meantime, attached is the side-by-side of the current law, Senate bill, and draft House proposal.

--John

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
Authorization Structure	Generally includes separate authorizations for separate programs, with the exception of 21 programs authorized under one authorization of appropriations under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.	<p>Maintains separate authorizations for separate programs as under current law (not all programs are maintained).</p> <p>Programs are authorized at such sums without specific authorization levels.</p>	<p>Combines multiple programs under a limited number of authorizations of appropriations. Some funding is reserved through specific percentages for individual authorities.</p> <p>For example, the main Title I program, Migrant Education, Neglected and Delinquent, English Language Acquisition, Indian Education and a new combined Rural Education Achievement program all share one authorization of appropriations with specific percentages reserved for each authority.</p> <p>The bill authorizes funds for programs from 2013 through 2018 with 2013 set at the following levels and 2014 through 2018 being increased by inflation (CPI) each year.</p> <p>Authorization levels for specific programs (with their percentage reservations) include:</p> <p>Programs under Title I: \$16.662 billion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Title I program: 91% • Migrant Education: 2.5% • Neglected and Delinquent: 0.3% • English Language Acquisition: 4.4% • Rural Achievement Education: 1% • Indian Education: 0.8% <p>National Assessment of Title I: \$3.2 million</p> <p>Title II programs: \$3 billion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Preparation and Effectiveness (state and local formula grant): 82% • Teacher and Leaders Flexible Grant: 18% 	No such provision.

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			<p>Title III programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charter schools: \$300 million • Magnet schools: \$99.8 million • Family Engagement (PIRCs): \$25 million • Local Academic Flexible Grant: \$2.683 billion <p>Impact Aid programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property: \$67.074 million • Basic Payments: \$1.155 billion • Children with Disabilities: \$48.505 million • Construction: \$17.474 million • Facilities Maintenance: \$4.854 million <p>The bill eliminates more than 70 existing elementary and secondary education programs, many of which have never been funded, are too small to have a meaningful effect on student achievement, or have been deemed ineffective by the federal government.</p> <p>The bill eliminates all of the current programs and special provisions targeted to specific national organizations to comply with the House earmark ban.</p>	
Standards	All states are required to have academic content and achievement standards in reading/English language arts, math and science.	All states are required to have fully implemented both college and career ready (CCR) academic content and achievement standards by the 2015-2016 school year. Standards must be aligned with coursework required by public IHEs in the state and career and technical education standards.	<p>All states are required to have academic content and achievement standards in reading/English language arts and math.</p> <p>Other subjects including science are at the discretion of the state.</p> <p>The bill does not require the four levels of achievement as current law.</p>	<p>All states are required to have fully implemented college and career ready standards no later than the 2013-2014 school year.</p> <p>Under the waiver package, implementing college and career ready standards means that teaching and learning aligned with such standards is taking place in all public</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			Standards are not required to be 'college and career ready' not is there any reference to common standards.	<p>schools in the state for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students.</p> <p>Under the blueprint, states may either choose to upgrade their existing standards, working with their public 4-year university system to certify that mastery of the standards ensures that a student will not need to take remedial coursework upon admission to a postsecondary institution in the system; or work with other states to create state-developed common standards that build toward college- and career-readiness. Standards must be evidence-based. States will continue to implement statewide science standards and aligned assessments in specific grade spans. States will develop and adopt statewide English language proficiency standards for English learners.</p>
Standards and Assessments related to Students with Disabilities	Two separate regulations apply to standards related to students with disabilities, alternative standards for students with the most cognitive disabilities (1% regulation) and modified achievement standards for other students with disabilities (2% regulation). In a state's accountability system, the scores of students with disabilities assessed against the 1% standards are limited to the number that is 1% of all students in a state. Scores of students	Statutorily authorizes the 1% regulation, including with the 1% cap. Does not statutorily authorize the 2% regulation.	<p>Closely mirrors the 1% regulation, except the term 'serve cognitive disabilities' is used rather than 'significant cognitive disabilities' and does not include the 1% cap.</p> <p>Does not statutorily authorize the 2% regulation.</p>	<p>Waiver package continues the 1% and 2% regulations. Requires states to include students with disabilities in the regular assessment once states have developed their assessments based on college and career ready standards, essentially phasing out the 2% regulations and its assessment for states utilizing this authority.</p> <p>The blueprint notes that primary funding for programs specifically focused on</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	with disabilities assessed against the 2% standards are limited to the number of students that is 2% of all students in a state.			supporting students with disabilities is through IDEA, but the reauthorization proposal will increase support for the inclusion and improved outcomes of students with disabilities.
English Language Proficiency Standards	Each state is required to have English language proficiency standards.	English language proficiency standards (revised to be consistent with CCR standards) must be updated no later than one year after the adoption of the CCR standards.	Maintains the requirement to have English language proficiency standards, but consolidates the requirements into the main Title I program.	Waiver package maintains the requirement to have English language proficiency standards. These standards would have to be aligned with any new CCR standards by the 2013-2014 school year. Blueprint: see <i>English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement</i> (below)
Assessments	<p>Each state is required to have assessments in math and reading/English language arts and science. Math and reading/English language arts are assessed annually in grades 3-8 and once in grades 10-12. Science is assessed once in each of the following grade spans: 3-5; 6-9; and 10-12.</p> <p>States are required to provide an assurance that they will participate in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics assessments under the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) if the Secretary pays for the costs of such assessments.</p> <p>An assessment program is authorized for the development of the annual</p>	<p>Requires adoption of assessments aligned to CCR standards by the 2015-2016 school year. Maintains the assessment timelines from current law for math, reading/English language arts, and science. For states that want to include student growth in their accountability system, assessments must be designed to measure growth. Assessments must be designed to produce student achievement data that can be used in teacher and principal evaluation.</p> <p>Maintains current law with respect to NAEP participation.</p>	<p>Each state is required to have assessments in math and reading/English language arts (but science assessments are no longer required).</p> <p>Annual testing remains required once in grades three through eight in these subjects.</p> <p>States must also assess once in grades nine through twelve.</p> <p>Assessments must measure individual student growth.</p> <p>Required assessments may be administered through a single annual assessment or through multiple assessments during the school year that are designed to result in a single summative score. Maintains current law with respect to NAEP participation.</p>	<p>Waiver package maintains the assessment timelines of current law for math, reading/English language arts, and science. Maintains current law with respect to NAEP participation.</p> <p>Blueprint will maintain support for state efforts to improve the quality of their assessment systems, and to develop and implement the upgraded standards and assessments required by the CCR Students program. States will receive formula grants to develop and implement high-quality assessments aligned with CCR standards in English language arts and mathematics. States may also use funds to develop or implement high-quality, rigorous statewide assessments in other academic or career and technical subjects.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>assessments for reading/English language arts and math and for enhanced assessment activities, such as those funding the development of the Common Core Assessments.</p>		<p>The bill eliminates the program authorizing funds for annual assessment development and enhanced assessment activities.</p>	<p>Beginning in 2015, formula funds will be available only to states that are implementing assessments based on CCR standards. The program will also support competitive grants to a consortia of states, and to other entities working in partnership with states, for research on, or development and improvement of, additional high-quality assessments to be used in such subjects as science, history, or foreign languages.</p>
<p>Report Cards</p>	<p>Each state and LEA is required to publish report cards that include information on student achievement, graduation rates and the professional qualifications of teachers.</p> <p>LEA report cards also contain information on the number of schools identified for school improvement and comparisons of achievement at individual schools to the LEA and state.</p>	<p>Maintains the requirement for state and LEAs report cards.</p> <p>New report card elements include: 1) for each high school, student graduation rates by the 2012-2013 school year; 2) the rate of enrollment in IHEs; 3) by the 2013-2014 school year, the rate of student remediation of high school graduates enrolled in IHEs; and 4) the number and percentages of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate assessments. Requires that data on school report cards be cross-tabulated.</p>	<p>Maintains a requirement for state and LEA report cards, but streamlines data reporting.</p> <p>Requirements for state report cards include: 1) Student achievement (aggregated and disaggregated by subgroups); 2) Participation rate on assessments (aggregated and disaggregated); 3) Adjusted cohort graduation rates for all public high schools; 4) the evaluation results of each public school under the state’s accountability system; 5) English acquisition by English Language Learners, and 6) Information on the results of the required teacher evaluations</p> <p>LEAs must report on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The information required under the state report cards; 2) How students in the LEA compare to students in the state as a whole; and 3) A school’s evaluation results under the state accountability system. 	<p>Waiver package maintains the requirement for state and LEAs report cards.</p> <p>Blueprint calls for states to have data systems in place to gather information critical to determining how schools and districts are progressing in preparing students to graduate from high school college and career ready. States and districts will make public data relating to student academic achievement and growth in English language arts and mathematics, student academic achievement in science, and if states choose, other subjects. At the high school level, this data will include graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and rates of college enrollment without remediation. All data must be disaggregated by race, gender, ethnicity, disability status, English Learner status, and family income.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			<p>The main differences between current law and this bill are the inclusion of the adjusted cohort graduation rates rather than graduation rates not based on this definition and the exclusion of reporting on 2-year trends in student achievement and the percentage of students not tested. In addition, because the bill eliminates the definition of highly qualified teacher, the report card section instead reports on information on teacher evaluations.</p>	<p>State accountability systems will be asked to recognize progress and growth and reward success, rather than only identify failure. The blueprint calls on states, districts and schools to aim for all students to graduate or be on track to graduate from high school ready for college and career by 2020.</p> <p>Blueprint also calls for states and districts to publish report cards at least every two years that provide information on key indicators, such as teacher qualifications and teacher and principal designations of effectiveness; teachers and principals hired from high-performing pathways; teacher survey data on levels of support and working conditions in schools; the novice status of teachers and principals; teacher and principal attendance; and retention rates of teachers by performance level. States will also be required to report on the performance of teacher and principal preparation programs by their graduates' impact on student growth and other measure, job placement and retention.</p>
<p>Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)/State Accountability</p>	<p>Each state is required to have a system of adequate yearly progress in place that sets annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for subgroups in all schools to meet 100% proficiency on the state assessments by the 2013-2014 school</p>	<p>No comparable requirement. AYP is eliminated.</p>	<p>AYP is eliminated. States are required to develop an accountability system that:</p> <p>1) Measures annually student achievement of public school students (including growth) using the assessments;</p>	<p>Under the waiver package, states are required to pick one of three AYP options:</p> <p>1) Half to 100% in 6 years: States would have to set new AMOs by subgroup that would cut the gap in half between where</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>year.</p> <p>In addition, secondary schools are required to include graduation rates and elementary schools are required to include an academic indicator in addition to the assessments results described above in their definitions of AYP.</p>		<p>2) Evaluates and identifies annually the performance of each public school based on student achievement and the achievement of subgroups at each school (and achievement gaps);</p> <p>3) Includes a system for low-performing public schools receiving funds under Title I that requires LEAs to implement interventions in such schools (the term low-performing is not defined).</p> <p>States would be provided with a 6-year timeline to implement the requirements related to standards, assessments and accountability systems.</p> <p>The Secretary is not permitted to establish any criteria that specifies, defines or prescribes any aspect of a state's accountability system.</p>	<p>scores are now (2010-2011 assessment results) and 100% in 6 years.</p> <p>2) 100% proficiency by 2020: States would be required to set new AMOs to get all students to 100% proficiency by 2020. They would use the 2010-2011 school year performance as the starting point.</p> <p>3) States developed option: States could develop their own AMOs on a different timeline than the previous two proposals. These AMOs would have to be ambitious but achievable.</p>
<p>School Improvement Structure</p>	<p>Each LEA must identify schools which do not make AYP for a certain number of years for school improvement, corrective action and restructuring. Schools are identified for school improvement after missing AYP for two years; for corrective action after missing AYP for four years; and for restructuring after missing AYP for five years.</p>	<p>States are required to identify two main categories of schools: 1) Achievement Gap Schools; and 2) Lowest-Achieving Schools. Out of the pool of lowest-achieving schools, a state must identify a subset of persistently low-achieving schools to which to apply federally defined school turnaround strategies. At state option, a state may identify Blue Ribbon Schools.</p> <p>Achievement Gap Schools: are the 5% of high schools and the 5% of elementary and middle schools that have the largest achievement gaps among subgroups, or schools with the lowest performance of students in the subgroups.</p> <p>Lowest-Achieving Schools are the lowest achieving</p>	<p>No federally defined system of school improvement or intervention. As described under the AYP/State Accountability section above, states must develop, as part of their accountability system, a system for low-performing public schools in which LEAs must implement interventions in such schools.</p> <p>The bill does not include any defined percentage of low-performing schools that require interventions.</p> <p>The bill eliminates the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program, instead using those funds to increase authorizations for the Title I program.</p>	<p>Under the waiver package, states are required to identify two main categories of schools: 1) Focus Schools and 2) Priority Schools. At state option, a state may identify reward schools.</p> <p>Priority Schools are the bottom 5% of schools in the state. For these schools, states would have to implement one of the 4 school turnaround models or design a model based on a set of school turnaround principles.</p> <p>Focus Schools are the 10% of the schools in the state with the worst achievement</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
		<p>5% of public high schools and 5% of elementary and middle schools. Public high schools that have less than a 60% graduation rate are also identified as the lowest-achieving schools.</p> <p>Persistently Low-Achieving School are the lowest-achieving schools that meet (1) and (2) and:</p> <p>1) Receive Title I funds; are public high schools with at least 50% poverty; or are public high schools with less than a 60% graduation rate; and</p> <p>2) For the 2013-2014 school year, were low-achieving for the previous school year, and for the 2014-2015 school year and beyond, have been low-achieving for the two preceding consecutive school years.</p> <p>In the 2014-2015 school year and beyond, lowest-achieving schools which have been identified as such for only one year do not have to undertake any interventions or other steps and do not have to undertake the federally defined school turnaround strategies until they are identified as lowest-achieving schools for the two preceding consecutive school years.</p> <p>Blue Ribbon Schools may be identified by states. These schools would be the top 5% of performing schools in the state based on the percentage of achievement, school graduation, subgroup performance, and student growth. Under this authority, states may provide Blue Ribbon schools with increased autonomy over the school's budget, staffing and time; allow such schools to have flexibility in the use of any funds provided to the</p>		<p>gaps. Although schools are identified, there is not a federally defined set of interventions that would apply to these schools.</p> <p>Reward Schools are the top performing schools in the state. Among other approaches, such schools may receive visits from state officials, to be honored or receive monetary rewards.</p> <p>The Blueprint creates a reward structure with Reward schools, districts and states for those meeting performance targets. States will receive funds to design innovative programs to reward high-poverty, Reward schools and Reward districts and could include financial rewards for staff and students; flexibility under ESEA and a competitive preference for federal grant competitions.</p> <p>At the other end of the spectrum are the Challenge states, districts and schools. States will identify Challenge schools that are in need of specific assistance. The first category of Challenge schools will be the lowest-performing five percent of schools in each state based on student academic achievement, student growth, and graduation rates, that are not making progress to improve. In these schools, states and districts will be required to implement one of four school turnaround</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
		<p>school under the Act or any purpose allowed under the Act; and may reserve 0.5% of Title I funds to distribute awards to LEAs which serve one or more Blue Ribbon Schools.</p>		<p>models. Reward districts will receive flexibility to implement different research-based intervention models beyond the scope of the four school turnaround models. The next five percent of low-performing schools will be identified in a warning category, and states and districts will implement research-based, locally-determined strategies to help them improve.</p> <p>Schools that are not closing significant, persistent achievement gaps will constitute another category of Challenge schools. In these schools, districts will be required to implement data-driven interventions to support those students who are farthest behind.</p> <p>Challenge districts whose schools, principals and teachers are not receiving the support they need to succeed may also face significant governance or staffing change. Both Challenge districts and states will face additional restrictions on the use of ESEA funds and may be required to work with an outside organization to improve student academic achievement.</p>
School Turnaround Strategies	<p>Under Restructuring, LEAs are required to adopt one of five alternate governance arrangements for such schools: 1) Reopening the school as a charter school; 2) Replacing all or most of</p>	<p>Persistently low-achieving schools must adopt one of the following strategies:</p> <p>Transformation Strategy: Replacing the principal (if the principal has served for more than two years);</p>	<p>No such provision.</p> <p>No federally defined system of school improvement or intervention. As described under the AYP/State Accountability section above, states</p>	<p>The waiver package outlines that priority schools would be required to implement one of the four school intervention models under the School Improvement Grant program or a state-designed</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>the school staff relevant to the failure to meet AYP; 3) Operating the school under a private management company; 4) State takeover; or 5) Other major restructuring of the school's governance agreement.</p> <p>Under the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program, schools identified for assistance must implement one of four turnaround models:</p> <p>Turnaround Model: which would include, among other actions, replacing the principal and at least 50% of the school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing a new or revised instructional program.</p> <p>Restart Model: in which an LEA would close the school and reopen it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an educational management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.</p> <p>School Closure: in which an LEA would close the school and enroll the students who attended the school in other high-achieving schools in the LEA.</p> <p>Transformation Model: which would address each of four specific areas critical</p>	<p>requiring instructional staff and school leadership to reapply for their jobs; and requiring hiring of instructional and leadership staff to be done by mutual consent.</p> <p>Strategic Staffing Strategy: Replacing the principal (if the principal has served for more than two years); and allow the principal to use a school turnaround team, which will consist of not more than 5 teachers in the case of an elementary school or not more than 20 teachers in the case of a secondary school.</p> <p>Turnaround Strategy: Replacing the principal (if the principal has served for more than two years); and screen all teachers in the school and retain not more than 65% of them.</p> <p>Whole School Reform Strategy: Implementing an evidence-based strategy in partnership with a strategy developer who has had at least 'moderate' level of evidence that their program will have a statistically significant effect on student outcomes.</p> <p>Restart Strategy: convert the school to a public charter school, magnet school, or innovative school, or close and reopen the school as a public charter school; and ensure the school serves the same grade levels as the original school and enrolls any former student of the original school.</p> <p>School Closure Strategy: close the school and enroll students in other public schools, including paying for transportation to the new school.</p>	<p>must develop, as part of their accountability system, a system for low-performing public schools in which LEAs must implement interventions in such schools.</p>	<p>intervention model based on a federally defined set of turnaround principles.</p> <p>The Administration defines turnaround principles as meaningful interventions designed to improve the academic achievement of students in priority schools. Specifically, the turnaround principles must require:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reviewing the current principal's performance and replacing the principal if necessary; 2) Providing operational flexibility to the principal; 3) Reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; 4) Preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools/providing professional development; 5) Redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and/or teacher collaboration; 6) Strengthening the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>to transforming the lowest-achieving schools including:</p> <p>Developing teacher and school leader effectiveness, which would include evaluations that are based in significant measure on student growth to improve teachers' and school leaders' performance.</p> <p>Comprehensive instructional reform strategies, which would include the use of instructional programs that are vertically aligned from one grade to the next; and individualized student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction;</p> <p>Extending learning time and creating community-oriented schools which would include providing more time for students to learn core academic content by expanding the school day, the school week, or the school year; more time for teachers to collaborate, including time for horizontal and vertical planning to improve instruction; more time or opportunities for enrichment activities for students; and ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.</p> <p>Providing operating flexibility and sustained support, which would include</p>	<p>State Developed Option: states could develop a strategy that is approved by the US Secretary of Education.</p> <p>Rural schools are permitted to modify one element of each of these strategies.</p> <p>States may apply to the Secretary for waivers of the provisions of the turnaround strategies that require the replacement or firing of principals.</p> <p>Schools which are identified for two or more times as a persistently low-achieving school must implement the restart and school closure strategies in these subsequent re-identification periods.</p>		<p>state academic content standards;</p> <p>7) Using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data;</p> <p>8) Establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional, and health needs; and</p> <p>9) Providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.</p> <p>The Blueprint outlines that the Administration will make significant grants to help states, districts and schools implement the rigorous interventions required in each state's lowest-performing Challenge schools under CCR program.</p> <p>States will receive funds by formula and may reserve funds to build their capacity to improve low-performing schools, including developing and implementing effective school quality review teams to assist schools in identifying school needs and supporting school improvement. States will award the remainder of the funds competitively to districts or partnerships of districts and non profit</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>giving the school sufficient operating flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and ensuring the school receives technical assistance from the LEA, SEA or an external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).</p>			<p>organizations to implement one of the following intervention models:</p> <p>Transformation model: replace the principal, strengthen staffing, implement a research-based instructional program, provide extended learning time, and implement new governance and flexibility</p> <p>Turnaround Model: replace the principal and rehire no more than 50 percent of the school staff, implement a research-based instructional program, provide extended learning time, and implement a new governance structure</p> <p>Restart Model: convert or close and reopen the school under the management of an effective charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization.</p> <p>School Closure Model: close the school and enroll students who attended it in other higher-performing schools in the district.</p> <p>Districts and their partners will receive 3-year awards to fully and effectively implement one of these intervention models, and will be eligible for two additional years of funding to support a school's ongoing improvement if the school is showing progress.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
<p>Supplemental Educational Services (SES) and Public School Choice/Charter Schools & Magnet Schools</p>	<p>Students in schools which have not made AYP for 2 consecutive years must be offered the ability to choose another public school. Students in schools which have not made AYP for three years must be offered free tutoring (supplemental educational services).</p> <p>Public Charter Schools: authorizes grants to SEAs or, if a state’s SEA chooses not to participate, charter school developers, to support the development and initial implementation of public charter schools.</p> <p>Magnet School Assistance: provides grants to plan and operate magnet schools</p>	<p>Students in the bottom 5% of schools must be offered the ability to choose another public school in the LEA, unless state law prohibits it. Funds are not reserved for transportation costs.</p>	<p>No such provision.</p> <p>The bill maintains and strengthens the existing Magnet School and Parent Information and Resource Center programs, which provide states, school districts, and other entities with federal support so parents can find quality options and participate in their children’s education. The legislation moves these programs from the current Title V to a new Title III.</p> <p>Magnet Schools: continues to provide funds to support the development and implementation of innovative education methods and practices that promote diversity and increase choices in public education. The legislation makes minor changes to improve the operation of the program.</p> <p>Parent Information and Resource Centers: the bill amends the Parental Information and Resource Centers (PIRC) program, which helps to implement parental involvement policies, programs and activities that lead to improvements in student academic achievement and strengthen partnerships among parents, teachers, principals, administrators, and other school personnel in meeting the educational needs of children.</p> <p>Private Sector Initiatives: under the Local Academic Flexible Grant, states will reserve 10 percent of their funds to support state and local programs that operate outside of traditional public school systems. Private or public entities could utilize these funds to support programs that</p>	<p>Waiver package allows states receiving flexibility from the Secretary to be permitted to waive the requirement to do supplemental educational services and public school choice.</p> <p>Blueprint provides competitive grants to states, charter school authorizers, charter management organizations, districts and nonprofit organizations, to start or expand high-performing public charter schools and other high-performing autonomous public schools, with a priority for applicants proposing to start or expand high-performing public charter schools. Both charter schools and other autonomous schools funded under this program must be subject to the same accountability systems as traditional public schools. The Secretary may reserve a portion of funds to improve charter schools’ access to facilities or to facilities financing.</p> <p>Public School Choice: Continue to provide grants to districts, consortia of districts, and states in partnership with districts to expand high-quality public school educational options for students, especially students in low-performing schools, and ensure that students and families are aware of these options. Priority given to inter-district choice programs and programs that provide</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			will help increase student achievement, including scholarship and tutoring programs.	comprehensive choices to every student in a district. Priority will also be given to programs that increase diversity in the schools served by the program. Magnet Schools: Continue to provide competitive grants to districts to support magnet schools under a desegregation plan ordered by a federal court, state court, or other authorized state agency or official, or approved by the Secretary.
State Set-Aside for School Improvement	States must reserve 4% of their Title I, Part A grant for grants to LEAs to assist schools identified for school improvement.		Would increase the set-aside from 4% to 10% of a state's main Title I program.	Waiver package: not applicable.
High School Provisions	As mentioned in the AYP/State accountability section, graduation rates are required to be included as an additional indicator of state AYP definitions.	As mentioned in the State AYP/State accountability section, AYP and its indicators are eliminated. In addition, the Senate HELP bill expands NCLB's focus on high schools through several provisions: As described in the School Improvement Structure section: High schools defined as Achievement Gap Schools are separately calculated from elementary schools. All high schools with less than a 60% graduation rate, regardless of whether they receive Title I funding, are defined as Persistently Low-Performing Schools. As described in the Report Card section, state and	As mentioned in the AYP/State accountability section, AYP and its indicators are eliminated. As described in the Report Card section, states and LEAs are required, as part of their report cards, to report on the adjusted cohort graduation rate of all public high schools in the state.	Waiver package: not applicable. Blueprint calls for competitive grants to states, districts and nonprofit partners to increase access to accelerated learning opportunities for students. Grantees will carry out activities that help students prepare for, or directly provide, college-level work (including early-college or dual-enrollment programs, Advanced Placement (AP) programs, and International Baccalaureate programs), other accelerated learning programs, and gifted and talented programs in elementary and middle schools. Priority will be given to applicants that propose to serve high schools with low graduation rates and that partner with state higher

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
		<p>local report cards are required to report:</p> <p>For each high school, student graduation rates by the 2012-2013 school year;</p> <p>The rate of enrollment in IHEs; and</p> <p>By the 2013-2014 school year, the rate of student remediation of high school graduates enrolled in IHEs.</p>		<p>education offices and institutions of higher education in a program that allows higher education credits to be portable beyond the individual partner institution(s).</p>
Comparability	<p>LEAs are permitted to receive funds under Title I if state and local funds are used in Title I schools to provide comparable services to those in schools which are not receiving Title I.</p>	<p>The bill requires LEAs that receive Title I funding to demonstrate to the state that their combined state and local per-pupil expenditures (which would include actual personnel and actual non-personnel expenditures) in each Title I school are not less than the average such amount at non-Title I schools in the LEA.</p>	<p>Maintains existing comparability requirements.</p>	<p>Waiver package maintains existing comparability requirements.</p>
Highly Qualified Teachers	<p>All teachers in Title I programs must be highly qualified. All states must have a plan in place to ensure that teachers who are teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified.</p>	<p>Maintains the highly qualified requirement (including guidance and regulatory changes since the passage of NCLB), with the following exceptions:</p> <p>Eliminates the requirement that highly qualified teachers obtain 'full' state certification (just requires certification);</p> <p>Deems a teacher who has a bachelor's degree and has 'received and maintained' a rating in the 'highest categories in the state';</p> <p>A state that has all of its LEAs implementing teacher and principal evaluation systems only have to ensure that new teachers are highly qualified; and</p>	<p>Eliminates any requirements related to and the definition of highly qualified teachers.</p>	<p>Waiver package maintains the existing highly qualified definition, except that there would be no consequences for states, such as having to take over a LEAs professional development program, which do not have all of their teachers highly qualified.</p> <p>Blueprint maintains the provisions of current law relating to 'highly qualified teachers' but with additional flexibility. Will require districts to put into place new statewide definitions of 'effective teacher,' 'effective principal,' 'highly effective teacher,' and 'highly effective principal.'</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
		<p>Allows teachers who are part of a visitation/exchange program to be deemed highly qualified.</p>		<p>With new definitions and flexibility, state-level data systems will also be required that link information on teacher and principal preparation programs to the job placement, student growth and student retention outcomes of their graduates.</p> <p>In addition, district-level evaluation systems must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> meaningfully differentiate teachers and principals by effectiveness across at least three performance levels; are consistent with their state’s definition of ‘effective’ and ‘highly effective’ teacher and principal; provide meaningful feedback to teachers and principals to use in professional development; and are developed in collaboration with teachers, principals and other education stakeholders.
Teacher and Principal Evaluation	No such requirement.	<p>Under the TIF (meaning that evaluation is tied to a competitive grant program and not mandatory), grantees define multiple categories of teacher and principal performance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For teachers: this is based in significant part on evidence of improved student achievement and include observations of classroom teaching and may include other measures of student achievement; 	<p>The bill rewrites the existing teacher program to support the development and implementation of teacher evaluation systems, including: altering the formula for how funds are allocated to states and districts to give equal weight to student population and student poverty.</p> <p>LEAs (in states which are not adopting statewide teacher evaluation systems and as a condition of</p>	<p>Waiver package would require an SEA and its LEAs to develop, adopt and implement teacher evaluation and support systems. The system would be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be used for continual improvement of instruction; Differentiate between at least three

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
		<p>2. for principals: this is based in significant part on evidence of improved student achievement and student outcomes, on evidence of providing strong instructional leadership and support to teachers and staff; and on evidence of parent and family engagement.</p> <p>TIF grantees would be required to use the evaluation system to determine professional development. There is no requirement that the evaluation system be used for personnel decisions.</p>	<p>receiving Teacher Preparation and Effectiveness formula grants) would be required to develop and implement teacher evaluation systems that:</p> <p>Use student achievement as a ‘significant factor’ in the evaluation</p> <p>Use multiple measures of evaluation for assessing teacher performance</p> <p>Has more than two categories for rating teacher performance</p> <p>Is used to make personnel decisions (as determined by the LEA), and</p> <p>Is based on input from parents, school leaders, teachers and other staff.</p> <p>LEAs in states that are developing and implementing a statewide teacher evaluation system would be required to participate in such a system. Funds may also be used to train school leaders how to evaluate teachers under the system; provide evidence-based, job-embedded, and continuous professional development for teachers and school leaders focused on core academic subjects or specific student populations; and provide additional support to teachers identified as in need of assistance.</p> <p>The bill caps the use of funds for class size reduction to 10 percent.</p> <p>Currently, the bill language has no requirement</p>	<p>performance levels;</p> <p>Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth, and other measures of professional practice;</p> <p>Be used to evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis; Provide feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development;</p> <p>Be used to inform personnel decisions.</p> <p>In the request for flexibility an SEA must include a plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by no later than the end of the 2011-2012 school year.</p> <p>The Blueprint provides that school districts can use funds to develop and implement fair and meaningful teacher and principal evaluation systems, working in collaboration with teachers, principals and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Districts that have put in place the required evaluation systems may generally spend funds flexibly, except that a district that is not improving equity in the distribution of effective teachers and</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			<p>that statewide teacher evaluation systems include the components required of LEA-based accountability systems described above.</p> <p>The bill maintains liability protections included in current law that protect school employees (including teachers, administrators, and school board members) acting to control, discipline, expel, or suspend a student or to maintain order in the classroom through reasonable actions.</p>	<p>principals will be required to submit a new plan to the state under which funds will be spent solely on ensuring its evaluation system meets specified requirements.</p>
Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF)	<p>Appropriations bills have funded the Teacher Incentive Grant program. This program largely allows LEAs to operate alternative compensation models for teachers, including augmenting or basing teacher pay on academic performance.</p>	<p>Authorizes the Teacher Incentive Fund program and incorporates the teacher and principal evaluation requirements for TIF grantees as described above.</p>	<p>Does not authorize TIF. See 'Teacher and School Leader Flexible Grant' below.</p>	<p>Not addressed in waiver package.</p> <p>2012 Administration budget would combine TIF with other teacher quality programs as part of a new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund.</p> <p>Blueprint provides detail on the Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund: competitive grants for states and school districts that are willing to implement ambitious reforms to better identify, recruit, prepare, develop, retain, reward, and advance effective teachers, principals and school leadership teams in high-need schools. Grantees may use funds to reform compensation systems, to staff high-need schools, take on innovative reforms (improving salary schedules), and describe the extent to which high-performing pathways are in place.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
Teacher Quality Partnership (HEA) and Teacher and School Leader Flexible Grant	The Teacher Quality Partnership program authorizes funds to partnerships of high-need LEAs and IHEs to strengthen and reform teacher preparation.	No such provision.	<p>The bill repeals the Teacher Quality Partnership program authorized in the Higher Education Act.</p> <p>The bill creates a new 'Teacher and School Leader Flexible Grant' authority under which funds are allocated to states by formula with eligible entities at the local level competing for funds for a variety of activities related to teachers and principals, including performance pay, certification reform, teacher residency programs, and induction and mentoring programs.</p> <p>Eligible entities include an LEA or consortium of LEAs, an LEA in partnership with an IHE, a partnership between an LEA and a for-profit or non-profit organization, or an LEA in partnership with any combination of an IHE, or a for-profit or non-profit organization.</p>	No such provision.
Teacher and Leader Pathways				<p>Blueprint includes competitive grants to improve and strengthen recruitment and preparation of effective teachers, principals and other school leaders by nonprofit organizations, colleges and universities, and school districts through the high-quality preparation programs.</p> <p>Competitive grants for the recruitment, preparation, placement and induction of promising teacher candidates for high-need schools, subjects, areas, and fields. Secretary will carry out a teacher recruitment campaign working with states, districts and outside organizations to recruit talented candidates into the</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
				<p>teaching profession.</p> <p>To strengthen traditional and alternative pathways into school leadership, competitive grants for the recruitment, preparation, and support of effective principals and leadership teams to turnaround persistently low-performing schools.</p>
<p>Race to the Top (RTTT)</p>	<p>The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 created the Race to the Top program (RTTT). This program provided competitive awards to states which agreed to institute a series of education reforms focused on college and career ready standards, improved teacher quality, better education data systems, and improving school turnaround.</p>	<p>Authorizes the Race to the Top (RTTT) program.</p>	<p>Does not authorize such program.</p>	<p>Not applicable to the waiver package, but the Administration’s 2012 budget sought funding for this program.</p> <p>Blueprint proposal will provide competitive grants to students and school districts to take on ambitious and comprehensive reforms, and to encourage the broad identification, dissemination, adoption, and use of effective policies and practices.</p> <p>State and school district grantees will be required to develop and implement comprehensive plans, in collaboration with other stakeholders, to improve student outcomes, including focusing on rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments; providing better information to families to help them evaluate and improve their children’s schools, and to educators to help them improve their students’ learning; supporting effective teachers and school leaders; turning around</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
				<p>persistently low-performing schools; and supporting innovative models for reform.</p> <p>States and districts that receive grants may spend funds flexibly in a manner aligned with their plans, but states must awarded at least 50 percent of their grant funds to school districts that participate in the state plan. Grantees will be required to meet specific annual performance targets related to the implementation of their plan and to improving measurable outcomes for students and schools. Grantees must invest in rigorous evaluation of their ongoing performance and reform efforts.</p>
<p>Investing in Innovation (i3)</p>	<p>The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 created the Investing in Innovation (i3) program. This program provided competitive awards for grants to develop and validate promising practices, strategies, or programs with potential to improve student outcomes but for which efficacy has not been systematically studied.</p>	<p>Authorizes the Investing in Innovation program (i3).</p> <p>A portion of i3 funding is reserved for a new ARPA-ED program (Advanced Research Projects Agency). Would fund research in education technology, learning systems and educational tools.</p>	<p>Does not authorize such program. See the <i>Local Academic Flexible Grant</i> below.</p>	<p>Not applicable to the waiver package, but the Administration’s 2012 budget sought funding for this program.</p> <p>Blueprint will provide additional competitive grants to expand the implementation of, and the investment in, innovative and evidence-based practices, programs and strategies that significantly improve student outcomes.</p> <p>Grantees will be required to form partnerships with the private sector to secure matching funds.</p> <p>Grantees will be required to conduct or participate in an independent evaluation of their project.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
Local Academic Flexible Grant	No such provision.	No such provision.	<p>The bill creates a new program funding separate authorities. These authorities would be administered by state that receive formula allocations from the US Department of Education: 1) a Local Competitive Grant program; and 2) Awards to Nongovernmental Entities to Improve Academic Achievement.</p> <p>Local Competitive Grant: This authority, funded with 85% of each state’s Local Academic Flexible Grant funds, would make awards to eligible entities to fund supplemental student support activities, such as tutoring, afterschool and extended day (but not athletics or in-school learning), and classroom support activities, such as subject specific programs, adjunct teacher programs and parent engagement, (but not class size reduction, construction, or providing compensation or benefits to teachers, principals or school officials). These activities must be allowable under state law and ‘improve student achievement.’</p> <p>An eligible entity is defined as: An LEA in partnership with a CBO, private sector business entity, or NGO; A CBO in partnership with an LEA and, if applicable, a private sector business entity or NGO; or a private sector business entity in partnership with an LEA and, if applicable, a CBO or NGO.</p>	No such provision.

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			<p>Awards to Nongovernmental Entities to Improve Academic Achievement – This authority, funded with 10% of each state’s Local Academic Flexible Grant Funds, would provide funds to public or private organizations, CBOs and business entities for programs that improve student achievement. Grantees would have to show evidence of how the program would improve student achievement and share evidence-based and other effective strategies with LEAs and others working with students.</p>	
<p>Transferability/ Flexibility in Using Funds</p>	<p>Under current law, states (with the state share of funds) and LEAs (with the local share of funds) can generally transfer up to 50% of a program’s allocation among certain programs. The only programs presently receiving funding for which this authority applies to are Title I, Part A and Teacher Quality Grants (Title II, Part A). States or LEAs are not permitted to transfer funds out of Title I.</p>	<p>The bill increases the transferability authority to 100% and limits it to Titles II (teachers and principals) and formula programs under the Supporting Successful Well-Rounded Students Title of the bill.</p>	<p>The bill allows states with the state’s share of funds and LEAs with the local share of funds to expend certain program funds on any state or LEA activity (respectively) authorized under certain programs. The following programs are generally impacted by this authority: Title I School Improvement, Title I State Administration, the main Title I program, Migrant Education, Neglected and Delinquent, English Language Acquisition, Indian Education and a new combined rural education achievement program.</p> <p>The state share of the above programs can be used for any authorized activity under any of the same programs, except for the main Title I program and the Rural Education Achievement Program which state shares are not included in the state authority.</p> <p>The LEA share of the above programs can be used for any authorized activity under any of the same programs, except all authorities related to the main Title I program are not included in the LEA</p>	<p>No such provision.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			authority.	
Maintenance of Effort	Under most ESEA programs, states and/or LEAs must maintain the amount of state and/or LEA funding that is being expended in the prior fiscal year.	Maintains these provisions.	Eliminates maintenance of effort provisions from ESEA programs.	Not applicable.
ESEA Waivers	<p>States, LEAs, or Indian tribes may request waivers of ESEA provisions. These waivers must demonstrate how they will increase the academic achievement of students.</p> <p>Waivers are not permitted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allocations or distributions of funds to states, LEAs or other recipients; • maintenance of effort; • comparability; • supplement not supplant private school participation; • parental participation and involvement; • civil rights; • charter school requirement; • prohibitions regarding state aid and religious worship or instruction; • prohibitions on using ESEA funds for the development and distribution of materials that 	No changes to current law.	<p>The Secretary must approve a waiver request within 60 days unless the Secretary determines and demonstrates that the waiver is of a restricted item, won't increase student academic achievement, and does not provide for adequate evaluation.</p> <p>The bill also requires the Secretary to establish a peer review process for reviewing waiver requests and must use their peer review process if a waiver will not be approved.</p> <p>The bill also strikes the prohibition on waiving maintenance of effort since the bill strikes this requirement from the law (see above).</p> <p>The bill limits the amount of time a waiver can be approved from 4 years to 3 years.</p> <p>The bill maintains current law limitations on what can be waived by the Secretary with the exception of dropping MOE.</p> <p>The bill prohibits the Secretary from putting</p>	Not applicable.

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>encourage sexual activity or are legally obscene</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> prohibitions on using ESEA funds to provide sex education, or distribute condoms; selection of school attendance areas under Title I that are more than 10% lower in poverty than those selected without a waiver. 		<p>various conditions on a waiver request to approve such request.</p>	
<p>Impact Aid</p>	<p>Compensates LEAs for ‘substantial and continuing financial burden’ resulting from federal activities. Impact Aid is intended to compensate LEAs for the resulting loss of tax revenue.</p> <p>Authorizes several different types of Impact Aid payments: compensates LEAs for the federal ownership of certain property; compensates LEAs for enrolling ‘federally connected’ children; provides funds for construction and facilities upgrading to certain LEAs with high percentages of children living on Indian lands or children of military parents; and provides funds for emergency repairs and comprehensive capital improvements to 24 schools that ED currently owns but LEAs use to serve federally connected children.</p>		<p>The Impact Aid program reimburses districts located near, or serving students from, military bases, federal lands, and Indian reservations for the loss of property taxes. The legislation moves the program from Title VII of current law to a new Title IV.</p> <p>Payments for Federal Property: the bill updates the formula by which school district allotments are determined for a district with federal property located within its boundaries that cannot be taxed. The legislation enables alternative verification of tax data for districts that cannot provide original tax records, including facsimiles or other reproduction of the records. It also establishes an initial payment for districts eligible for federal property compensation based on 90 percent of the 2006 applications.</p> <p>Payments for Federally Connected Children: The bill streamlines the Heavily Impacted District program, which provides payments for school districts with high percentages of federally connected children. The legislation standardizes eligibility criteria for these districts at 45 percent</p>	<p>Will continue significant formula grant support designed to compensate districts for the expense of educating federally-connected children and for the presence in their districts of tax-exempt federal property or other property removed from the tax rolls by the federal government.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
			<p>enrollment of federally connected children, bases per pupil expenditure eligibility requirements on state average expenditures rather than national average expenditures, and maintains the tax rate requirement for eligible districts of at least 95 percent of the average tax rate for general fund purposes of comparable districts in the state. The bill also allows federally connected children to be counted in enrollment numbers in the case of open enrollment policies in a state, but does not allow children to be counted if they are enrolled in a distance education program located outside of the boundaries of the district. The bill also provides equal prorated payments greater than 100 percent of Learning Opportunity Threshold (LOT) for eligible districts. Finally, the bill extends the timeline from three to four years for which a district may count children relocated from off-base housing due to authorized DOD housing renovations and demolitions.</p> <p>Timely Payments: the bill requires the Secretary to provide Impact Aid payments for school districts within three years, addressing a major concern that many school districts do not receive on-time payments to meet their current needs.</p>	
Migrant Education	Authorizes grants to SEAs for the education of migratory children and youth. Funds are allocated by formula on the basis of each state’s number of migratory children and youth age 3-21 and the Title I-A state expenditure factor. ED may also make grants for the coordination of services and transfer of		The bill provides a reservation of funds to assist states in supporting high-quality educational programs and services to address the unique educational needs of migratory children, including during summer periods. The bill strengthens how migrant student counts are determined in each state, basing state allocations on the sum of an average of identified eligible migratory children	Continue and strengthen formula grants to states, districts, and other providers to meet the educational needs of migrant students. Will update the current funding formula to incorporate more accurate and timely data. Will strengthen and facilitate interstate efforts to support the educational transition of migrant students

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	educational records for migratory students.		from the previous three years and a count of the number of migrant children who receive services under summer programs. The legislation also allows states, school districts, and other public and private entities to improve intrastate and interstate coordination and information exchanges regarding migratory children.	into local schools and communities.
At-Risk Children and Youth	Authorizes a pair of programs intended to improve education for students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk of dropping out of school. Grants for the education of children and youth in state institutions for the neglected or delinquent, including community day programs and adult correctional institutions. Provides aid for programs operated by LEAs in collaboration with locally operated correctional facilities.		The bill provides a reservation of funds to improve educational services for students in state and local institutions or for those children who are transferring out of institutionalization.	<p>Strengthen formula grants to help states and districts put in place systems and services to meet the educational needs of homeless students. Allocate funds on the basis of counts of homeless students rather than by shares of Title I allocations. Will remove barriers to effective services for homeless children. Clarify provisions of the current statute where ambiguity resulted in delays in services for homeless children and youths. Require grantees to report on the academic outcomes for students served by the program.</p> <p>Continue and strengthen formula grants to states to improve educational services for students in state-operated institutions and community day programs for neglected or delinquent children and youths. Will ask districts to reserve funds received under the College and Career Ready Students program to support programs conducted by locally-operated institutions.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
<p>English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement</p>	<p>Formula grant allocations made to states based on the proportion of LEP students and immigrant students in each state relative to all states. States make subgrants to eligible entities based on the relative number of LEP students in schools served by the eligible entity. States required to reserve up to 15% of the state allocation to make grants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the number of immigrant students enrolled in schools in the geographic area served by the eligible entity.</p> <p>Funds must be used to increase the English language proficiency of LEP students by providing high-quality instructional programs that are grounded in scientifically based research. Funds must also be used to provide high-quality professional development to school or staff-based personnel that work with LEP students.</p> <p>Each SEA is required to develop and hold eligible entities responsible for meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for LEP students, including: annual increases in the number or percentage of students making progress in attaining English proficiency; annual increases in the number or percentage of students attaining English proficiency by</p>		<p>The bill includes a reservation of funds to provide services to English learners to help these students learn English and meet state academic standards. The bill consolidates accountability and reporting requirements for English learners into the Title I program to encourage greater alignment while maintaining student achievement expectations for these students in public reporting of progress.</p> <p>The bill eliminates the Improving Language Instruction Educational Programs, which have never been funded and are duplicative.</p>	<p>Provides formula grants to help states and school districts implement high-quality language instruction educational programs to improve the education of English Learners.</p> <p>Grantees may provide dual-language programs, transitional bilingual education, sheltered English immersion, newcomer programs for late-entrant English Learners, or other language instruction educational programs.</p> <p>Grantees may also provide effective professional development for all teachers of English Learners, including teachers of academic content areas.</p> <p>States will be required to: 1) establish new criteria to ensure consistent statewide identification of students as English Learners, and to determine eligibility, placement, and duration of programs and services, based on the state’s valid and reliable English language proficiency assessment; 2) Implement a system to evaluate the effectiveness of language instruction educational programs, and to provide information on the achievement of subgroups of English Learners, to drive better decisions by school districts for program improvement and to support districts in selecting effective programs.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>the end of each school year; and AYP targets for LEP students on annual assessments.</p>			<p>Districts not improving the performance of English Learners will lose flexibility around the use of funds under this program, and must work with the state to implement more effective strategies.</p> <p>Will provide new competitive grants to states, districts, and nonprofit partners to support the development of innovative programs, build the knowledge based about promising practices, and scale up effective practices to improve instruction for English Learners, including funding for graduate fellowships to support research and leadership in developing effective practices to improve English Learner outcomes, as well as state or district partnerships with colleges and universities for developing effective teachers.</p> <p>States will be required to adopt and implement grade-by-grade English language proficiency standards that are linked to the state's college- and career-ready academic content standards.</p>
<p>Rural Education</p>	<p>Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) initiatives that are designed to assist rural LEAs that may lack resources to compete effectively for competitive grants. Authorizes the Small, Rural School Achievement Program (SRSA) that provides flexibility in the use of funds for LEAs with less than 600 students. Authorizes the Rural and Low-Income</p>		<p>The bill reserves funds to serve rural schools and consolidates the two rural education programs: the Small Rural School Achievement program and the Rural Low-Income Schools program into one Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP).</p> <p>The legislation creates a new consolidated formula to ensure small rural schools and low-income rural schools receive funding to increase</p>	<p>Continue formula grants to rural districts to address the specific needs of students in rural areas, through the Small Rural School Achievement and the Rural and Low-Income School programs.</p> <p>Update the method used to identify districts as rural.</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>School Program (RLIS) where grants are made to rural LEAs that have a school-age poverty rate of 20% or more.</p>		<p>rural student achievement.</p> <p>The bill includes a hold-harmless provision to protect funding levels for states and school districts who received funding under the previous programs.</p>	<p>Expand the current REAP Flex authority which allows eligible small districts to use other federal education funds flexibility to districts that are eligible to receive funds under RLIS.</p> <p>Better align the accountability requirements of the College and Career Ready Students program with the rural education program so that rural education program supports school improvement efforts in low-performing districts.</p> <p>Secretary may reserve funds for national activities such as technical assistance and research on innovative programs that are designed to help rural districts overcome common capacity constraints.</p>
<p>Indian Education, Native Hawaiian Education, Alaska Native Education</p>	<p>Authorizes grants to LEAs and to schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Eligible LEAs must meet Indian student enrollment thresholds of at least 10 students or 25% or total enrollment (thresholds don't apply in Alaska, California, or Oklahoma or on or near and Indian reservation). Formula grants are allocated on the basis of the number of Indian students and the greater of the average expenditure per pupil for the state or 80% of the national average. Also authorizes competitive grants, national activities, and establishes the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.</p>		<p>The bill reserves funds to meet the unique educational and cultural needs of American Indian students and encourages Indian tribes, communities and parents to participate in the education of their children.</p> <p>The bill allows school districts and Indian tribes applying for formula grants to apply in consortia to maximize the use of federal funds.</p> <p>The bill eliminates the Native Hawaiian Education and Alaska Native Education Equity programs, which are duplicative of other services and funds provided these populations under Title I.</p> <p>Eliminates the Fellowships for Indian Students</p>	<p>Continues formula and competitive grants to states; districts; Indian tribes; Indian institutions of higher education; Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native educational and community-based organizations; and nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions to help meet the unique needs of Indian students, Native Hawaiian students and Alaska Native students.</p> <p>Grantees will have greater flexibility to use funds to carry out programs including Native language immersion and Native language restoration programs, and develop tribal specific standards and</p>

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>Authorizes consolidated program of competitive grants to Native Hawaiian educational or community-based organizations with experience operating Native Hawaiian programs, and establishes a Native Hawaiian Education Council and supports the establishment of individual island councils.</p> <p>Authorizes competitive grants for a variety of activities and services intended to improve education for Alaska Natives.</p>		<p>program and the Improvement of Educational Opportunities for Adult Indians program, which have not been funded since 1995.</p> <p>Eliminates the In-Service Training for Teachers or Indian Children Grant, the Gifted and Talented Indian Students program, and the Grants to Tribes for Education Administrative Planning and Development program, which have never received federal funding.</p>	<p>assessments.</p> <p>Improve access to funds for Indian tribes under other ESEA program and recognize and strengthen the role of tribal education departments in coordinating and implementing services and programs for Indian students within their jurisdiction.</p> <p>Continue to require participation of parents of Indian children in the design of programs.</p> <p>Expand eligibility to school districts and public charter schools under the Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native program.</p>
General Provisions	<p>Definitions.</p> <p>Authorizes SEAs and LEAs to consolidate and jointly use funds available to administration under multiple ESEA programs.</p> <p>Authorizes SEAs and LEAs to prepare single, consolidated plans and reports for all 'covered' ESEA programs.</p> <p>Authorizes waivers for the Secretary of Education associated with any program authorized under ESEA, if specifically requested by SEAs, LEAs, Indian tribes or schools.</p> <p>Uniform provisions for the participation</p>		<p>Moves them from current Title IX to a new Title V.</p> <p>Private School Students: strengthens provisions in Title I and Title V to ensure the participation of private school students and schools in the programs funded under the Act.</p> <p>Improves the consultation and negotiation processes to provide clearer procedures and faster notice for private school officials.</p> <p>Secretary's Authority: Bill protects state and local autonomy over decisions in the classroom and 1) limits the authority of the Secretary of Education.</p> <p>The legislation prevents the Secretary from creating additional burdens on states and districts through the regulatory process, particularly in the</p>	

Side-by-Side: ESEA Reauthorization

Issue	Current Law (PL 107-110)	Senate HELP Committee Bill (Passed out of Committee on 11/2011)	House Republican Committee Draft Bills (Student Success Act & Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act)	Administration Waiver Package & Administration Blueprint for Reform
	<p>of private school students and staff in those ESEA programs where such participation is authorized.</p> <p>General definition of ‘maintenance of effort’ as applied in several ESEA programs; requires ED to publish guidance on prayer in schools, among other provisions.</p> <p>Authorizes ED to reserve .5% of funds appropriated for ESEA programs (other than Titles I and III) for program evaluations</p>		<p>area of standards, assessments, and state accountability plans; 2) prohibits the Secretary from supporting efforts around state standards and influencing and coercing states into entering partnerships with other states; and 3) outlines procedures the Secretary must follow when conducting a peer review process for grant applications that will bring greater transparency.</p>	
Military Recruiters	<p>Requires LEAs receiving funds under any ED program to provide to the armed services access to directory information on secondary school students, unless students or their parents request that such information not be released.</p>		<p>Improves military recruiting provisions in current law by ensuring military recruiters have the same access to high schools as institutions of higher education.</p>	