

**From:** Janet Barresi  
**Sent time:** Monday, August 22, 2011 2:30:59 PM  
**To:** Katie Altshuler  
**Subject:** Fwd: working document for ESEA waiver call  
**Attachments:** C4C at a glance Indiana.xlsx Indiana 2011 C4C Flexibility for Reform Framework Questionnaire.docx

---

For you review. Some of the comments are from Policy folks in Indiana.  
Janet

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Mary Laura Bragg** ([MaryLaura@excelined.org](mailto:MaryLaura@excelined.org)) <[MaryLaura@excelined.org](mailto:MaryLaura@excelined.org)>

**Date:** Sun, Aug 21, 2011 at 8:21 AM

**Subject:** working document for ESEA waiver call

**To:** "Barresi, Janet" <[jcb@sde.ok.gov](mailto:jcb@sde.ok.gov)>, "Barresi, Janet Asst Becky Woodie" <[becky.woodie@sde.ok.gov](mailto:becky.woodie@sde.ok.gov)>, "Barresi, Janet Comm Dir Damon Gardenhire" <[damon.gardenhire@sde.ok.gov](mailto:damon.gardenhire@sde.ok.gov)>, "Barresi, Janet COS Jennifer Carter" <[jennifer.carter@sde.ok.gov](mailto:jennifer.carter@sde.ok.gov)>, "Bennett, Tony" <[tb@doe.in.gov](mailto:tb@doe.in.gov)>, "Bennett, Tony Asst Debbie Downing" <[ddowning@doe.in.gov](mailto:ddowning@doe.in.gov)>, "Bennett, Tony Asst Jennifer Outlaw" <[joutlaw@doe.in.gov](mailto:joutlaw@doe.in.gov)>, "Bennett, Tony COS Heather Neal" <[hneal@doe.in.gov](mailto:hneal@doe.in.gov)>, "Bowen, Stephen" <[stephen.bowen@maine.gov](mailto:stephen.bowen@maine.gov)>, "Bowen, Stephen" <[stephenbowen@myfairpoint.net](mailto:stephenbowen@myfairpoint.net)>, "Cerf, Chris" <[cdcerf@gmail.com](mailto:cdcerf@gmail.com)>, "Cerf, Chris Asst Helene Leona" <[helene.leona@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:helene.leona@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Cerf, Chris Dep Comm Sp Asst Mamie Doyle" <[mamie.doyle@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:mamie.doyle@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Cerf, Chris Special Asst Andrew Smarick" <[andrew.smarick@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:andrew.smarick@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Gist, Deborah" <[deborah.gist@ride.ri.gov](mailto:deborah.gist@ride.ri.gov)>, "Huffman, Kevin" <[Kevin.S.Huffman@tn.gov](mailto:Kevin.S.Huffman@tn.gov)>, "Huffman, Kevin COS Emily Barton" <[emily.barton@tn.gov](mailto:emily.barton@tn.gov)>, "Pastorek, Paul" <[pastorekpg@gmail.com](mailto:pastorekpg@gmail.com)>, "Pastorek, Paul Asst Christina Rose" <[christina.rose@eads-na.com](mailto:christina.rose@eads-na.com)>, "Robinson, Gerard" <[gtr924@aol.com](mailto:gtr924@aol.com)>, "Robinson, Gerard scheduler Joseph Morgan" <[joseph.morgan@fldoe.org](mailto:joseph.morgan@fldoe.org)>, "Robinson, Gerard Scheduler Nyla Benjamin" <[nyla.benjamin@fldoe.org](mailto:nyla.benjamin@fldoe.org)>, "Skandera, Hanna" <[hanna.skandera@state.nm.us](mailto:hanna.skandera@state.nm.us)>, "Skandera, Hanna COS Cathie Carothers" <[cathie.carothers@state.nm.us](mailto:cathie.carothers@state.nm.us)>, "Skandera, Hanna Policy Leighann Lenti" <[leighann.lenti@state.nm.us](mailto:leighann.lenti@state.nm.us)>, "Skandera, Hanna Scheduler Bernadette Tennyson" <[bernadette.tennyson@state.nm.us](mailto:bernadette.tennyson@state.nm.us)>, "Smith, Eric" <[drericjsmith@gmail.com](mailto:drericjsmith@gmail.com)>  
**Cc:** "Erlichson, Bari" <[bari.erlichson@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:bari.erlichson@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Kant, Nick" <[nick.kant@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:nick.kant@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Emigholz, Christopher" <[christopher.emigholz@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:christopher.emigholz@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Gantwerk, Barbara" <[barbara.gantwerk@doe.state.nj.us](mailto:barbara.gantwerk@doe.state.nj.us)>, "Patricia Levesque ([patricia@excelined.org](mailto:patricia@excelined.org))" <[patricia@excelined.org](mailto:patricia@excelined.org)>, Chris Meyer <[Chris.Meyer@la.gov](mailto:Chris.Meyer@la.gov)>, "[mbrown@doe.in.gov](mailto:mbrown@doe.in.gov)" <[mbrown@doe.in.gov](mailto:mbrown@doe.in.gov)>

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!

# Chiefs FOR CHANGE

The following table identifies the key priorities for each C4C state. The purpose of the chart is to represent the importance of each issue discussion only. The issues derive from the "Chiefs for Change Flexibility for Reform Framework."

Rating scale: 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important , but not a top priority.

C4C @ a Glance	Accountability				Funding			Human Capital			Charter	Virt.
	Common standards/ assess.	Improving ID of schools & districts	Aggressive & differentiated Intervention	Parental/ community information	Student based budgeting	Flexibility & incentives	Analyzing school level fiscal w/ academic growth	Evaluations based in significant part on growth	Staffing decisions based on evaluations	Development of SHCM(1) based on evaluations & strategic support		
OK	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
IN	2	3	3	2	1	2	3	3	3	2	3	3
ME	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
NJ	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
RI	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	2	2
TN	2	2	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
FL	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2
NM	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

(1) Strategic Human Capital Management

e for the state. This is intended for internal

Options			Reports	Data
Tax - credits	Choice	Tutor	Single federal report	Develop SLDS
2	2	2	2	2
2	3	2	3	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2
2	2	2	2	2

## 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? **CCSS already adopted. We are a PARCC managing partner. It is important to us, but not necessarily something we think of in terms of this waiver.**
  - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective? **College and career-ready assessment??**
  - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know? **Nothing.**
  - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy? **We can substitute PARCC assessments (someday) for our own assessments. Not sure if there is anything immediate we would ask for.**
  
- 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? **This is maybe the highest priority of all for IN. We want the waiver process to help us raise the bar on our state accountability system, so that we can reach more schools (and maybe districts as well for the first time). We’d like ED to tell us we need to reach approximately the bottom 5% of schools with our state system in order to substitute it for AYP.**
  - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective? **Bottom 5% of schools in return for not having to follow AYP**
  - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know? **State accountability system and making it more aggressive was one of the main bills that caused our House Dems to walkout for 5 weeks last session. We had to pull back the bill last year. If ED can hold us to a higher bar, we may finally be able to make our accountability system stronger as we want to. We can “blame” it on the feds.**
  - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy? **(AYP flexibility is suggested). In return for allowing state to sub their own state accountability systems for AYP, state must address approximately the bottom 5% of schools.**
  
- 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? **Ability to utilize our own accountability system, which already gives our state board of education broad authority to implement differentiated interventions depending on the needs of the school.**

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective? Refer to above element. States should have broad authority to implement differentiated consequences for schools as part of their own accountability systems in return for no longer using AYP.
- 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?  
(Close coordination with the School Improvement Grant (SIG) will be critical). Ability to utilize our own accountability system, which already gives our state board of education broad authority to implement differentiated interventions depending on the needs of the school. We would be happy to coordinate SIG more closely with our state accountability system in any way the feds request, as long as it doesn't involve extra/excessive paperwork/bureaucracy
- 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? If feds are willing to require some kind of parent trigger provision as part of a state's accountability system, we'd be pleased about that.
  - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective? Not sure I'd want them to require anything more than simply that parents and/or community members' voices be heard as part of a state's accountability system in order for it to be substituted for AYP. It would get bureaucratic to require too many specifics in this area.
  - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know? We already require community representatives to be part of the teams that evaluate schools that fall into the early years of our state's accountability system, so we are
  - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy? Require parent trigger and/or require parent/community involvement in some way as part of intervention process through the state accountability system

## 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? Want to better understand other states' objectives in this area in order to help us formulate our own.
  - 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? Would also like to better understand other state's policy objectives in this area in order to help us formulate our own.
  - 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? Tony strongly wants to implement some kind of “fiscal letter grade” for each district in our state. We aren't yet sure how this might be calculated.
  - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective? Would love to hear other states' ideas about this- we want to include use of state and possibly even local funds in our calculations, so how we might want fed waiver requirement to help us achieve this isn't clear to me yet.
  - 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? End HQT requirements completely and substitute it with "HET"
  - How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective? State must propose system of requiring teacher evaluations based in significant part on student/school growth data. An even higher bar could require this to be tied to teacher licensure as well.
  - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know? We are already able to do this, so we have no problem with it.
  - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy? (Current HQT requirements focus on the wrong, or at least insufficient, indicators). No more requirement to track HQT in any way if a state implements annual teacher evaluations based in significant part on student/school growth data.
  
- 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? I think we have already achieved our policy objectives along these lines.
  - How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective? I think any requirement along these lines is already a high bar.
  - 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? This could be part of the state requirement in return for no longer having to track HQT in any way.
  
- 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. Not sure
  - What is the state's key policy objective? Would love to hear other states' ideas here in order to help spur my thinking.
  - 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? Keep our market for virtual charters and other virtual schools alive and growing.
  - How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
  - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know? General assembly is mis-trustful of virtual schools and virtual charters in particular.
  - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy? Not sure? Maybe somehow requiring states to allow virtual charters and other virtual schools, but I'm not sure in return for what flexibility...
  
- 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? **Promote the inter-district choice, private choice, tax credit and charter school, in addition to intra-district choice options available in the state.**
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?
- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know? **We already have vouchers, charters, tax credits, a good deal of inter-district choice. It would be great to find ways to help publicize it all.**
- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy? **If LEAs allow intradistrict choice and will promote the multitude of other choice options in the state (per IDOE's requirements), LEA will no longer have to do 20% set-aside. (This is just one crazy idea- what do others think?)**

➤ 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? **Be allowed to merge all federal reports for LEAs and SEA.**
- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective? **This could be a reward for meeting all of the other "high bars."**
- 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? **Be allowed to merge all federal reports for LEAs and SEA.**

**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?