

From: Becky Woodie
Sent time: Thursday, September 01, 2011 12:56:49 PM
To: Patricia Levesque (patricia@excelined.org); john.bailey@dutkograyling.com
Cc: job@sde.ok.gov; Damon Gardenhire
Subject: Re: Chiefs for Change call agenda
Attachments: Oklahoma Flexibility for Reform framework.doc

John,

attached is Oklahoma's completed questionnaire that was sent to Hanna Skandera yesterday.

Becky Woodie
EA to Supt. Janet Barresi
Room B-10, Oliver Hodge Bldg.
2500 N. Lincoln Blvd.
OKC, OK 73105
405-521-4885
Becky.Woodie@sde.ok.gov

On Thu, Sep 1, 2011 at 10:22 AM, Patricia Levesque (patricia@excelined.org) <patricia@excelined.org> wrote:
Chiefs,

Attached are the agenda and documents for tomorrow's call. Please see the spreadsheet on the ESEA waivers. We are missing responses from several states. If you or your policy staff wants to weigh in prior to tomorrow's call, please send your responses to John Bailey.

Thank you so much.

Patricia

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.

Florida	high priority
Indiana	important, but not a top priority
Oklahoma	high priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	High school graduates will be ready for college or career as measured by common assessments. Instruction using the revised standards begins this year in kindergarten with PARCC common assessments beginning in 2014-15.
Indiana	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.
Oklahoma	OK has adopted CCSS and implementation is in progress. OK is also a PARCC managing partner.

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	Once established, performance standards for students and accountability standards for schools will be based upon common expectations with high performing states and compared to high performing countries.
Indiana	College and career-ready assessment??
Oklahoma	True readiness measure that can be used for postsecondary placement.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	Nothing
Oklahoma	OK just fired its testing vendor and is fighting push back against CCSS and PARCC. OK is trying to bridge to PARCC under these “heightened” circumstances.

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	Florida would like students who take more challenging course work and associated assessments (e.g., Algebra 1 in 7 th grade) to use the score in state's end-of-course test for school accountability rather than be required to also take the less-demanding grade-level assessment
Indiana	We can substitute PARCC assessments (someday) for our own assessments. Not sure if there is anything immediate we would ask for
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK needs flexibility to bridge to PARCC and would like to exclude bridge questions from accountability. • OK is struggling with vertical scaling issues related to assessment (tension between testing within grade and students several years behind) • Oklahoma is implementing new reporting model for graduates to align with federal reporting requirements.

- 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.

Florida	high priority
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	high priority
 - What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	To identify those schools which are consistently demonstrating unacceptably low achievement and ensure implementation of initiatives that are most likely to result in improved outcomes for students
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Flexibility of control. The SDE needs the power to intervene and reduce funding if necessary.
 - How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	Utilize Florida's statewide accountability system including increased achievement expectations, in lieu of ESEA AYP criteria, to identify schools that are failing their students. Florida has new assessments for reading, mathematics, and science that measure more challenging content and will have increased expectations for proficiency
Indiana	Bottom 5% of schools in return for not having to follow AYP
Oklahoma	Oklahoma wants to utilize growth models as opposed to AYP. We will be able to ID lowest 5% under this model and implement either state guided restructure, or state takeover and operation of school or charter conversion. Also autonomy for top 5%.
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida already has a differentiated accountability system approved for use in ESEA
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Oklahoma just passed and is in early stages of implementation of A-F grading system.
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?
(AYP flexibility is suggested).

Florida	Florida would like to improve differentiated accountability so that it is fully aligned with the state's school grading system without direct components of AYP. The criteria for identifying struggling schools currently are a hybrid between state and Federal accountability systems. This design makes it confusing to the general public and difficult to get community support for making changes at these schools. The desired flexibility would include dropping the AYP criteria and only employing the State's school grades criteria. These criteria are under revision and are customized to our assessment system. The criteria establish rigorous expectations which have been shown to make significant impact on achievement, include measures of student growth, and place additional emphasis on the lowest achieving students in each school
Indiana	In return for allowing state to sub their own state accountability systems for AYP, state must address approximately the bottom 5% of schools
Oklahoma	Automatic flexibility for high performing schools [top 5%] and required takeover of chronically low performing districts [bottom 5%]. Ability to use A-F grading system instead of traditional accountability; growth model included in A-F.
- Implementing aggressive & differentiated Intervention
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2=important, but not a top priority.

Florida	high priority
Indiana	high priority

Oklahoma	high priority
----------	---------------

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	To reform struggling schools into schools which ensure maximum opportunities for their students' success. After a defined period, if these schools don't improve, the district and the school must choose turn around options such as contracting with an EMO, a charter operator, or closing the school
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Letter grades will guide differentiated intervention. Parent trigger would also be an option..

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	In order to exit the state's intervene category in DA, schools must improve their state accountability rating (from an "F" to a "C") and improve their student performance in Reading.
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Effective rules for identifying low performing schools; must move from F to C in 2 years.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

(Close coordination with the School Improvement Grant (SIG) will be critical).

Florida	Use our state accountability system to determine when schools must enter intervene status and when they have made enough progress to exit. This will help the public understand when aggressive action must be taken to improve opportunities for their community
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	State accountability with clearer identification, more effective measures of performance/growth/improvement; effective methods for evaluation of intervention should lead to free hand for states. SIG can fold into accountability & differentiated intervention well

➤ Providing clear and thorough parental/ community information

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

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	important, but not a top priority
Oklahoma	important, but not a top priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	The school grade and DA status must be aligned and provide parents/communities with information that is transparent, trusted, and assists in decision making
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Remove cap on charter schools, allow vouchers. Develop incentives through public-private partnerships, competitive grants criteria and true state accountability.

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	We must have truth in advertising. A school that has received an F must clearly be failing its students and be entered into intervene status. A system that leads to a C school being in forced turn-around is not logical
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Agree on truth in advertising and voices of parents/community.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	n/a

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	Require parent trigger and/or require parent/community involvement in some way as part of intervention process through the state accountability system
Oklahoma	Parent trigger supported by both a community engagement process and a state evaluation team (based on 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.

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	low priority
Oklahoma	high priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	Section 1, Article IX, of the Constitution of the State of Florida provides the state's key policy objective “The education of children is a fundamental value of the people of the State of Florida. It is, therefore, a paramount duty of the state to make adequate provision for the education for the education of all children residing within its borders. Adequate provision shall be made by law for a uniform, efficient, safe, secure, and high quality system of free public schools that allows students to obtain a high quality education, and operation of institutions of higher learning and other public education programs that the needs of the people may require.”
Indiana	Want to better understand other states' objectives in this area in order to help us formulate our own
Oklahoma	Funding follows the child – even with mid-year mobility. Funding formula should not vary by state – coding needs to be clear and common/universal for reporting by site. Funding by USDE should be close to a block grant model with state sending out and accounting for dollars per student. Easier to determine ROI.

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	The Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) is the student enrollment based formula that allocates equalized funding to Florida school districts and schools. The funding formula, when enacted into law, articulates the constitutional requirements “for a uniform, efficient, safe, secure and high quality system of free public schools that allows students to obtain a high quality education.”
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Data system links performance and funding and can measure ROI.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida has unique and diverse demographic and geographic economies that provide challenges to the delivery of education services to Florida students. School districts in Florida range from large urban to small rural districts with a wide range of education needs of the students they serve
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a

- 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).

Florida	None
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If funding is more than required to meet student needs, then allow money to be repurposed. Title I funding follows the student (reported out that way). Link state and federal funding guidelines

- rewarding fiscal transparency with additional fiscal flexibility/transferability
- Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2= important, but not a top priority.

Florida	high priority
Indiana	important, but not a top priority
Oklahoma	High priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	Funding transparency and fiscal flexibility are key components of Florida school district budget systems. A key policy objective is to provide local school boards with maximum flexibility in the use of funds while making information available to the public (transparency) about budget plans and accountability for expenditures
Indiana	Would also like to better understand other state's policy objectives in this area in order to help us formulate our own
Oklahoma	Linking federal funds to transparency (reporting) and student-based funding. Transparency is very important before flexibility is granted to the district.

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	Currently school district annual reports and program cost reports are available on the Department of Education's website. Plans for the availability of transaction-level data and contracts for goods and services are being developed on a statewide basis
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Districts publish dashboard reports for expenditures vs. revenues and Report academic outcomes and site grade (A-F). Reporting must show priority given to instruction as opposed to administration.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	The State of Florida is working toward a uniform chart of accounts and uniform financial reporting across all state agencies, school districts, state colleges and universities, cities, counties, and other governmental entities
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Career Tech is unique and possesses funding challenges.

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	While it is desirable to have a “maintenance of effort (MOE)” policy for federally funded programs, the policy should have provisions to accommodate economic recession. Perhaps a MOE waiver provision should be provided for states that can document losses to state and local revenue due to economic hard times
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	As fed and state transparency policies align, move to block grants to states. MOE waiver is good idea, especially in difficult economic times.

- 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.

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	high priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	Florida's educators and policymakers are frequently asked to explain how funds appropriated for education are spent and how effectively these funds have been used to generate school and student performance. Because funding for education is an investment in Florida's future, the shareholders (Florida's citizens) have an interest in the return provided by this investment.
---------	--

	<p>Evaluating schools' educational Return on Investment (ROI) can help answer key questions about the direction of education in Florida, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we measure the success of our efforts? • How do we know whether we're accomplishing what we set out to do? • How can we make informed decisions about the ongoing use of our resources? <p>To assist in answering these questions, the Florida Department of Education has developed the ROI website, which includes an ROI index calculation for schools. The ROI index provides an indicator of a school's cost-effectiveness by combining two key measures of the delivery of educational programs: costs and learning gains</p>
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	OK wants to move towards ROI measures – consistent with the funding and accountability points raised above. Besides showing on SDE website, it should be on each district website.

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	The bar for the ROI index is set by the academic performance standards for students approved by the State Board of Education
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	OK would love to engage with other states in an ROI discussion.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	School finance information is collected for each school by education program. Individual student learning gains are measured. This detailed level of information is used to calculate the ROI index
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	None
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Allow accountability reports on budgeting to be aligned with state reporting. Make it student based, not program based. Easier to see ROI.

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.

Florida	high priority
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	high priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	The state has achieved its policy objectives with the passage of SB 736. There is implementation yet to do, especially with regard to grades and subjects not included on statewide assessments; however, the objective has been achieved, as Florida law now requires that beginning with the 2011-12 school year, 50% or each instructional personnel and administrator evaluation is based upon the performance of students assigned to his/her classroom or school
Indiana	End HQT requirements completely and substitute it with "HET"
Oklahoma	Licensure based on performance. Include evaluation of superintendents. HET replaces HQT.

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	A reasonable expectation is that the gap between student performance and evaluation results continues to shrink (like our percentage of NHQ teachers has to shrink each year) – the proof is in the data. The high bar is that it is eventually included as a criterion for Professional Certification or renewal of a Professional Certificate
---------	---

Indiana	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
Oklahoma	OK strongly agrees with FL & IN.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida has a law that now requires this beginning in 2011-12; has adopted a value-added calculation to measure student learning growth in statewide assessments, with additional models being adopted for other grades, subjects and assessments over the next three years
Indiana	We are already able to do this, so we have no problem with it.
Oklahoma	TLE is developing.

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

(Current HQT requirements focus on the wrong, or at least insufficient, indicators).

Florida	Allow the State to stop tracking/reporting on Highly Qualified Teachers if the state is going to track/report on Highly Effective Teachers
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	Move flexibility on HQT for special education. No HET if strong TLE system.

➤ Staffing decisions based on evaluations

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

Florida	high priority
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	high priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	Districts execute staffing plans that hire/retain/dismiss/place teachers primarily based on data gleaned through their evaluation systems
Indiana	I think we have already achieved our policy objectives along these lines
Oklahoma	Ditto Florida

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	A high bar is that the percentage of teachers determined to be effective and highly effective is greater for schools that are high poverty, high minority or previously low performing than the average for a whole district. A reasonable expectation is that the district report these data for the Equitable Distribution plan and that the gap in percentages closes over a period of three years
Indiana	I think any requirement along these lines is already a high bar
Oklahoma	HETs placed at high need schools. This should be a part of requirements under differentiated intervention.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida has included this as a part of RTTT and SB 736 requires the use of evaluation data for teacher assignment, reduction in force and contract renewal. In addition, under SB 736, a principal can refuse to access a transferred teacher based on his/her evaluation results
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	If the state reports these data for its equitable distribution plan the state no longer needs to track/report HQT data
Indiana	This could be part of the state requirement in return for no longer having to track HQT in any way
Oklahoma	No more HQT track.

➤ 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.

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	important, but not a top priority. Not sure
Oklahoma	important, but not a top priority.

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	(1) To have regular compensation systems ("salary") and bargaining agreements that support student achievement, effective instruction and successful leadership (2) To have professional development that is based on positive changes instructional (or leadership) practices and on student outcomes, and to glean some of these data from the new evaluation systems.
Indiana	Would love to hear other states' ideas here in order to help spur my thinking
Oklahoma	Implementation of RTI. Use part of Title I and all of Title II on professional development with programs evaluated for effectiveness (improved outcomes for students) and ed schools learning from effective programs. Performance pay after we get TLE in place and longitudinal data system. Tenure is earn in (& earn out). Certification renewal is based on performance. PD should be directed at supporting development of teacher effectiveness with respect to policy initiatives.

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	(1) A high bar is that each district has a salary schedule and a collective bargaining agreement that are based in incentivizing and rewarding effective performance (2) A high bar is that the renewal of a professional certificate would include indicators of student performance (as mentioned above) and participation in professional development that was rated as effective based on an evaluation of the professional development.
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	PD should be focused & designed to meet the needs of the initiative. Also, it should be responsive to TLE evaluations, appropriated and targeted.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	(1) SB 736 requires each district to adopt a performance salary schedule to be implemented in 2013-14 school year (2) The state is focusing resources on job-embedded professional development, especially lesson study, to assist teachers in implementing state and Common Core standards.
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	TLE commission will have guidelines in December.

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	None
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Flexibility in spending Title I, II to meet PD needs.

Options

➤ Charter schools

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

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	high

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	To support the establishment and maintenance of high quality charter schools as a school choice option for all students and parents regardless of income, disability or race
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Ditto Florida

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	In Florida, charter schools are graded just as traditional schools are graded so they are accountable for student performance and financial stability. The standard that we attempt to reach is to provide support to our charter schools and charter authorizers to make sure that they are getting results in those areas. We also encourage and support the closure of charter schools that have failed to get results after being given a fair opportunity
---------	--

Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Ditto Florida

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida has recently developed a set of criteria for what constitutes a "high performing charter school". With this prestigious designation come certain benefits in terms of replication of these schools, contract renewal, funding, etc
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	In order to protect the innovative and autonomous nature of charter schools, it may be appropriate for charter schools to be treated separately from traditional public schools in terms of differentiated accountability and school improvement. Charter schools should be given the freedom to open a school and operate autonomously. If they are not successful they should be closed rather than made to look like traditional public schools.
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	We need to be able to repurpose some funds for facility related expenses.

➤ virtual schools

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

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	Important, but not a priority at this time.

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	The main state policy objective is provide Florida students with choice and access to high quality virtual education options that incorporate the ten elements of high-quality digital learning and prepare students for postsecondary education and the 21 st century workplace.
Indiana	Keep our market for virtual charters and other virtual schools alive and growing
Oklahoma	Getting ahead of virtual schools – policy and data catch up without undermining their growth or success, and Ditto Florida.

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	All virtual schools and programs are school choice options for parents and the funding follows the student. Funding is based on performance (successful completions) rather than enrollment and attendance (seat time). Private virtual instruction providers go through an extensive DOE approval process. All virtual public school students must take state assessments and all full-time virtual options are included in the state's accountability system. All full-time virtual programs and schools (FLVS, districts and providers) receive school grades for the performance of their virtual students. The state is currently developing an evaluation methodology for part-time virtual providers
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Virtual schools should have the same accountability as traditional schools. They should be accountable for a competency based model.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida has multiple state-level and district-level virtual choice options for families. These include both full-time and supplemental virtual options at all grade levels. All Florida school districts offer at least one virtual option for students at all grade levels and most offer more. Florida's state-level virtual school is now authorized to offer a full-time K-12 virtual school at the state-level in addition to its largely supplemental program. Florida now has an online course requirement for graduation
Indiana	General assembly is mis-trustful of virtual schools and virtual charters in particular
Oklahoma	Virtual Charter School got off to a very bad start and there is little trust by the legislature.

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	None
Indiana	Not sure? Maybe somehow requiring states to allow virtual charters and other virtual schools, but I'm not sure in return for what flexibility
Oklahoma	n/a

➤ Tax credits

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

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	important, but not a top priority
Oklahoma	Important, but not for waiver.

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	The state's objective is to ensure that private schools that receive scholarship students are compliant with all state laws, including those that relate to health, safety and welfare as well as testing and audit requirements. It is further, to make sure that the state can provide as much information as possible to parents of eligible students on how to make the best choice for their child
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Oklahoma is implementing the tax credit scholarship.

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	High parental satisfaction with the options available and demonstrable student achievement results from those who participate.
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	All providers must meet stringent requirements and accountability for student outcomes.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	We do not allow donors to target donations to specific private schools or systems. Donations must be to the program as a whole and only the parent has the ability to choose the best option for his/her child
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Newly implemented

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	Not applicable
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a

➤ Choice

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

-

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	High priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	To ensure that parents and students have the choices needed to find the high quality school that best meets the needs of their student and that the state and districts are able to provide as much information as possible to parents and students to allow them to make that decision
Indiana	Promote the inter-district choice, private choice, tax credit and charter school, in addition to intra-district choice options available in the state
Oklahoma	Ditto above, plus assure Oklahoma kids have access to the full range of choice options.

- How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	Continually increase the number of high quality options available to all children
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Have a 5 year plan to increase choice options.

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	In addition to the many school choice options that districts provide including magnets, career academies and controlled open enrollment, Florida has statewide programs for charter schools, virtual education, and private school scholarship programs for poor and disabled students
Indiana	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
Oklahoma	No vouchers yet

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	None
Indiana	If LEAs allow intra-district 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?)
Oklahoma	n/a

➤ Tutoring/SES

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

-

Florida	high priority
Indiana	important, but not a top priority
Oklahoma	Important, but not a top priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	To increase the number and percentage of high performing SES providers as determined by the SEA's provider evaluation process
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	To be able to determine the effectiveness of SES providers and to find workable/palatable SES for rural schools.

- How do you articulate a "high bar" for this objective?

Florida	The number of SES providers who obtain an "Excellent" service designation during the SES Provider Evaluation process
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Grade SES like you do schools

- What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Regarding SES, the 20% Title I set aside poses significant policy challenges: rural schools have very few (if any) options for SES and online tutoring is unpopular.

- What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

(20% set aside and very structured state approval process may be problematic).

Florida	To allow the SEA to utilize a small percentage of the 20% set-aside so that Florida can implement a state-wide assessment for SES providers
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	More flexibility for rural schools on SES.

Reports

➤ Single federal report

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

-

Florida	n/a
Indiana	high priority
Oklahoma	high priority

- What is the state's key policy objective?

Florida	Florida has no concerns at this time
Indiana	Be allowed to merge all federal reports for LEAs and SEA
Oklahoma	OK has just begun a project to merge federal and state reporting – to

- | | |
|--|--|
| | reduce the multi-reporting burden on SEAs and LEAs. Starting to explore federal reporting data mart for K12 and higher ed. |
|--|--|
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	This could be a reward for meeting all of the other “high bars.”
Oklahoma	n/a
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	n/a
Indiana	Be allowed to merge all federal reports for LEAs and SEA
Oklahoma	Ditto Indiana
- Data**
- Development of state longitudinal data systems
 - Is this a priority? 1=low priority; 3= high priority; 2= important, but not a top priority.

Florida	high priority for agency, low priority for state ESEA waiver
Indiana	important, but not a top priority
Oklahoma	High priority
 - What is the state’s key policy objective?

Florida	Florida is modernizing its data systems to make data more accessible to stakeholders and researchers and facilitate the use of data in education policy decision making
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	OK is tackling an array of data system issues; change the culture about data-use it to inform instructional practices.
 - How do you articulate a “high bar” for this objective?

Florida	Florida will increase access to information for policy decision making
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	Data is used by each teacher daily to inform decisions. Principals & superintendents use it to best manage employees.
 - What is unique to your state that other the other C4C chiefs should know?

Florida	Florida has had a long history of student data collection and now is in the process of upgrading systems to ensure that they continue to inform education policy for the future. Florida is increasing the avenues that stakeholders can access to get information such as providing a customizable function so that people can build their own reports, and developing dashboards that users can use to customize the information they need. In addition, Florida is tagging key words to the data we provide on the web so people can search for information. In addition, Florida will provide predefined reports in a more consistent manner. Finally Florida is working to decrease the length of time that people need to wait to get information. For example, Florida is automating the data request process to make it quicker for researchers to get data once approved
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	WOW – Florida, you rock!
 - What is the desired federal flexibility from NCLB to facilitate that policy?

Florida	None
Indiana	n/a
Oklahoma	n/a