

## Kansas ESEA Flexibility Request Summary

### Purpose of the ESEA Flexibility

In order to move forward with State and local reforms designed to improve academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction for all students, the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) is requesting flexibility, on its own behalf and on behalf of its districts, through waivers of thirteen provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The request will be submitted to the US Department of Education by February 28, 2012.

To receive the flexibility through the waivers, KSDE must submit a request that addresses four principles to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student academic achievement in the state and districts.

### Principle 1: College- and Career- Ready (CCR) Expectations for All Students

- a) Kansas adopted the Kansas Common Core Standards in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- b) Kansas is developing new assessments for grades 3-8 and once in high school which will be administered in 2014-2015. Kansas is a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium which is designing this next generation of assessments.
- c) During the next few years, KSDE will be aligning the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards to the Kansas Common Core Standards and developing English Language Proficiency assessments.

### Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support

- a) Accountability
  - a. 2011-2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) will be calculated using the 2010-2011 AYP targets. The results will be included in the report cards next fall.
  - b. 2013-2014 Adequate Yearly Progress will not be determined; however, in Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) will be established and calculated. KSDE will indicate on the report cards whether or not schools and districts met each AMO. No school or district is identified for improvement based on AMOs.
    - i. The AMOs will include state reading and mathematics assessment results from numerous years calculated in three different ways: achievement, growth and gap.
    - ii. Achievement is based on the Assessment Performance Index (API) results. Each performance level is assigned points. The points are multiplied by the number of test results in that performance level. Then the points are totaled and the average determined. Each school and district will have an API score. The scores are ranked to determine what the school's percentile is. To meet the Annual Measurable Objective for achievement, a school based on its percentile will have to increase its API score by a certain number of points.

- iii. Growth is calculated using the Student Percentile Growth Model. To compare the growth of students in a subgroup, cohort, building, or district, individual students' growth percentiles were aggregated for specific years and subjects, and the median score used as a measure of the group's performance.

To determine if a school or district meets the AMO for growth, the expectation is that the school falls within the top half of the distribution comprised of the building's median student growth score.

- iv. GAP is based on the performance difference between a building's highest and lowest performing students. To meet the AMO a school's gap must be reduced by one-half in six year.

b) Identifying Schools—Title I only

- a. Reward schools—highest achieving and high progress will be based on the Assessment Performance Index (API) and the Student Percentile Growth model data.
- b. Priority schools—lowest 5% based on achievement using the API and growth
- c. Focus schools—10% of Title I schools with the largest gaps based on gap when comparing the lowest performing students to state benchmark (top 30% of schools)

c) Interventions, Supports and Rewards

- a. Incentives and recognition—Title I “reward” schools
- b. Title I “priority” schools—Implement interventions based on turnaround principles for 3 years
- c. Title I “focus” schools—Interventions based on academic needs
- d. Incentives and supports for improvement for all other Title I schools not making progress
- e. Build state, district and school capacity to improve all schools and close gaps
- f. Timely and comprehensive monitoring of priority and focus schools
- g. Technical assistance and State and district provide support

Principle 3 Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

- a) Kansas is developing guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems
  - a. Develop, adopt, pilot and implement teacher and principal evaluation and supports
  - b. Continuous improvement instruction
  - c. Differentiated performance levels—at least 3
  - d. Multiple, valid measures
  - e. Student growth
  - f. Measure professional growth
  - g. Evaluate teachers and principals on regular basis
  - h. Clear and timely feedback
  - i. Used for personnel decisions
- b) Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol is one option for schools and district to adopt.