

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline

Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1111: STATE & LOCAL REQUIREMENTS			
➤ COLLEGE & CAREER READY ALIGNED STANDARDS FOR READING OR LA & MATH (P. 32 - 35)		Nancy Konitzer	<p>Summary:</p> <p>Standards section contains little change from NCLB, except the standards must now be college and career ready aligned. Note the reference to alignment with course work at higher ED, CTE standards and career skills, in additional to academic achievement.</p> <p>State consortia are permitted and the Secretary has no approval authority.</p> <p>College and Career Ready Standards</p> <p>State needs CCR content standards for ELA and math by Dec. 2013</p> <p>State needs CCR achievement standards aligned to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) course work at higher ED (w/o remediation) B) CTE standards C) Career skills D) As well as – aligned to CCR content standards E) And levels of performance - basic ,on track, and advanced <p>NO review or approval by Secretary</p> <p>Science Standards</p> <p>State needs science content and achievement standards aligned to CCR standards</p> <p>NO review or approval by Secretary</p> <p>OPTION for accountability – science plus other subjects – if meet ELA/math requirements</p>
➤ SCIENCE STANDARDS (P. 35)		Nancy Konitzer	
➤ ALTERNATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES (P. 36 - 37)		Nancy Konitzer	
➤ ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY STANDARDS (P. 37 - 38)		Nancy Konitzer	
➤ STATE ASSESSMENTS (P.38 - 41)		Nancy Konitzer	

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline

Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>Alternative Assessments</p> <p>Aligned with CCR standards</p> <p>Promote access to general curriculum</p> <p>Individual achievement measures</p> <p>ELP Standards</p> <p>Aligned with CCR content ELA standards</p> <p>Measure 4 domains of proficiency</p> <p>Address levels of proficiency</p> <p>Updated when ELA standards are updated</p> <p>State Assessments</p> <p>statewide to all students:</p> <p>Required in reading/ELA and mathematics</p> <p>For grades 3-8 plus at least once in grades 10-12</p> <p>Aligned to content standards</p> <p>Measure individual achievement</p> <p>OPTION – may be used for growth model</p> <p>One-time or multiple assessments for a summative score</p> <p>Science in grades spans 3-5, 6-9,and 10-12</p> <p>Includes EL proficiency and other subject assessments</p>
<p>➤ REQUIREMENTS FOR ASSESSMENTS (P. 41 - 47)</p>		Debbie Owens	<p><u>Key Issues</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Valid and reliableMultiple measures including higher order thinkingSWD and ELLUse English for RLA if attended school for 3 or more years except case by case determination.

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use other languages for a period not to exceed 2 yrs.• Include students who have attended an LEA for a full academic year but not attended a single school for full academic year.• Disaggregate results• Enable itemized score analyses to be produced and reported to LEAs and schools to address academic needs of students.• Produce student achievement and other student data that “can” be used for principal and teacher evaluation.• Participation rate not less than 95 % of all students enrolled <p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• P.42 what does “multiple measures” mean?• P.44 lowest level (good) of ELL exempt for not more than 2 years. RECOMMEND 3 yrs.• P. 45 Use other languages for a period not to exceed 2 yrs. RECOMMEND 3 yrs. & allow states with English only to continue with practices• ???Produce student achievement and other student data that “can” be used for principal and teacher evaluation. (TN doesn’t have concern)• ???Participation rate not less than 95 % of all students enrolled (TN doesn’t have concern) <p>Areas of Support</p> <p>Support all areas except those listed in areas of concerns</p>
➤ LANGUAGES OF ASSESSMENTS (P. 48)		Debbie Owens	<p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• States make efforts to develop assessments in other languages.• By 2015-16 annual assessment of English proficiency of ALL ELL students.

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• p. 48 States make efforts to develop assessments in other languages. What about English ONLY states? <p>Areas of Support</p> <p>Support all areas except those listed in areas of concerns</p>
<p>➤ ASSESSMENTS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (P. 48 - 49)</p>		Debbie Owens	<p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By 2015-16 annual assessment of English proficiency of ALL students. <p>(Note: TN has been doing this for awhile under an Office of Civil Rights order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• English language proficiency assessment aligned to state’s English lang prof standards. <p>Areas of Support</p> <p>Support all areas.</p>
<p>➤ ALTERNATE ASSESSMENTS FOR STUDENTS WITH THE MOST SIGNIFICANT COGNITIVE DISABILITIES (P. 49 - 52)</p>	<p><u>Franken I:2</u> (Insert on p.52 after line 24)</p>	Debbie Owens	<p>Key Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• State may provide alternative assessments for the MOST sign SWD• Parents are involved with decision and informed whether assessment may prevent against regular HS diploma• Assessments consistent with IDEA are universally designed• Develops and promotes adaptations and accommodations with the MOST signif. SWD to increase # of students participating in grade-level instruction & tested against grade-level standards• Reg and Sped know how to administer assessments and make

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline

Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>accommodations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires SEPARATE determinations about whether a student should be assessed using alternative assessment for EACH SUBJECT assessed. <p><u>Franken I:2</u> (Insert on p.52 after line 24)</p> <p>Franken I:2 To amend the ESEA of 1965 in order to allow computer adaptive assessments</p> <p>Areas of Concern</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No 1% is designated, only MOST significantly cognitive delayed. This Is very vague but refers to IDEA.. No 2% or max 3% designated and this may impact many states. (What is NASTID’s position on this?) <p>Areas of Support</p> <p>Support all areas except those listed in areas of concerns</p>
➤ STATE-DESIGNED ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS (P. 53 - 56)	<p><i>Alexander 1 (Strike p.54 lines 4-10)</i></p> <p><i>Alexander I:3 (Insert on p.56, between line 21 and 22 – “Prohibition on Regulation”)</i></p>	Bob Harmon	<p>State Designed Accountability Systems</p> <p><i>Key Issues Presented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed and implemented by the beginning of SY 2013-14 Annually measures reading/language arts and math in all public schools and districts and graduation rates in high schools Expects continuous improvement for all students and subgroups Annually identifies schools in need of support and interventions
➤ STATE PLANS (P. 56 - 68)	<p><i>Alexander I:4 (Strike and Replace “Peer Review & Secretarial Approval” p.62-65)</i></p>	Bob Harmon	
➤ ANNUAL STATE REPORT CARDS (P. 68 – 77)	<p><u>Murray I:3</u> (Insert on p. 76, between lines 7 and 8)</p>	Bob Harmon	

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

<p>➤ PARENTS’ RIGHT-TO-KNOW (P. 80 – 82)</p>		Bob Harmon	<div><div><div>· Areas of Concern</div><div><div>Funding to support the state-designed accountability systems</div></div></div><div><div>· Areas of Support</div><div><div>Unsure</div></div></div><div><div>STATE PLANS (PP 56-68)</div></div><div><div>· Key Issues Presented</div><div><div>Developed with stakeholders</div><div>May incorporate student growth</div><div>Coordinated with other state plans required under ESEA (e.g., IDEA, etc.)</div><div>Continue to administer academic assessments</div><div>Describes the state accountability system</div><div>Involve the Title I Committee of Practitioners</div><div>Coordinate with Early Childhood Education (via State Advisory Council)</div><div>Provide for the equitable distribution of teachers</div><div>Subject to peer review</div><div>Strengthen the engagement of parents and families</div></div></div><div><div>· Areas of Concern</div><div><div>Funding to support the implementation of state plans</div><div>Resolving discrepancies, inconsistencies, or differences of interpretation in the coordination of state plans under various federal statutes</div></div></div><div><div>· Areas of Support</div><div><div>Unsure</div></div></div></div>
--	--	------------	--

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<div><div><u>ANNUAL STATE REPORT CARDS (PP 68-77)</u></div><div><div><div>·<i>Key Issues Presented</i></div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Includes all public schools, school districts, and the stateCites specific requirements, accountability criteria, and data elements (including 3-year trends)Include information on ELLs and SWDsInclude graduation rates (4-year adjusted and cumulative)Include post-secondary statisticsInclude NAEP results</div></div><div><div>·<i>Areas of Concern</i></div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Funding to implement requirements for annual state report cards</div></div><div><div>·<i>Areas of Support</i></div><div>Unsure</div></div></div><div><div><u>PARENTS' RIGHT-TO-KNOW (PP 80-82)</u></div><div><div><div>·<i>Key Issues Presented</i></div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">Inform parents regarding teacher qualifications and state licensureProvide information to parents on the level of achievement of the studentProvide timely notice to parents when the student has been taught for 4 or more weeks by a teacher who is not highly qualified</div></div><div><div>·<i>Areas of Concern</i></div><div><ul style="list-style-type: none">None</div></div></div></div></div>
--	--	--	---

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<div>· Areas of Support</div> <div>• Unsure</div>
--	--	--	---

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1112: LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY PLANS			
➤ PLANS REQUIRED (P. 84)		Bernell Cook	
➤ PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND DURATION (P. 84 – 85)		Bernell Cook	
➤ STATE APPROVAL (P. 85 – 86)		Bernell Cook	
➤ PLAN PROVISIONS (P. 86 – 90)	<i>Alexander 1 (Strike p.86 line 23 through p.87 line 2 – letter D)</i>	Bernell Cook	
➤ ASSURANCES (P. 90 – 93)			
➤ PARENTAL NOTIFICATION REGARDING LANUGAGE INSTRUCTION PROGRAMS (P. 93 – 97)		Margaret MacKinnon	<p>This section requires LEAs using Title I funds for language instruction programs as defined in Title III to provide parent notification about their child the same as that in Title III –There is also a requirement to notify parents separately if the LEA fails to meet the Title III AMAOs.</p> <p>Areas of concern: <i>The draft language for parent notification in Title III was different in the bill than in the current law. Also, many states only apply the consequences of not meeting the Title III AMAOs to LEAs that receive Title III funding. Propose simply referencing the applicable section in Title III as proposed in sec 3202 so there are no discrepancies</i></p>

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<i>between the two sections.</i>
--	--	--	----------------------------------

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1113: ELIGIBLE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREAS			
➤ RANKING ORDER (P. 98 – 99)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ MEASURES (P. 99 – 100)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ LOW-INCOME FAMILIES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS (P. 100)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ FEEDER PATTERN (P. 100 – 101)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ RESERVATION FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE (P. 101)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ FUNDS FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN & YOUTH (P. 101 – 104)		Marcia Beckman	

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1114: SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS			
➤ COMPLIANCE (P. 105)		Mike Radke	Section 114 Schoolwide programs <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Appears to simplify methodology to consolidate funds in SW programs without supplanting.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Requiring only that the LEA demonstrate that the methodology it uses to allocate State and local funds to each SW school ensures the school receives all of the state and local funds it would otherwise receive○ Eliminates requirements in SW schools to provide services to private school children, MoE, comparability, supplement not supplant or distribution of funds to SAE or LEAs- Replaces terminology<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ “proficient and advanced” becomes “on-track and advanced”○ “scientifically based research” becomes “scientifically valid”○ “vocational” becomes “career”- References “highly rated” teachers as well as highly qualified teachers- Eliminates professional development and parent involvement as required components of a SW plan- Eliminates references to Even Start and Reading First and allows
➤ NONAPPLICABILITY (P. 105 – 109)		Mike Radke	

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			inclusion of programs under Title IV-A
			- Eliminates the need to consider the technical assistance provider recommendation in making the decision to develop a SW plan in less than 1 year.

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1115: TARGETED ASSISTANCE SCHOOLS (P. 110 – 112)		Rachelle	

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1116: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE			
➤ APPROVAL AND PEER REVIEW OF SYSTEM (P. 113 – 114)		Margaret MacKinnon	State designs plan to identify achievement gap and persistently lowest achieving (PLA) schools and improvement strategies or consequences. State plan will be peer reviewed.
➤ ACHIEVEMENT GAP SCHOOLS (P. 114 – 116)	<i>Alexander 1 (Strike entire subsection.)</i>	Margaret MacKinnon	1) Identify 5% of high schools and 5% of elem and sec (not high schools) that are not PLA but have the largest gap among subgroups or lowest performance by subgroups re: college and career ready (CCR) subjects and graduation rate (for HS). Note that these are not limited to Title I schools only. May use data for most recent year or 2 or 3 years. Must notify parents.

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline

Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>2) LEA must develop correction plan for each gap subgroup in alignment with state accountability system.</p> <p>3) After 3 years schools with no improvement not eligible for priority, preference or special consideration for any grant, subgrant or program under this Act</p> <p>Area of concern: <i>unsure what the consequence means for not being eligible for priority, preference, etc.</i></p>
<p>➤ PERSISTENTLY LOW-ACHIEVING SCHOOLS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LOWEST ACHIEVING SCHOOLS IN STATE (P. 116 – 119) ▪ IDENTIFICATION AS PERSISTENTLY LOW-ACHIEVING (P. 119 – 120) ▪ STATE WAIVER (P. 120) ▪ NEEDS ANALYSIS (P. 120 – 121) ▪ STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES (P. 121 – 125) ▪ SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES (P. 125 – 134) ▪ IMPROVEMENT (P. 134 – 135) ▪ REPEATED CLASSIFICATION AS PERSISTENTLY LOW-ACHIEVING (P. 135) 	<p><u>Hagen I:2</u> (Strike and replace p. 128 - 130)</p> <p><u>Alexander I:6</u> (Insert p. 134, between line 13 and 14)</p> <p><u>Alexander I:5</u> (Insert p. 134, between line 13 and 14)</p>	<p>Margaret Mackinnon</p>	<p>1) State identifies lowest achieving 5% of HSs and lowest achieving 5% of non-high schools for R/LA and Math, absolute performance, growth if used by state, & grad rates, & must include schools with <60% grad rate; notify parents & make list publicly available <i>Area of concern: need a minimum n size for grad rate or something similar as for participation rate for identification of PLA schools?</i></p> <p>2) state may used most recent year data or use a 2- or 3-year average; keep schools on list for 3 years; school identified as PLA remains so for 5 years, with exception in (7);</p> <p>3) State may request waiver of PLA list if all schools on PLA list are performing satisfactorily</p> <p>4) LEA conducts needs analysis of PLA school, may include with external partner - includes student and staff data, analysis of school governance, curriculum & instruction, student supports, etc. & resources available;</p> <p>5) LEA selects and implements appropriate improvement strategies based on needs assessment and creates detailed 5 year budget – strategies cover all major areas, use data & monitor effectiveness; state ensures implementation for 5 years; SEA may take over PLA if permitted by state law;</p> <p>6) list of required activities for ALL SI strategies – PD, use data to inform instruction & select interventions, evaluate teachers</p>

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>regularly & provide feedback, collaborate with parents, teachers, etc., consider school readiness & collaborate with early childhood programs, provide parent & family engagement, provide supports to students;</p> <p>LEA required to choose one of these 6 strategies:</p> <p>(i) transformation (similar to waiver requirements, - replace principal if >2 yrs, require existing staff to reapply, but includes this language: “(III) require that all instructional staff and school leadership hiring be done at the school through mutual consent)”</p> <p>(ii) strategic staffing, - replace principal if >2 yrs and allow to staff with school turnaround team of principal’s choosing (<i>includes some limitations on # of teachers for elementary & secondary schools that is confusing</i>),</p> <p>(iii) turnaround – replace principal if >2 yrs, screen all teachers and retain not more than 65%,</p> <p>(iv) whole school reform –implement evidence-based whole school reform strategy – must be in partnership with strategy developer with at least moderate level of evidence with >1 well designed or well implemented experimental or quasi-experimental study,</p> <p>(v) restart – close & restart as charter school with charter operator with demonstrated record of success, or convert to magnet school, or other new innovative school, and ensure former students can enroll, or</p> <p>(vi) school closure – close school and enroll students in other schools and provide transportation to new school.</p> <p>NOTE: rural flexibility allows an LEA eligible for rural flexibility to “modify not more than 1 of the elements or activities required under subparagraph (A) of a school improvement strategy selected for a school described in paragraph (5)(A), in order to better meet the needs of students in such school”, and may apply</p>
--	--	--	---

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>to Secretary for waiver of provision to replace principal in transformation, strategic staffing, or turnaround models</p> <p>Area of concern: <i>Should this rural flexibility apply to small schools as well as to only LEAs that meet rural definition?</i></p> <p>7) For schools that improve during the 5-year period, state may remove from PLA list, but they continue to get the SI funds for full 5 years;</p> <p>8) if school is re-identified as a PLA school for the subsequent 5-year time period, the LEA must close or restart the school.</p> <p>Area of concern: <i>Closing or restarting schools are serious consequences – especially because it’s not based on some absolute criteria, but because it’s relative to which other schools are in lowest 5% and what if all schools improve, but they’re still in lowest 5%. Also, this is not feasible for rural schools</i></p> <p>Note: all the provisions for SES and for LEA improvement in the current law have been removed from this bill.</p>
➤ SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS (P. 135 – 146)		Margo DeLaune	

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1117: BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS			

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

➤ IDENTIFICATION (P. 147)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ CRITERIA (P. 147 – 149)		Marcia Beckman	
➤ REWARDS (P. 149 – 150)		Marcia Beckman	

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1118: PARENT AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT			
➤ FAMILY ENGAGEMENT PLAN – IN GENERAL (P. 150 – 151)		Monique Chism	Key Issues Presented <ul style="list-style-type: none">In order to receive funds LEAs must have a Parent and Family Engagement Plan aligned to plan outlined in section 1112Options LEA may include plan related to how they will involve business leaders, philanthropic and nonprofit organizations and other CBOSCoordinate with parent and family information and resource centers established under part F of Title IVLEA must conduct annual evaluation Reservation and Use of Funds <ul style="list-style-type: none">1% of funds except for allocations equal to or less than \$5,000Not less than 95% of the 1% reservation must go to schools Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none">Annual meeting to review LEA compactEach school must develop a Parent and Family Engagement compact Areas of Concern
➤ CONSULTATION AND DISSEMINATION (P. 151 – 152)		Monique Chism	
➤ CONTENTS OF PLAN (P. 152 – 157)		Monique Chism	
➤ DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS (P. 157 – 158)		Monique Chism	
➤ FAMILY MEMBER ENGAGEMENT (P. 158 – 161)		Monique Chism	

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">None <p><i>Areas of Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">There is not much change to this section, feedback that each State Title I Director has received regarding current implementation of requirements for parent engagement may be useful to consider.
➤ SHARED RESPONSIBILITIES FOR COLLEGE & CAREER READINESS (P. 161 – 164)		Margo DeLaune	

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1119: QUALIFICATIONS FOR TEACHERS & PARAPRO'S	<i>Alexander 2 (Strike p.164 line 22 – p.166 line 4 and replace. Remove all HQ labels, throughout bill, as well.)</i>		
➤ SPECIAL RULE (P. 166)	<u>Murkowski I:1 and I:3</u>	Gayle Pauley	

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1120: COMPARABILITY OF SERVICES			
➤ COMPARABILITY (P. 166)		B. J. Granbery	<u>Comparability p. 166</u> <i>Key Issues Presented</i>

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

➤ ALTERNATIVE COMPARABILITY (P. 167)		B. J. Granbery	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Actual personnel and non-personnel expenditures in each school servedNot less than the average combined state and local per pupil expenditures for schools not served
➤ BASIS (P. 167)		B. J. Granbery	
➤ EXCLUSION OF FUNDS (P. 167 – 168)		B. J. Granbery	<i>Areas of Concern</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Requires school level accounting not used by all states/districts
➤ DOCUMENTATION AND INAPPLICABILITY (P. 168)		B. J. Granbery	<i>Areas of Support</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">More accurate test of true comparability <u>Alternate Comparability p. 167</u>
➤ PROCESS AND PROCEDURES (P. 168 – 169)		B. J. Granbery	<i>Key Issues Presented</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Compare same for high poverty vs. low poverty schools if all schools served <i>Areas of Concern</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">How high poverty and low poverty will be defined/determined <i>Areas of Support</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Serving all schools does not relieve LEA of meeting requirements <u>Basis p. 167</u> <i>Key Issues Presented</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">May use LEA-wide or grade span by grade span method <i>Areas of Concern</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">None <i>Areas of Support</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Provides needed flexibility and the ability to compare schools that are more similar to each other. <u>Exclusion of funds p. 167-168</u> <i>Key Issues Presented</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">LEA must exclude state and local expenditures for excess costs of services to English learners, children with disabilities, capital expenditures, and other costs as the Secretary determines appropriateLEA need not include changes in enrollment or personnel

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p>assignments that occur after the start of the school year</p> <p><i>Areas of Concern</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Possible difficulties in identifying accurately <p><i>Areas of Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Helps to avoid inflated costs for some schools with more special needs or in need of repair <p><u>Documentation and Inapplicability p. 168</u></p> <p><i>Key Issues Presented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LEA must submit to SEA the per pupil expenditures, personnel expenditures, non-personnel expenditures, and total expenditures for each school served by the LEA• Does not apply to an LEA that has only one building per grade span <p><i>Areas of Concern</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How will SEA be able to check accuracy without also seeing this data from the schools not served? <p><i>Areas of Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exclusion where there is only one building per grade span is appropriate <p><u>Process and Procedures p. 168-169</u></p> <p><i>Key Issues Presented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• By October 31, 2016 the LEA must report to the SEA on its compliance for the preceding school year including a listing, by school, of actual combined per pupil state and local personnel and non-personnel expenditures• The SEA must ensure this information is made public by the state or LEA and includes the school by school listings described above• An LEA that does not meet the requirements must develop and implement a plan to ensure compliance for the subsequent school year and may be required by the SEA to report on its progress in implementing the plan.
--	--	--	---

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined

Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			<p><i>Areas of Concern</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This provision does not specify whether it applies to all schools or only served schools; but this may clear up the concern listed above where it specifies served schools only.• No changes are required for the current school year if requirements are not met. <p><i>Areas of Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Making a plan for the next year instead of current year adjustments gives LEA more time for correcting situation and means less disruption to school personnel assignments. <p><u>Transition Provisions p. 169-170</u></p> <p><i>Key Issues Presented</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For school years before 2015-2016, an LEA may only receive funding if the LEA demonstrates to the SEA that it meets the requirements that were in effect for Comparability under the previous law (the law in effect on the day before the day of enactment of the new law).• The Secretary must take such actions as necessary to provide for an orderly transition between Comparability requirements under the old law to those in the new law. <p><i>Areas of Concern</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None <p><i>Areas of Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This provision seems reasonable.
➤ TRASITION PROVISIONS (P. 169 – 170)	<u>Franken I:5</u> (Insert on p. 170, between lines 15 and 16)	Judy Miller	

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1120B: COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS (P. 170 – 173)		Judy Miller	<u>Sec.1120B: Coordination Requirements</u> There is more specificity in this section. It not only includes coordinating with Head Start (School Readiness Act of 2007) but also Part C and Sec. 619 programs of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA.) There are more communication requirements. In the Activities section there are several new items: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ongoing communication that might include Homeless liaisons• Aligning programs• Having the early childhood programs (ECH) and district ensure continuity of developmentally appropriate instructional programs• Developing comprehensive transition policies and procedures as students transition to elementary schools• Involving parents—outreach to parents, families and elementary teachers, help parents of ELL understand services,• Increasing participation of underserved populations of eligible children

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1122: GRANTS FOR THE OUTLYING AREAS AND THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR (P. 173)		Judy Miller	See section 1124

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1123: ALLOCATIONS TO THE STATES (P. 173)		Judy Miller	See section 1124

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1124: EDUCATION FINANCE INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM (P. 173 – 174)		Judy Miller	<u>Sec. 1124: Education Finance Incentive Grant Program</u> The three sections above have just a few numbering or labeling changes (i.e. striking f and add). In the current law Sec. 1125 is about Targeted Grants to Local Educational Agencies and 1125A is the Education Finance Incentive Grant Program. These appear to be part of 1124 in the Senate bill with no changes.

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>RELATED AMENDMENT(S)</u>	<u>DESIGNATED READER</u>	
§1125: GRANTS FOR STATE ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES (P. 174)		Judy Miller	<u>Sec. 1125: Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities</u> This section basically is new in Title I Part A. In the current ESEA, the state assessment grants are found in Title Vi, Flexibility and Accountability, Part A, Subpart 2, Sec. 6111. It is being moved to Title I Part A Sec. 1125. There are still two components: formula grants to states and competitive

Senate ESEA Reauthorization Bill Outline
Title I Part A

Adopted Amendments Underlined
Withdrawn Amendments to be presented on Senate floor in Italics

			grants. The Senate bill includes things such as adding development of early childhood instruments and computer-adaptive assessments.
--	--	--	--

SECTION	RELATED AMENDMENT(S)	DESIGNATED READER	
§1131: SUBPART 3 – GRANTS FOR STATE ASSESSMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES			
➤ GRANTS FOR STATE ASSESSMENTS (P. 174 – 177)		Judy Miller	
➤ GRANTS FOR ENHANCED ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS (P. 177 – 178)		Judy Miller	
➤ ALLOTMENT OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS (P. 178 – 179)		Judy Miller	