



The Time Is Now

Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

March 2011

Introduction and summary

Our nation does far too little to ensure that all students have access to an excellent education. Only about one in three eighth graders is proficient in reading. Most high schools graduate little more than two-thirds of their students on time. And even the students who do receive a high school diploma lack adequate skills: More than 33 percent of first-year college students require remediation in either math or English. Moreover, low-income and minority students fare worse, sometimes far worse, than their peers on every indicator of achievement.

This must change if our country is going to remain a global economic leader. And we believe federal policy has a role to play in improving America's schools.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or ESEA, is the largest federal program designed to improve education, particularly for disadvantaged students. Following the groundbreaking reforms to ESEA in 2001—the No Child Left Behind Act—the latest reauthorization of ESEA was scheduled for 2007, but a variety of events led to its delay. In the meantime, schools have labored to deal with limitations in the current version of the law, such as a one-size-fits-all approach to accountability, a lack of focus on teacher and principal effectiveness, inefficient and unfair funding practices, and inadequate attention to turning around struggling schools.

Therefore, we believe now is the time to reauthorize ESEA. Whether the process is done in one comprehensive bill or broken into smaller segments, the goal should be the same—pass significant education reforms that:

- Improve the effectiveness of teachers and principals while ensuring all students have equitable access to effective educators
- Make funding more fair, effective and efficient
- Extend learning time
- Encourage innovation
- Turn around low-performance schools
- Provide wraparound services

In short, reauthorization offers a seminal opportunity to advance smart, progressive policies that improve the educational outcomes for all of our nation's students.

This summary of key recommendations for the reauthorization of ESEA accompanies a series of memos detailing our positions on specific reform proposals. These specific recommendations represent a larger body of work conducted by the Center for American Progress over the past six years. But these memos are not meant to be exhaustive or static. They are a distillation of what Congress should consider to pass effective policy, and they are a starting point for conversation. As we complete additional work on ESEA topics we will add recommendations to our body of work.

We look forward to providing more specific guidance and recommendations as congressional action gets underway. The Center for American Progress stands ready to work with Congress to reauthorize ESEA in a timely and thoughtful manner.



Improve teacher and principal effectiveness

Introduction

We must ensure that all students have the strong teachers that they need and deserve if our nation is to remain a global economic leader. Effective teachers are critical to raising achievement and closing longstanding gaps between student sub-groups such as low-income students and students of color. The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA, offers an important opportunity to improve teacher and principal effectiveness. To make greater use of ESEA as a lever for reform, Congress should hold the line on formula funding while increasing competitive funding programs that support promising reforms. We also believe that federal funding should be used more strategically and ensure that all students have access to strong teachers.

Recommendation #1

Authorize a Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund that supports innovative strategies to recruit, retain, and reward effective teachers and principals

A new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, or TLIF, would award grants to states and school districts to support innovative strategies that attract and support effective teachers and principals in high-need schools. States or districts could use the funds to develop more aggressive recruitment strategies, strengthen tenure processes, and institute career ladders for teachers, among other reforms. Under TLIF, states or districts should be required to demonstrate that the activities are increasing educator effectiveness. Given the program's importance, TLIF should be made the new Part A of Title II of ESEA. State Teacher Quality Grants would become Part B.

Recommendation #2

Create a Teacher and Leader Pathways program that focuses on preparing effective educators for high-needs schools

A Teacher and Leader Pathways program would consolidate a number of existing recruitment and preparation programs into a larger program focused on preparing educators for high-needs schools. The program would focus on teacher and principal preparation and provide competitive grants to districts as well as non-profit and university partners. Programs would be designed to meet the specific needs of districts. And the programs must either have a record of preparing effective educators or commit to tracking and measuring the effectiveness of graduates in the classroom.

Recommendation #3

Require states to develop teacher and principal evaluation systems and ensure the equitable distribution of strong teachers

Congress should require that states create new evaluation frameworks for both teachers and principals. For teachers, the evaluation system should be in use no later than five years after ESEA reauthorization. The new teacher evaluation systems must include measures of teacher impact on student growth as a substantial factor in the evaluation. Another significant part of the teacher evaluation process should be rigorous observations of their practices in classrooms. Evaluations should differentiate teachers into at least four groups of performance, with states determining the names of the categories and their precise cut-off points.

Once a state has a new teacher evaluation system in place, it should use the results to inform critical human resources decisions, including tenure, compensation, professional development, as well as to hold teacher preparation programs accountable for the performance of their graduates. The data should also be used to identify and to redress inequities within districts based on factors of race and poverty. If a district has not significantly narrowed gaps in teacher effectiveness between schools over time, they should lose part, or eventually all, of their ESEA Title II funds. Until stronger evaluations systems are online, Congress should require states to create a Teacher Quality Index that would identify inequity and guide action to fix it.

Similarly, principal evaluation systems need to be introduced, and should be in use no later than four years after ESEA reauthorization. Districts could create their own evaluation systems as long as they followed guidelines set by the state. State guidelines should include a measure of schoolwide academic growth as well as research-based rubrics that assess whether principals are taking the actions they need to improve student learning and teacher practice.

Recommendation #4

Boost state capacity and consolidate programs

Federal education funding should advance equity and excellence in education. To make the greatest use of ESEA dollars, Congress should continue to support formula-based programs while boosting competitive funding for programs that encourage reform. In order to boost capacity, states should retain an additional 2.5 percent of Teacher Quality funds so that they can develop and implement improved evaluation systems.

At the same time, there are a number of programs within Title II of ESEA that are too small to have much of an impact. They should be consolidated to better leverage the funds. Like the Obama administration, we propose eliminating or consolidating a number of these programs to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our federal education spending while ensuring those funds are spent fairly to improve the educations of all of our children.¹

What our recommendations are based on

- [Advancing Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: Four Recommendations for Reforming the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Essential Elements of Teacher Policy in ESEA: Effectiveness, Fairness, and Evaluation](#)
- [So Long Lake Wobegon?: Using Teacher Evaluation to Raise Teacher Quality](#)
- [Increasing Principal Effectiveness: A Strategic Investment for ESEA](#)
- [Principals' Approaches to Developing Teacher Quality](#)

¹ Glenda Partee, "Education Transformation: Doing What Works in Education Reform" (Washington, DC: Center for American Progress, 2010).



Make Title I more fair and efficient

Introduction

Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act, or ESEA, is the largest program operated by the Department of Education. For Fiscal Year 2010 ending September 30 last year, Congress appropriated \$14.49 billion for Title I. The program reaches 95 percent of school districts nationwide. Over time, Title I's goal has evolved to ensure an equitable education for disadvantaged students and to bolster economic competitiveness by promoting higher academic achievement, yet Title I has some glaring problems. Due to cumbersome allocation formulas some states and districts receive a disproportionate amount of money, while others do not receive their fair share. Further, a loophole in the law allows districts to skirt important equitable education requirements, the very purpose of Title I.

Recommendation #1

Close the comparability loophole

Require districts to show Title I schools receive comparable dollars.

Under current law districts must ensure that schools receiving Title I funds and those not receiving Title I funds have comparable resources before federal funds are added, a requirement known as comparability. But districts may comply with the comparability requirement in ways that mask inequity, such as adopting a district-wide salary schedule, showing equivalent student/staff ratios, or reporting average (not actual) teacher salaries. These loopholes result in inequity. Experienced teachers, who are paid more, for example, tend to transfer to low-poverty schools, so the actual dollars going to high-poverty schools are far less than wealthier schools.¹ We recommend amending Title I to require comparability using actual per pupil expenditures, such as that outlined in the Fiscal Fairness Act of 2011 sponsored by Representative Chaka Fattah (D-PA) and Senator Michael Bennet (D-CO).

Require districts to report per-pupil expenditures for each school

Reporting actual per-pupil expenditures would have two main benefits. First, it would allow for greater transparency and more rigorous financial oversight. Secondly, it would give district officials a clearer picture of spending and, thus, flexibility in making budget decisions. We believe per pupil expenditure reporting should be part of an augmented comparability provision during a three-year phase-in period, as outlined in the Fiscal Fairness Act.

Ensure districts use smart incentives to demonstrate comparability

Districts may need assistance from the states to comply with comparability requirements, including direct technical assistance or access to an information clearinghouse. Some districts may be tempted to force teachers to change schools. This would be counterproductive. Instead, districts should empower schools to use state and local funds to take actions such as:

- Offering financial incentives for experienced, effective teachers to transfer to Title I schools
- Offering retention bonuses for effective teachers to remain in, rather than transferring out of, Title I schools
- Selectively reducing class sizes in conjunction with other strategies to support less experienced teachers in Title I schools

Recommendation #2

Simplify the Title I formula

Consolidate the four existing formulas into one fair and efficient formula

The Department of Education applies four formulas to determine Title I grants to districts: Basic, Concentration, Targeted, and Education Incentive Finance Grants. Because the formulas are needlessly complex, state agencies exhaust capacity re-calculating grants to districts that remain oblivious to the number of formulas. Therefore, we propose consolidating the four Title I formulas into one.

Our proposal uses the eligibility criteria of Targeted Grants—eligible districts must serve at least 10 low-income children representing at least 5 percent of all children served by the district. In addition, we recommend setting the minimum state allocation to a level tied to the fixed costs of operating public schools, which could benefit rural states that are often shortchanged under the current formulas. Lastly we propose that the authorized amount for each district would be the product of four factors:

- An amount of \$2,250, which puts the product in dollar terms and determines an authorized total
- A rescaled weighted-cost factor based on state and local values on the Department of Education's Comparable Wage Index
- A fiscal-effort factor using a refinement of the measure used by the current Education Finance Incentive Grant formula
- A weighted count of qualifying children, employing only the concentration-based weighting scale in the current Targeted Grant formula

The final point is important because a concentration-based weighting scheme is fair to small and large districts alike. Furthermore, because estimates of the number of qualifying children served by small districts are volatile, replacing the raw estimate with a three-year running average would make allocations to small districts more stable.

Create an implementation fund to ensure the new formula works

Changing funding formulas would be challenging to implement and some states and districts may gain funds while others do not. We recommend creating a temporary equity fund to help implement formula changes and to lessen the impact of a lower allocation. Districts would receive equity funds based on the old formulas or allocations gradually approaching higher levels due to the new formula.

What our recommendations are based on

Closing the Comparability Loophole

- [Walking the Talk: Closing the Comparability Requirement Loophole in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Comparable, Schmomparable: Evidence of Inequity in the Allocation of Funds for Teacher Salary Within California's Public School Districts](#)
- [Pulling Back the Curtain: Promoting Fiscal Equity and Providing All Students with Access to Effective Teachers Will Not Require Forcible Re-assignment](#)

Simplifying the Title I Formula

- [Bitter Pill, Better Formula: Toward a Single, Fair, and Equitable Formula for ESEA Title I, Part A](#)
- [Spoonful of Sugar: An Equity Fund to Facilitate a Single, Fair, and Equitable Formula for ESEA Title I, Part A](#)
- [Secret Recipes Revealed: Demystifying the Title I, Part A Formulas](#)

¹ Raegen Miller, "Comparable, Schmomparable," (Washington, DC: Center for American Progress, 2010).



Expand learning time

Introduction

The reality of what it takes to make sure all students are college ready and career ready is bumping up against the rigid time constraints of the traditional American school calendar. On average students in the United States attend school for six-and-a-half-hours per day, 180 days per year. This is considerably less time than their counterparts in other countries, which continue to outperform students in the United States. The solution: expand learning time in our country. Expanded learning time lengthens the school day, week or year for all students by at least 300 hours. The key, however, is not just adding time but changing the way time is used so that students benefit. Through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA, federal policy can help scale up expanded time initiatives.

Recommendation #1

Create a competitive grant program for states and districts for expanding learning time

Creating a competitive demonstration program that provides funding for lengthening and redesigning the school calendar would support good practice and stimulate new approaches to school improvement. Funds should be targeted to states and districts that agree to expand time by at least 300 hours and redesign the schedule for all students in participating low-performing, high-poverty schools.

Rather than just adding time to the school calendar, schools carefully redesign the schedule, incorporating the extra time for:

- More in-depth and rigorous learning opportunities in core academic subjects such as reading, math, science, history, and civics
- More time for other subjects and enrichment activities such as music, arts, physical education, service-learning, and work-based opportunities for older students
- Increased opportunities for teachers to work together to review student achievement data, plan coursework, and improve their skills

In 2011, members of Congress reintroduced a bill that would authorize a competitive program for expanding learning time called the Time for Innovation Matters in Education Act. The TIME Act would help provide students with the opportunities that lead to a well-rounded education, preparing them for college and the workplace in a complex 21st century economy. The new bill is sponsored by Senators Tom Harkin (D-IA) and Jeff Bingaman (D-NM) and Representatives Mike Honda (D-CA) and Donald Payne (D-NJ).

Recommendation #2

Amend Title IV Part B (21st Century Community Learning Centers) to allow funds to be used for expanding learning time

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program supports school-based academic and enrichment opportunities for students during nonschool hours, including after and before school, and summer programs. These programs can help address students' academic and nonacademic needs, but participation in these programs is voluntary—a significant drawback.¹ And often low-income and disadvantaged students who are most likely to benefit from such programs are less likely to participate.²

Expanded learning time schools, by contrast, ensure that all students in a school benefit from increased academic and enrichment opportunities by formally incorporating enrichment opportunities into the school schedule. Strengthened partnerships with traditional afterschool providers and other community organizations is a key purpose of the TIME Act.

What our recommendations are based on

- Transforming Schools to Meet the Needs of Students: Improving School Quality and Increasing Learning Time in ESEA
- Expanded Time, Enriching Experiences: Expanded Learning Time Schools and Community Organization Partnerships
- Union and District Partnerships to Expand Learning Time

1 Harvard Family Research Project, "What are Kids Getting into These Days? Demographic Differences in Youth Out-of-School Time Participation" (2006).

2 Ann Duffett and Jean Johnson, "All Work and No Play" (Washington, DC: Public Agenda, 2004).



Invest in innovation

Introduction

American schools consistently produce students unready for the rigors of college or the workplace. Only about one third of all eighth graders are proficient in reading. Most high schools graduate little more than two-thirds of their students on time. And 33 percent of first-year college students require remediation in either math or English. Clearly our current approach to education needs to be reinvented.

But ingenuity does not mean embracing every novel reform. Innovation is the process of leveraging new tools, talent, and management strategies to craft solutions that were not possible or necessary in an earlier era. Educators should have the opportunity to assess challenges, to devise smarter, more effective solutions—and then to be held accountable for the results they deliver.

Recommendation #1

Incentivize states and districts to spur innovation

Authorize the Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation funds

The Race to the Top, or RTT, and Investing in Innovation Fund, or i3, programs have spurred significant education reforms. At least 10 states changed their laws to make themselves more competitive for RTT before money was awarded, and 34 states in total reformed their education laws or policies to prepare for the first two rounds of the competition. We encourage Congress to authorize both of these competitive programs as a permanent part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA.

Expand and authorize the Teacher Incentive Fund

We urge Congress to authorize and expand the Teacher Incentive Fund into a new Teacher and Leader Innovation Fund, or TLIF. TLIF would award grants to states and school districts to support innovative strategies that attract and support effective teachers and principals in high-need schools. TLIF would consolidate existing programs that serve similar purposes, and states or districts could use the funds to develop more aggressive recruitment strategies, strengthen pay and tenure processes, and institute career ladders for teachers, among other reforms. Under TLIF, states or districts should be required to demonstrate that the activities are increasing educator effectiveness.

Recommendation #2

Incentivize states and districts to provide flexibility in staffing and funding

Empower schools to play a greater role in staffing

Staffing decisions are usually made at the district level. The result is that principals have little, if any, freedom to recruit, hire, or retain staff, particularly in low-performing schools that teachers tend to avoid. Congress should empower school-level leaders, including teacher leaders, in chronically failing schools to make human capital decisions, such as having a jumpstart on hiring, flexibility to recruit and retain effective teachers, and resources to pay effective teachers more for working in high-need schools.

Provide districts more flexible funding options

Most districts do not allocate or report funds based on actual school-level expenditures, obscuring what resources are available for each school. Congress should require districts to report actual expenditures for each school and encourage them to move toward student-weighted funding. Both moves would give administrators greater *clarity* about the resources they have and greater *flexibility* to use them to meet student needs. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 required districts to report school-level data for that year, and we believe that should be required permanently in ESEA.

Recommendation #3

Incentivize states and districts to provide more choices in schools, programs, and access to educators

Support the planning and development of *effective* charter schools

The federal Charter Schools Program provides grants to states to support the planning and development of new charter schools. This funding is critical because charter schools usually receive less public funding than traditional public schools. High-flying charter models have achieved unprecedented outcomes for low-income students, and their existence has spurred innovation. By supporting the Charter Schools Program, the federal government can send a strong signal to states and districts that reinventing school models is critical to meeting the needs of all students.

Break down the barrier between high school and college

The distinction between 12th grade and the first year of college is artificial, the product of historic norms that are no longer relevant to today's learners. This divide leaves some students unchallenged in high school, unready for college, or both. There is growing evidence that early college and dual-enrollment programs can strengthen the educational pipeline at a crucial junction by bridging this gap. The Fast Track to College Act of 2011 (S. 154 and H.R. 925) provides support for such programs and is worth consideration.

Broaden the pool of potential teachers and leaders

Teachers and principals are the most important school-based factors in student learning, which is why it is important to cast a wide net and allow the best candidates to enter the profession, whether or not they have conventional credentials. Congress should authorize a Teacher and Leader Pathways program that would consolidate a number of existing recruitment and preparation programs into a larger program focused on preparing educators for high-needs schools. The program would provide competitive grants to districts as well as non-profit and university partners. Programs would be designed to meet the specific needs of districts and must either have a record of preparing effective educators or commit to tracking and measuring the effectiveness of their graduates in the classroom.

What our recommendations are based on

- [Leaders and Laggards: A State-by-State Report Card on Educational Innovation](#)
- [Advancing Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: Four Recommendations for Reforming the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Walking the Talk: Closing the Comparability Requirement in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Fast Track to College: Increasing Post-secondary Success for All Students](#)



Turning Around Low-Performing Schools

Introduction

Across the country, states and districts are focusing on turning around the nation's lowest-performing schools. However, turnaround has proven difficult to do at scale. Districts introduce piecemeal reforms but too often neglect larger issues of human capital. State laws, policies, and lack of capacity prevent state education agencies from effectively managing district turnaround efforts. Systemic, sustained interventions are needed to break cycles of underperformance. Federal policy can help by supporting states and districts that commit to effective turnaround reforms.

Recommendation #1

Target funds to schools and districts ready to reform

Turnaround funds should be awarded based on need—poverty and degree of underperformance—but also capacity and willingness to implement reforms. That will ensure limited federal dollars are spent wisely. Congress should require states to award competitive grants to districts based on how districts address:

- **Human capital.** Districts should show that they have a sufficient pool of effective educators to staff low-performing schools and a comprehensive plan to recruit, retain, reward, and improve them using evaluation systems.
- **Support for reform.** Districts should demonstrate support between school management and stakeholders such as teachers unions or community partners, a history of implementing bold reforms, and a willingness to make difficult decisions.
- **Flexibility.** Districts should show that principals enjoy flexibility in staffing, scheduling, and budgeting to implement aggressive school turnaround plans.
- **Data systems.** Districts must be able to show that they are able to use student data systems to drive decision-making and target resources at the school level.

Recommendation #2

Ensure funds support bold, effective interventions

A turnaround program in ESEA should offer *flexibility* for schools to tailor interventions to their context and *incentives* that encourage bold reform. The decision about which strategy to use should be based upon a locally devised needs-assessment and should include one of the following:

- **Closing** the school and re-enrolling students in a higher-achieving school.
- **Restarting** the school under the management of a charter operator, charter management organization, or an education management organization.
- **Transforming** the school by, at least, screening staff for effectiveness using evaluation systems, replacing ineffective principals and teachers with effective ones, and developing reward systems for attracting and retaining successful educators.

- **Employing an existing strategy** that has demonstrated success at the school or a new strategy that has demonstrated success in similar contexts. Success is defined as making at least a 10 percent increase in student achievement in one year.

Recommendation #3

Collect and report data that informs turnaround

Data provides guidance when a school misses its goal so that problems are accurately diagnosed and addressed. Dramatic gains in *core* achievement data (e.g., test scores) may be elusive in the first two years of turnaround, but progress on *leading* indicators (e.g., attendance) should foreshadow later gains. Therefore, we recommend that districts and schools monitor and report data that includes:

- **Core indicators**, such as percentage of students reaching proficiency on state tests, progress toward accountability benchmarks, percentage of English language learners achieving language proficiency, graduation rates, and college enrollment rates. Data should be reported for all students and for each sub-group of students.
- **Leading indicators**, such as student and teacher attendance rates, student completion of advanced coursework, dropout and discipline rates, and distribution of teachers by performance level. Again, data should be reported for all students and for each sub-group of students.

Recommendation #4

Hold states, districts, and schools accountable

Accountability works best when it is shared by all parties who educate students. Therefore, we recommend schools, districts, and states be held accountable in the following ways:

- **School accountability.** If a turnaround school demonstrates improvement—based on core academic achievement—within three years, districts should reward the school with another two-year grant. If a school fails to demonstrate improvement in three years, states should require districts to select a new intervention model, re-tool the existing model based on a data-driven needs assessment, restart the school as a charter school, or close the school and transfer students to a higher-performing school.
- **District accountability.** States can hold districts accountable through monitoring and oversight of the turnaround plan and ensuring benchmarks are met in a timely fashion. Ultimately, a state should revoke a district's set-aside funds if a majority of its schools do not make adequate progress.
- **State accountability.** Congress should require states to articulate in advance what is expected of turnaround schools in terms of reporting, meeting benchmarks, and consequences for failing to make progress. States failing to do so should lose a portion of their set-aside funds under the turnaround program. Further, states with a majority of schools failing to improve after three years should lose an additional portion of their set-aside funds until substantial improvement occurs.

What our recommendations are based on

- [Incentivizing School Turnaround: A Proposal for Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Turning Around the Nation's Lowest-Performing Schools](#)
- [Levers for Change: Pathways for State-to-District Assistance in Underperforming School Districts](#)



Providing Wraparound Services

Introduction

As Congress moves to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA, it should authorize a program to provide comprehensive “wraparound” support services that create the conditions for students to learn in the classroom. These services range from primary health and dental care to family engagement strategies. Currently, two federal programs that support wraparound services—Promise Neighborhoods and Full-Service Community Schools—have significant areas of overlap that indicate potential for consolidation.

Recommendation #1

Consolidate Promise Neighborhoods and Full-Service Community Schools into one authorized wraparound services program

The strengths of both existing programs should be streamlined to focus on meeting the academic, physical, mental, and social needs of children and their communities while maximizing federal dollars. We recommend that a consolidated program:

- **Combine funding sources.** Current funding for both programs should be combined for competitive awards to qualified applicants.
- **Serve high-need communities.** Both programs currently serve low-income communities and an authorized program should continue to do so.
- **Coordinate services.** An authorized program should include coordination of services among community organizations.

Recommendation #2

Ensure that a consolidated program requires a planning year for grantees undertaking new initiatives

Planning is integral to the success and sustainability of wraparound services and provides grantees with information for effective implementation. Therefore, we recommend that a consolidated program include:

- **A mandatory planning period** to help grantees accurately assess community needs before implementing a new initiative.
- **Phase 1 Planning Grants** for grantees to develop a program plan for new initiatives.
- **Phase 2 Implementation Grants** for grantees to carry out their blueprints.
- **Applicants seeking to expand** an existing wraparound services initiative can apply directly for a Phase 2 Implementation Grant.

Recommendation #3

Continue to allow other federal programs to include wraparound services

Several other federal programs currently include some aspects of wraparound services. It is important to note that authorizing a consolidated wraparound services program should not prevent other programs from including wraparound services.

- **Title I School Improvement Grants** guidance currently allows School Improvement Grant funds to support social-emotional and community-oriented services.
- **The 21st Century Community Learning Centers** program provides opportunities for academic enrichment and additional family and youth development activities.

What our
recommendations
are based on

- [Maximizing the Promise of Community Schools: Streamlining Wraparound Services for ESEA](#)
- [Breaking the Mold: Combining Community Schools with Expanded Learning Time to Help Educationally Disadvantaged Students](#)
- [Promise Neighborhoods Shows Real Potential but Needs the Right Funding](#)
- [A Look at Community Schools](#)



CAP's Body of Work on ESEA Topics

Increasing Teacher and Principal Effectiveness

- [Advancing Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: Four Recommendations for Reforming the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Essential Elements of Teacher Policy in ESEA: Effectiveness, Fairness, and Evaluation](#)
- [Measuring What Matters: A Stronger Accountability Model for Teacher Education](#)
- [So Long Lake Wobegon?: Using Teacher Evaluation to Raise Teacher Quality](#)
- [Treating Different Teachers Differently: How State Policy Should Act on Differences in Teacher Performance to Improve Teacher Effectiveness and Equity](#)
- [Increasing Principal Effectiveness: A Strategic Investment for ESEA](#)
- [Principals' Approaches to Developing Teacher Quality](#)

Closing the Comparability Loophole

- [Walking the Talk: Closing the Comparability Requirement Loophole in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Comparable, Schmocomparable: Evidence of Inequity in the Allocation of Funds for Teacher Salary Within California's Public School Districts](#)
- [Pulling Back the Curtain: Promoting Fiscal Equity and Providing All Students with Access to Effective Teachers Will Not Require Forcible Re-assignment](#)

Simplifying the Title I Formula

- [Bitter Pill, Better Formula: Toward a Single, Fair, and Equitable Formula for ESEA Title I, Part A](#)
- [Spoonful of Sugar: An Equity Fund to Facilitate a Single, Fair, and Equitable Formula for ESEA Title I, Part A](#)
- [Secret Recipes Revealed: Demystifying the Title I, Part A Formulas](#)

Extending Learning Time

- [Transforming Schools to Meet the Needs of Students: Improving School Quality and Increasing Learning Time in ESEA](#)
- [Expanded Time, Enriching Experiences: Expanded Learning Time Schools and Community Organization Partnerships](#)
- [Union and District Partnerships to Expand Learning Time](#)

Innovation

- [Leaders and Laggards: A State-by-State Report Card on Educational Innovation](#)
 - [Advancing Teacher and Principal Effectiveness: Four Recommendations for Reforming the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
 - [Walking the Talk: Closing the Comparability Requirement in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
 - [Fast Track to College: Increasing Post-secondary Success for All Students](#)
-

Turning Around Low-Performing Schools

- [Incentivizing School Turnaround: A Proposal for Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act](#)
- [Turning Around the Nation's Lowest-Performing Schools](#)
- [Levers for Change: Pathways for State-to-District Assistance in Underperforming School Districts](#)

Providing Wraparound Services

- [Maximizing the Promise of Community Schools: Streamlining Wraparound Services for ESEA](#)
- [Breaking the Mold: Combining Community Schools with Expanded Learning Time to Help Educationally Disadvantaged Students](#)
- [Promise Neighborhoods Shows Real Potential but Needs the Right Funding](#)
- [A Look at Community Schools](#)