



December 22, 2011 Revisions to “No Child Left Behind Waiver Applications” Report

Jeremy Ayers

Page 1

Amended fifth bullet point as follows:

Reduction of burden. Few states shared specific plans for reducing administrative burdens placed on districts and schools.

Page 9

Amended entry for New Jersey in Chart 1, under “Reducing duplication and burden on districts and schools”:

Charged task force to identify unnecessary regulations

Page 11

Amended section entitled “New annual goals for school improvement” by reordering the first two bulletin points so that their order aligns with the order set forth in the Department of Education’s waiver application rubric. Reworded subsequent paragraph to align with this change:

The waiver process would also allow states to significantly change their annual achievement goals. The department provided states three options for making the change:

- **Reduce by half** the percentage of students, including student subgroups, who are not proficient, the so-called “gap-cutting” option.
- **Ensure 100 percent** of students reach proficiency by 2020 (rather than 2014, as NCLB requires).
- **Use another sound method** to define ambitious but achievable goals for all districts, schools, and student subgroups.

No state chose the second option, but three states chose the gap-cutting option. Eight states chose the last or “other” option. Massachusetts essentially proposed the gap-cutting option but over five years instead of six.

Page 16

Amended entry for New Jersey in Chart 2, under “State must pass legislation to implement evaluations?” as follows:

In parentheses next to “Yes”: (New Jersey indicates this was incorrectly reported by Education Week.)”

Page 16

Revised footnote #9 in Chart 2 as follows:

Further, New Jersey is one of only six states that does not have a statewide teacher identifier with a teacher-student match. See Data Quality Campaign, “2011 DQC State Analysis: Element 5” (2011). However, New Jersey indicates that it does have this capability and that its data system is poised to support its evaluation reforms.

Page 17

Amended first paragraph as follows:

New Jersey would similarly ask all priority schools to undergo a quality school review conducted by seven regional turnaround centers.

Page 17

Amended section entitled, “Reducing duplication and administrative burden” as follows:

Reducing burden is the fourth principle of reform in the waiver package, but few states discussed this principle at length. Massachusetts said it would substitute state-required school plans and report cards for those required by Title I of NCLB. Florida law requires the state education agency and school districts to annually review and reduce reporting burdens. New Jersey charged a task force with identifying unnecessary regulations, and the state will act on its recommendations in 2012.

Page 23-24

Amended the section entitled “New Jersey” as follows:

New Jersey chose the straightforward gap-cutting approach to yearly goals and would retain accountability for subgroups reaching those goals. The state proposed a new report card that would rate schools on four categories—achievement, college- and career-readiness, graduation and post-secondary success rates, and closing achievement gaps. New Jersey would maintain traditional sub-group accountability for the achievement measure, and it would evaluate how well schools close achievement gaps between the bottom 25 percent of students and the top 75 percent for the gap-closing measure.¹ Yet the state has proposed a new school-grading system that will not be finalized until the spring of 2012. So, how the state grades schools and holds them accountable could

change in the coming months. New Jersey should clarify how final the new grading proposal is and how likely the new measures are to pass. In the meantime, the Department of Education should consider delaying approval until the issue is clarified.

In terms of evaluations, the state has not developed the evaluation guidelines required by the waiver application, and it will finalize linking student performance and class rosters for all schools by September 2012. One union affiliate has recently expressed strong opposition to evaluation changes, forcing the Newark superintendent to scale back her plans. But the state has moved ahead in ten other school districts.²

Page 26

Amended section entitled "Reduction of burden" as follows:

Few states shared specific plans for reducing administrative burdens placed on districts and schools, though the department gave minimal direction for doing so.

Page 27

Amended section entitled, "Ask for more information" as follows:

Some states should clarify how they will treat student subgroups in accountability systems, how prepared they are to implement evaluation reforms, and how they plan to reduce administrative burden on districts and schools. Few states described specific plans for reducing burden.

Page 33

Amended footnote 21 as follows:

If approved, New Jersey's new report card would rate schools based on achievement, graduation and post-secondary success rates, closing achievement gaps, and college and career-readiness. It would also track student-level progress including early warning indicators, college and career readiness, and how successfully high school graduates fare in college.