Description of Revisions Made to ESEA Flexibility Request Following Public Comment

Consultation

This section was revised to include the survey, webinars, and multiple in person and phone outreach events conducted by ODE and the Governor's office, that took place in late December and January. The section then describes some of the substantive changes that you see described here, with an emphasis on those changes that resulted from stakeholder and public feedback.

Overview

To provide background on Oregon, a section describing demographics of Oregon schools and districts was added. To guide the reader, a revised "roadmap" was added to address what work Oregon has done, and plans for continuing, based on each of the principles that guide the ESEA application.

Common Core State Standards (Section 1)

To address comments raised by stakeholders and the CCSSO pre-review panel, this section was restructured to make it easier to delineate what work has already been done, and what still needs to be done. More clear description of the state's plans and commitment to increasing capacity to fully support the difficult and important work outlined in the waiver was included, as well as a detailed timeline. The application attempted to better describe plans for ensuring that common core implementation is supported at the classroom level through a plan for professional development and plans for supporting the needs of students with disabilities and English language learners.

Existing Oregon Report Card for 2011-12 (Section 2.A.i)

One change was made to the section that describes plans for adopting this year's Oregon School Report Cards to the waiver, which was to describe how a model, focus or priority school would be identified on the report card. The draft waiver stated the focus, priority or model label would be added to the existing labels required by Oregon law of "Satisfactory", "Outstanding", and "In Need of Improvement." To reduce labeling of schools, and to reduce confusion, the section was revised to indicate only that the schools identification as a focus, priority and reward school would appear somewhere on the 2012 report card.

New Oregon Report Card (Section 2.A.i)

Some revisions were made to the table that projects potential new measures to be put in place (removal of consideration of a "lowest 25% subgroup" and of "by 21" graduation rate) based on feedback from NGA that these were unnecessarily confusing.

We also clarified that we want to make sure that whatever growth model is ultimately selected for a new Oregon Report Card is sufficiently ambitious to ensure college and career readiness for all students. The section previously said this, but in language that readers did not find clear.

We also deleted an unverified statement that Oregon is one of 2 states to have an achievement gap that is widening, and converted language with respect to using ELPA to measure English language arts to a section of potential recommendations around developing a separate growth model for measuring English language proficiency.

Identifying Model, Focus and Priority Schools (Sections 2.C.i & ii, 2.D.i &ii, 2.E.i & ii)

The primary changes to this section were not substantive, but rather an attempt to make the section considerably more readable despite the dense technical information that must be presented.

Substantive changes did include:

- Identifying about 10 percent (rather than 5 percent) of Title I schools in the model schools identification to ensure representation from among schools with the most severe poverty;

- Revising the methodology to ensure that alternative schools are not overrepresented in the identification of priority & focus schools (this was intent before but it was unclear in first draft)

- Based on feedback from NGA and CCSSO, we added description of the process that ODE will use to rate small schools and K-2 schools so that all Oregon schools can ultimately receive a rating

Achievement Compacts (Section 2.B)

The language in this section was revised to better align with the current LC 160 and to address questions arising from CCSSO panel. The following was added:

- Ensuring the achievement compact includes multiple measures focused on closing the achievement gap;
- Including the role for teachers, parents and community in the development of achievement compact goals
- Clarifying that the achievement compacts will set goals for districts, but that the districts will have the authority to set school level objectives that will allow the district to meet its goals. This process will be informed by the ratings that will be provided to schools in the context of the Oregon report card and the methodology for differentiating the performance of schools included therein.

Supports and Interventions (Sections 2.D iii & iv, 2.E.iii & iv)

The bulk of substantive revisions occurred in this section. The revisions were made in order to (1) make the section more clear and readable;(2) respond to feedback around the timeline and process for determining the intervention “level” of a focus or priority school; (3) respond to feedback around who would be engaged by the state to do the deeper diagnosis and provide support to districts. Specifically,

- Some criteria were set out to aid the Superintendent in those engaged in deeper diagnosis in determining the appropriate level of intervention
- The application was revised to ensure the state has the ability to use Level 3 intervention as soon as 2013 for the most struggling schools; and
- The potential intervention description was revised to express the state's commitment to ensuring that tutoring and transfer options with reasonable transportation are considered where diagnosis reveals them to be an appropriate intervention for meeting students' needs in a focus or priority school.
- The qualifications that should be used by ODE in selecting coaches / mentors /reviewers was added to ensure priority and focus schools are well-qualified and supported

Teacher / Leader Evaluation & Support (Section 3)

The primary change to this section was ensuring the timeline for implementation of locally developed teacher evaluation and support systems, and the technical assistance that will be provided to districts, are consistent with SB 290. The first draft had listed 2013-14 as a pilot year for teacher evaluations; this was revised to indicate that districts would launch an evaluation in 2013-14, but that ODE would work to provide guidance and support necessary to ensure the criteria in the guidelines that will be developed under the waiver are implemented by 2014-15.

The section also attempts to better describe the assistance that will be provided by ODE to districts in implementing locally-developed systems, and uses language to connect this section better to the supports and interventions plans and processes for those districts with priority and focus schools.