

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

- 2.A.i.** Provide a description of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that includes all the components listed in Principle 2, the SEA’s plan for implementation of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system no later than the 2013–2014 school year, and an explanation of how the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.
- 2.A.ii** Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding information, if any. (A or B – re: reading/math only or more)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
1. How to frame and describe overview and theory of action? Key ideas and principles to highlight				
2. Limit assessments to reading and math (Option A)? Or add others (Option B)	Reading and math – achievement & growth Grad rate		Reading and math – achievement & growth Grad rate	Reading and math – achievement & growth Grad rate
3. Include writing? If so, when?	No writing		No writing scores	No writing scores
4. Include growth?	Yes. Consider CO growth model Group wants to measure growth as authentically as possible (i.e. preferring to measure growth in cohort)	Need to look at actual Maine school data for modeling? What growth formula will we use?		
5. What “n” size shall be used?		Currently use 20 for everything but participation (41)? Is it 20 over 2 years? How many smaller schools are excluded?		

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
6. How to describe transition to new SBAC metrics?	Establish a group to monitor and adjust and reset is necessary following the principles outlined above	Create grade by grade cohort illustration: testing year, Accountability year, and, learning year. Address the manner in which 'growth' will be calculated for students in the 2014-15 school year. Look at RI's transition plan.		
7. How to describe implementation of standards-based system?	Stay simple. Focus on what we know...			
8. What metrics – if any – to add from standards-based system?				

DRAFT

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

2B. Select the method the SEA will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (**AMOs**) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. If the SEA sets AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, the AMOs for LEAs, schools, or subgroups that are further behind must require greater rates of annual progress. (Option A, B, or C?)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
1. Reduce by 50% students <i>not</i> proficient over 6 years or meet 100% over 8 years?	Reduce by 50%			Reduce by 50%
2. Establish different targets (both starting and ending) for schools and subgroups?	Yes. Different, based on most recent school and subgroup performance.	Need to view models. Need to establish starting and ending points for every school and subgroup	Yes. Different, based on most recent school and subgroup performance.	Yes. Different, based on most recent school and subgroup performance.
3. Use of index?	Yes.	What variables go into the index? What weight for each variable? How different for ES, MS, HS, and other grade configurations?		
4. Number of overall school performance levels?	4?			

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
<p>5. Labels for each school performance level?</p>	<p>Maybe tied to SBAC language: Substantially below proficient (priority) Partially proficient (focus) Partially proficient Proficient Proficient with distinction</p>	<p>Need to find out what language they will use for student level proficiency.</p>	<p>Need to determine this?</p>	
<p>6. Use additional decision-making process to ensure identification of sufficient priority and focus schools?</p>	<p>If we don't use a secondary decision-making tree, we run the risk of placing more schools in each category than can be meaningfully supported.</p>	<p>Modeling needed to determine this once we determine the index/score system. Need number of Title I receiving schools (overall, by grade level configurations). Can exiting SIG schools reenter SIG? What is SIG status for Maine in 2012-2013? What is SIG determination?</p>		<p>Additional decision-making tree needs to include Title I receiving and eligible HSs with grad rate less 60%. Also include current SIG schools.</p>

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
7. What additional measures?	<p>Include 5-yr cohort grad rate in the index/score</p> <p>Also keep flow chart that automatically includes HSs with 4-yr rates less than 60%</p> <p>Consider drop-out in the formula because it is an indication of how students continue to be engaged in school. Schools ought to receive credit for continuing to support and engage them.</p>	<p>Need to make note in the application that Maine statute has 80% target for 2013 and 90% target for 2016. Also, there is an NESSC 5-year target.</p> <p>Need to determine how students who have not graduated in 4 years but are still in school are credited.</p> <p>Should we keep and/or modify current state minimum HS grad rates?</p>	<p>Include 5-yr cohort grad rate in the index/score</p> <p>Also keep flow chart that automatically includes HSs with 4-yr rates less than 60%. Consider additional</p>	<p>Include 5-yr cohort grad rate in the index/score</p> <p>Also keep flow chart that automatically includes HSs with 4-yr rates less than 60%</p>
8. HS grad rates	<p>HS schools meeting all other academic expectations, but have grad rates >60% but less than state target (83%, 80%, 90%) placed in a 'new' category... warning?</p>			
9. Should there be measures that automatically place schools in one category or another?				

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
10. Include participation?	<p>Cons: keep the formula simple and minimalistic. Attendance shouldn't serve as the basis for identification.</p> <p>Pro: without including it, the wrong message is being sent – especially given the importance of subgroup performance.</p>	<p>Return to this during next meeting.</p> <p>Required since part of current AYP?</p> <p>Want to see what this would look like? Might including it help?</p> <p>For how many schools is this an issue? (17 public HS with n>40 had part. Rates <95% in 2011 MHSA; if n>20, then 19 schools in list)</p>		
11. Include attendance?	<p>Cons: keep the formula simple and minimalistic. Attendance shouldn't serve as the basis for identification.</p> <p>Pro: we want kids in school. If they are not in school, they are not learning.</p>	<p>Is a non-academic indicator required since part of current AYP?</p> <p>If so, should attendance be factored for only tested grade levels?</p> <p>If so, should there be different targets or the same?</p> <p>Want to see what this would look like? Might including it help?</p>	<p>Don't include in determination. However, include examination of this issue under the required school assessment and diagnosis process leading to school improvement.</p>	
12. How to identify and support schools that are not Title I eligible or receiving?				

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

- 2.C.i** Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as **reward schools** . If the SEA’s methodology is not based on the definition of reward schools in *ESEA Flexibility* (but instead, e.g., based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), the SEA should also demonstrate that the list provided in Table 2 is consistent with the definition, per the Department’s “Demonstrating that an SEA’s Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions” guidance.
- 2.C.ii** Provide the SEA’s list of reward schools in Table 2.
- 2.C.iii** Describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools.

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
1. Type of reward schools?	Both high performing and high progressing			
2. How to identify?		How will index and/or decision tree be used to identify both high performing and progressing schools? Need to run models.		
3. Incentives and reward?				
4.				
5.				
6.				

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

- 2.D.i** Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying a number of lowest-performing schools equal to at least five percent of the State’s Title I schools as **priority schools**. If the SEA’s methodology is not based on the definition of priority schools in *ESEA Flexibility* (but instead, e.g., based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), the SEA should also demonstrate that the list provided in Table 2 is consistent with the definition, per the Department’s “Demonstrating that an SEA’s Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions” guidance.
- 2.D.ii** Provide the SEA’s list of priority schools in Table 2.
- 2.D.iii** Describe the meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles that an LEA with priority schools will implement.
- 2.D.iv** Provide the timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year and provide a justification for the SEA’s choice of timeline.
- 2.D.v** Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
1. Index score leading to minimum number of focus schools?		Need to develop modeling		
2. What happens when schools meet the minimum index or score, but don’t meet other measures		Clarify other measures beyond reading and math. Draw up flow-chart to illustrate decision tree.		
3. How shall school(s) exit?		Which group: I & S or AMO?		
4. Include Title I eligible schools in system?				
5.				

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
6.				

DRAFT

Maine ESEA Flexibility Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) Workplan (DRAFT as of 7/2/12 3:00 PM)

- 2.E.i** Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State’s Title I schools as **“focus schools.”** If the SEA’s methodology is not based on the definition of focus schools in *ESEA Flexibility* (but instead, e.g., based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), the SEA should also demonstrate that the list provided in Table 2 is consistent with the definition, per the Department’s “Demonstrating that an SEA’s Lists of Schools meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions” guidance.
- 2.E.ii** Provide the SEA’s list of focus schools in Table 2.
- 2.E.iii** Describe the process and timeline the SEA will use to ensure that each LEA that has one or more focus schools will identify the specific needs of the LEA’s focus schools and their students. Provide examples of and justifications for the interventions focus schools will be required to implement to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind.
- 2.E.iv** Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status and a justification for the criteria selected.

Guiding questions	Initial ideas	Follow-up questions & needs	Candidate elements for recommendations	Final Recommendations
1. Index score leading to minimum number of focus schools?		Need to develop modeling		
2. How shall school(s) exit?		Which group: I & S or AMO?		
3.				
4.				
5.				