



## Legislation Consistent with NSBA's Recommendations for NCLB

### NSBA Recommendations

### 110<sup>th</sup> Congress House/Senate Bills

<b>MEASURING ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS GROUP SIZE/ MEASURING AYP OF GROUPS</b>	
1. The "N" size may be larger for school districts than for schools.	<b>H.R. 648<sup>1</sup></b>
2. The "N" size for a group within a school may be increased to a number or percentage of that school's total school enrollment to better align with schools with large enrollments.	<b>H.R. 648</b>
3. The "safe harbor" requirement is reduced from 10% to 5%, thus permitting fewer students to demonstrate progress within the group in order to meet this alternative AYP requirement.	<b>H.R.648, S.562</b>
4. In calculating AYP, students identified in more than one group may be represented in the count for each group as an equal fraction totaling one student. This change creates a fairer approach in determining AYP for schools with students belonging to more than one group than over-representing their count.	<b>S.348<sup>2</sup>, H.R. 648, H.R.1169, H.R.3292, S.1913</b>
5. A school or school district would be identified as making AYP when one or more subgroups fail to make AYP as long as the total number of students in the subgroups failing to score proficient or above does not exceed 10% of the total number of students counted for the specific assessment or indicator. (This alternative method could not be applied to the same groups for the same subject in two consecutive years)	<b>H.R.648</b>
<b>GOALS FOR ADEQUATE YEARLY PROGRESS</b>	
6. Intermediate goals do not have to increase in equal increments.	<b>H.R.648, S.348, H.R.2070</b>
7. Different groups can have different rates of increase to ultimately reach 100% proficient.	<b>H.R.648, S.348, H.R.2070</b>

<sup>1</sup> Introduced by Rep. Don Young in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress and contains **all** of NSBA's recommendations

<sup>2</sup> Introduced by Sen. Mike Crapo in the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress and contains **most** of NSBA's recommendations

## NSBA Recommendations

## 110<sup>th</sup> Congress House/Senate Bills

<i>GAIN SCORES AND OTHER MEASURES OF AYP DEVELOPED BY THE STATE</i>	
8. The basic AYP measurement system may be expanded to include: 1) gain score approaches (like value added); and 2) partial credit for meeting basic proficient targets.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.1169, H.R.2070, H.R.1711, H.R.2087, H.R.2166, H.R.2946, H.R.3426, H.R.4305, S.562, S.1194, S.1236, S.1913, S.2001, S.2053
9. Alternate methods of measuring AYP may be substituted for the existing methodology, provided the system is based on attaining proficiency in the 2013-14 school year and using intermediate goals, thereby providing states with greater flexibility to design their accountability systems without lowering the ultimate goals of NCLB.	<b>H.R. 648</b> , S.348, H.R.1169, H.R.1711, H.R.2087, H.R.2946, H.R.3426, S.562, S.1236, S.1913
<i>PARTICIPATION RATE</i>	
10. The specific requirement for 95% test participation may be adjusted to a range of 90% to 95% (based on criteria established in the state plan).	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, S.1913
11. Students may be exempted from the participation rate requirements on a case-by-case basis due to medical conditions, current state laws that grant parents final decisions regarding participation on standardized assessments, and uncontrollable circumstances (e.g. natural disaster).	<b>H.R.648</b> , H.R.1169
12. Students determined to have “ <i>unusual patterns of attendance</i> ” as defined by the state education agency may be exempt from the calculation to determine participation rate and referenced in the local school district accountability plan. (This category of students may include chronic truants as well as students who fail to attend school on a regular basis because of life circumstances but continue to maintain their official enrollment status.)	<b>H.R.648</b> , H.R.1169
13. Students not participating in the assessment and determined not to be eligible for exemptions may be assigned a “ <i>below basic</i> ” score by the school. In such cases, the school may not be identified as failing to meet the participation rate for AYP on the basis that those same students did not take the assessment.	<b>H.R.648</b>
<i>STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES</i>	
14. As determined by the state, students with disabilities may be offered an alternate assessment for the purpose of determining AYP, provided that any such assessment is reflected by the student’s IEP and is based on the IEP team’s evaluation and the services to be provided for that student – and meets parent consent requirements for IEPs.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.2070, H.R.2166, H.R.2946, H.R.3076, H.R.3292, H.R.3426, S.562, S.1913
15. The percentage of students statewide who may have their score counted under this provision as meeting AYP may not exceed 3% of the total number of students assessed.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.3292, S.562, S.1913

## NSBA Recommendations

## 110<sup>th</sup> Congress House/Senate Bills

16. Consistent with the student's IEP, alternate assessments may include out of level assessments. Likewise, a student's test results for the purpose of determining AYP may be based on gain scores toward meeting the state standard for proficient or on an adjusted "cut" score for determining proficient.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.3426, S.562
<b><i>LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS</i></b>	
17. The current regulation is codified relating to 1) first year students in the United States; and 2) counting students as LEP for determining AYP once they leave the group, except that such count may be extended to a third year.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.1711, H.R.2070, H.R.3075, S.1913, S.2001
18. Students may be provided an alternate assessment that is based on making specific gains individually determined for that student toward meeting state standards for up to three years, as determined by the local school district.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, S.1913
<b><i>FIRST ASSESSMENTS</i></b>	
19. The higher score achieved by a student who is assessed more than once prior to the beginning of the next school year may be used as the sole score for that student for the purposes of determining AYP.	<b>H.R.648</b> , H.R.2070
20. If a student scores proficient or above on an assessment taken prior to the academic year in which that assessment is normally offered, that student's score can be counted for the purpose of determining whether AYP was met. However, if that student fails to score at the proficient level, that student's score will not be counted for determining AYP.	<b>H.R.648</b>
<b><i>STATE FLEXIBILITY BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</i></b>	
21. In approving a state's NCLB accountability plan the Secretary shall grant states flexibility to alter the federal framework to align with the state's own accountability system.	<b>H.R. 648.</b>
22. The Secretary may provide statutory and regulatory waivers – including waiving requirements that are unnecessarily burdensome or duplicative of state requirements.	<b>H.R. 648</b>
23. When the Secretary approves an amendment to state plan or grants a waiver, that information must be published on the ED's website in clear and complete language within 30 days.	<b>H.R. 648</b> , H.R.4305, S.2053
24. A waiver or state's plan's revision approved by the Secretary shall be available to any other state on a case-by-case determination.	<b>H.R. 648</b>
<b><i>IMPLEMENTATION OF SANCTIONS TRANSFER TO OTHER SCHOOLS</i></b>	
25. A transfer option need only be offered to those low achieving students within the group who failed to meet their AYP targets in the same subject for two or more years – not to all students in the school.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, S.1913

## NSBA Recommendations

## 110<sup>th</sup> Congress House/Senate Bills

26. Financial obligations for a school district to provide transportation for a student ends when the group to which the student belongs no longer is identified as not meeting AYP target within the student's former school even if that school continues to be identified as not making AYP for other reasons.	<b>H.R.648</b>
27. A student need only be offered the option to transfer to one other school rather than the current interpretation of at least two schools.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348
28. The current regulation exempting students from being offered the transfer option when health and safety are involved is codified and the following conditions for exemption are added: 1) class-size laws; 2) overcrowding; 3) the need for mobile classrooms, construction, or other significant capital outlays; and 4) such travel burdens as time, safety, and unusually high per pupil costs.	<b>H.R.648</b>
<b><i>SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES</i></b>	
29. Supplemental services may be offered in the first year that a school is in improvement status – rather than only offering the transfer option for that year.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, S.1236, S.1913
30. Supplemental services need only be offered to low achieving students within the specific group that fails to make AYP in the same subject for two or more years.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.1169
31. The state is required to consult with school districts in developing criteria for supplemental service providers.	<b>H.R.648</b> , H.R.1169, S.1913
32. The state is required to develop – and make available to the public – procedures to enable local school districts to bring complaints regarding the selection and performance of the provider, and number of schools served by the provider if such scope of service adversely affects the quality of service.	<b>H.R.648</b> H.R.1169, S.1913
33. The state should establish a date, no later than December 15, to permit school districts to spend portions of the 20% of the Title I funds set aside for choice and SES that are not needed for such services with appropriate parental notification.	<b>H.R.648</b>
34. School districts may not be denied the opportunity to provide supplemental services solely because they did not make AYP or they are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status.	<b>H.R. 648</b> H.R.1169
<b><i>SANCTIONS IN GENERAL</i></b>	
35. Sanctions for schools and school districts will apply only when AYP is not met by the “ <i>same group</i> ” for two or more consecutive years in a subject on the “ <i>same indicator</i> ” – rather than applying sanctions when different groups and/or different indicators are involved from year to year in that subject.	<b>H.R.648</b> , S.348, H.R.2070, H.R.3292, H.R.3426, S.562, S.1913
36. The application of corrective action sanctions to restructure a school district will occur when it fails to make AYP in each of the grade spans or as averaged across all grades.	<b>H.R.648</b> , H.R.1169

## NSBA Recommendations

## 110<sup>th</sup> Congress House/Senate Bills

37. Provisions of federal law requiring the restructuring of a school or a school district shall not be implemented unless the total number of students in the groups not scoring proficient or above exceeds 35% of that school or school district's enrollment. Provisions of federal law requiring the restructuring of a school or a school district shall not be implemented unless the total number of students in the groups not scoring proficient or above exceeds 35% of that school or school district's enrollment.	<b>H.R.648,</b> H.R.1169
38. In addition to deferring implementation of sanctions for one year for schools and school districts that face hardships such as natural disasters or financial difficulties, implementation may also be deferred due to a sudden change in the enrollment of particular groups of students in the school or within identified groups.	<b>H.R.648,</b> H.R.1169
39. Sanctions relating to corrective action and restructuring will be deferred in any year that appropriations for Title I is not increased by at least \$2.5 billion over the previous year until Title I is fully funded.	<b>H.R.648,</b> H.R.684 H.R.1169
40. Sanctions relating to corrective action and restructuring will be deferred in any year that appropriations under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act do not increase by at least \$2 billion over the previous year's funding level. (For 109 <sup>th</sup> Congress, the provision was to defer restructuring in any year that the appropriations under IDEA are not consistent with the authorized funding levels in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004.	<b>H.R.648,</b> H.R.684 H.R.1169
<b>NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS</b>	
41. Students receiving Title I benefits in non-public schools shall be given the same assessments, as public school students, with appropriate accountability and test reporting requirements to parents and school districts that are required by NCLB to provide consultative services to those non-public schools.	<b>H.R.648</b>
42. States may authorize a cessation of Title I support to a non-public school whose Title I students as a whole do not make AYP and perform at lower levels than the area public school(s) for three years or more.	<b>H.R.648</b>
<b>HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS</b>	
43. Special education teachers of multiple core academic subjects who have a bachelor's degree and full state special education certification would be considered highly qualified.	S.1913
44. Streamlining existing Highly Qualified Teacher requirements for social studies teachers so that teachers receiving a "broad field" state certification in social studies are considered highly qualified without needing an academic major or certification in multiple, specific social studies subjects such as geography, history, civics and government and economics.	H.R.2087, H.R.2946, S.562, S.1194
45. Instructional personnel of core academic subjects employed by supplemental educational services providers should be held to the same Highly Qualified Teacher requirements as public school educators.	H.R.1169

# 110<sup>th</sup> Congress

## House Bills

---

**H.R. 648** – “*No Child Left Behind Improvements Act of 2007*” January 23, 2007 – Rep. Don Young (R-AK-At-Large)

**H.R. 684** – “Keep Our Promise to America’s Children Act” January 24, 2007 – Rep. Dennis Moore (D-KS-3)

**H.R. 1169** – “*Student Achievement and Successful Schools Act of 2007*” February 16, 2007 – Rep. Betty McCollum (D-MN-4)

**H.R. 1711** – “*Flexibility in Assessments for Individuals Reform (FAIR) Act of 2007*” March 27, 2007 – Rep. Darlene Hooley (D-OR-5)

**H.R. 2070** – “*Comprehensive Learning Assessment for Students and Schools (CLASS) Act of 2007*” April 26, 2007 – Rep. Mark Udall (D-CO-2)

**H.R. 2087** – “*No Child Left Behind Reform Act*” May 1, 2007 – Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-CT-3)

**H.R. 2166** – “*Practicality in Education Act*” May 3, 2007 – Rep. Jerry Moran (R-KS-1)

**H.R. 2946** – “*State and Local Education Flexibility Act of 2007*” June 28, 2007 – Rep. Lee Terry (R-NE-2)

**H.R. 3075** – Allow states to identify former LEP and SWD in the subgroups for 3 years, July 18, 2007 – Rep. John Boozman (R-AR-3)

**H.R. 3076** – Allow states to adopt alternate and modified standards for students with disabilities, July 18, 2007 – Rep. John Boozman (R-AR-3)

**H.R. 3292** – “*Education Assessment Technical Corrections Act*” August 1, 2007 – Rep. Mark Kirk (R-IL-10)

**H.R. 3426** – “*Flexibility for Individual Excellence in Education Act of 2007*” August 3, 2007 – Rep. Jim Matheson (D-UT-2)

**H.R. 4305** – Amend part A of ESEA to improve elementary and secondary education, December 6, 2007 – Rep. Thomas Allen (D-ME-1)

## Senate Bills

**S. 348** – “*Improving No Child Left Behind Act*” January 22, 2007 – Sen. Mike Crapo (R-ID)

**S. 562** – “*No Child Left Behind Flexibility and Improvements Act*” February 13, 2007 – Sen. Susan Collins (R-ME) and Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-ME)

**S. 1194** – “*To Improve the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*” April 24, 2007 – Sen. Christopher Dodd (D-CT)

**S. 1236** – “*School Accountability Improvements Act*” April 26, 2007 – Sen. Lisa Murkowski (R-AK)

**S. 1913** – “*No Child Left Behind Enhancement Act*” August 1, 2007 – Sen. Mike Crapo (R-ID), Co-Sponsor Blanche Lincoln (D-AR)

**S. 2001** – “*All Students Can Achieve Act*” August 3, 2007 – Sen. Joseph Lieberman (I-CT)

**S. 2053** – “*Improve Student Testing Act of 2007*” September 17, 2007 – Sen. Russell Feingold (D-WI)