

Differentiated Accountability Model

Proposed Pilot Program for differentiated consequences that produce more targeted interventions for schools and districts in need of improvement

Oklahoma is a state with 540 school districts and 1,789 schools, with a majority of those schools in rural locations and with high percentages of economically disadvantaged students. Of those schools and Districts 540 districts and 1,192 schools were Title I. Oklahoma ranks 47th out of 50 states as measured by the median household Income by family size in 2006. Oklahoma households in 2006 earned more than only Arkansas, West Virginia, and Mississippi. Oklahoma is one of only ten states with a poverty rate of over 16 percent. Oklahoma ranks 3rd in the nation for heart disease, 6th in diabetes and 7th in the nation for the percentage of adults who are obese. These are just some of the statistics for Oklahoma on factors that identify some of the challenges schools and districts deal with while educating their students. In addition the Oklahoma demographics are changing. Oklahoma is becoming a majority minority state with a growing population of Hispanic and American Indian students. Schools and districts are facing new challenges as they are striving for proficiency of all students. The differentiated accountability system will allow the State to more effectively distribute and utilize resources for meaningful reform for schools in need of improvement.

Oklahoma's proposed plan provides significant and comprehensive interventions for its lowest-performing schools prior to the schools reaching the restructuring phase.

Oklahoma's proposed plan provides a model of differentiation and system of interventions.

School Improvement and Corrective Action

A school is identified for school improvement after it has not made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years.

Once a school is identified for improvement Oklahoma has recognized two categories to distinguish the phases from improvement to restructuring. These levels are identified as either targeted or comprehensive and align to the interventions that will enable schools and districts to become successful in achieving proficiency for all students. Schools identified as targeted are successful in most of the benchmarks and student groups but still have a specific area of need. Schools identified as comprehensive may have several benchmarks or several student groups in need of improvement or the majority of the school's students may need improvement.

Criteria For Differentiated Consequences

Table 1: Targeted: failing to make AYP with the below criteria for two consecutive years

Criteria Scenarios for Differentiation	Math	Math % Tested	Reading	Reading % Tested
Failed in only one benchmark	Failed in 35% or less of the student groups and only one benchmark	Failed in 35% or less of the student groups and only one benchmark	Failed in 35% or less of the student groups and only one benchmark	Failed in 35% or less of the student groups and only one benchmark
Failed in multiple benchmarks for limited number of student groups	Failed in Multiple benchmarks but less than 20% of student groups	Failed in Multiple benchmarks but less than 20% of student groups	Failed in Multiple benchmarks but less than 20% of student groups	Failed in Multiple benchmarks but less than 20% of student groups
Significant population did not fail	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in less than 50%.	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in less than 50%.	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in less than 50%.	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in less than 50%.

Table 2 Comprehensive: failing to make AYP with the below criteria for two consecutive years

Criteria Scenarios for differentiation	Math	Math % Tested	Reading	Reading % Tested
Fails in multiple student groups	Failed in over 35% of student groups.			
Fails in multiple benchmarks	Failed in over 20% of the student groups and at least one other benchmark	Failed in over 20% of the student groups and at least one other benchmark	Failed in over 20% of the student groups and at least one other benchmark	Failed in over 20% of the student groups and at least one other benchmark

Significant population failed	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in 50% or more.	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in 50% or more.	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in 50% or more.	Less than 3 student groups represented and failed in 50% or more.
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---

School Improvement Phases

General Requirements

In general, schools identified for improvement must receive technical assistance that enables them to specifically address the academic achievement problem that caused the school to be identified for improvement. The local educational agency (LEA) is required to provide technical assistance as the school develops and implements the plan, including specific assistance in analyzing assessment data, improving professional development, and improving resource allocation.

In addition, the following must take place as the school remains in *Need of Improvement*:

Table 3

Level	Targeted	Level	Comprehensive
1a (1 st Year in Need of Improvement)	1. All students are offered public school choice. 2. Each school identified for improvement must develop or revise a two-year school improvement plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, the local educational agency, and other experts, for approval by the LEA. The plan must incorporate research-based strategies, a 10 percent set-aside of Title I funds for professional development, extended learning time as appropriate (including school day or year), strategies to promote effective parental involvement and mentoring for new teachers.	1 (1 st Year in Need of Improvement)	1. All students are offered public school choice. 2. Each school identified for improvement must develop or revise a two-year school improvement plan, in consultation with parents, school staff, the local educational agency, and other experts, for approval by the LEA. The plan must incorporate research-based strategies, a 10 percent set-aside of Title I funds for professional development, extended learning time as appropriate (including school day or year), strategies to promote effective parental involvement and mentoring for new teachers.
1b (2 nd Year in Need of Improvement)	1. Make available supplemental educational services to students from low-income families. <i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance to implement the new plan and offer public school choice.</i>		

Level	Targeted	Level	Comprehensive
2a (3 rd Year in Need of Improvement)	1. Provide targeted professional development for areas of need. i.e.: Coteaching training for special education teachers or What Works In Schools instructional strategies for graduation rate. <i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance, public school choice and supplemental educational services.</i>	2 (2 nd Year in Need of Improvement)	1. Make available supplemental educational services to students from low-income families. 2. Develop and provide Principal Mentorship Program. <i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance to implement the new plan and offer public school choice.</i>
2b (4 th Year in Need of Improvement)*	1. Develop and provide Educational Leadership Coaches program. 2. Incentive program to equitably distribute experienced Highly Qualified Teachers in areas of need. <i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance, public school choice and supplemental educational services.</i>		
3 (5 th Year Targeted, 3 rd Year Comprehensive)	Corrective Action requires an LEA to take actions likely to bring about meaningful change at the school. To accomplish this goal, LEAs are required to take at least one of the following corrective actions, depending on the needs of the individual school: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replace school staff responsible for the continued failure to make AYP; 2. Implement a new curriculum based on scientifically based research (including professional development); 3. Significantly decrease management authority at the school level; 4. Extend the school day or school year; 5. Appoint an outside expert to advise the school in its progress toward making AYP in accordance with its school plan; or 6. Reorganize the school internally. <i>In addition, the LEA continues to offer technical assistance, public school choice and supplemental educational services.</i>		
4 (6 th Year Targeted, 4 th Year Comprehensive)	During the first year of restructuring, the LEA is required to prepare a plan and make necessary arrangements to carry out one of the following options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reopen school as charter school. 2. Replace principal and staff. 3. Contract for private management company of demonstrated effectiveness. 4. State takeover. 		

Level	Targeted	Level	Comprehensive
	5. Any other major restructuring of school governance. <i>In addition the LEA continues to offer public school choice and supplemental educational services.</i>		
5 (7 th Year Targeted, 5 th Year Comprehensive)	Implement alternative governance plan no later than first day of school year following year four described above.		

Schools moving from the targeted to comprehensive categories:

A school that is moving through the targeted phases of needs improvement will continue on that path unless or until they have failed to make AYP based on the comprehensive criteria. At this time the school will move to the next numbered level on the comprehensive path of improvement. For example a school in needs of improvement level 1a that has met the comprehensive criteria in the following year will move into the level 2 comprehensive path. Further a school in needs of improvement level 1b that has not met the AYP based on the comprehensive criteria the following year will move into the level 2 comprehensive path.

Schools moving from the comprehensive to targeted:

A school that is in the level 1 or level 2 of the comprehensive phase of needs improvement will continue on that path unless or until they have failed to make AYP based only on the targeted criteria in the following year. For example a school in level 1 will move to level 1b targeted and a school in level 2 will move to 2b on the targeted path. Schools identified at year 3 corrective action and beyond will follow the same path.

Transition of SI Schools under the current accountability system

The Oklahoma State Department of Education has reviewed all schools currently in School Improvement and identified the transition placement of these schools onto the differentiated phases of needs improvement. Schools will move forward on the transitioned placement beginning with the 2007-2008 AYP and SI determinations. The interventions applicable to schools in the transition are at or above the level identified during the 2006-2007 school year and applied for the 2007-2008 school year. See table 4 below.

Table 4

SI Level	Targeted	SI Level	Comprehensive
1a	Cave Springs ES Cave Springs HS Etta Dale JHS Lost City Public School Cache Public School Mounds Lower ES Hodgen Public School Crescent ES Madill HS Wayne HS Webster MS	1	Stringtown ES Rogers MS Taft MS Jackson ES

SI Level	Targeted	SI Level	Comprehensive
	Indianola ES Shawnee MS Academy Central ES Wilson MS Jenks MS		
1b			
2a	Shady Grove Public School Putnam City HS Coolidge ES F.D. Moon Academy/Mass Media North Highland Math/Science School Spencer ES Douglas HS Houston ES Whitman ES Daniel Webster HS Union IHS	2	Douglas MS Picher-Cardin ES Guymon HS
2b			
3	Emerson Alternative Education HS U.S. Grant HS Northwest Classen HS Justice A.W. Seeworth Academy Commerce HS Wilson School Pickett-Center Public School Foster MS Gilcrease IS Central HS East Central HS		
4	Bell Public Schools Capitol Hill HS John Wesly Charter School Nathan Hale HS Mclain HS for Science and Technology Will Rogers HS		
5	Hamilton MS Monroe MS Madison MS		