

## COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

Legal Name of Requester: New Mexico Public Education Department	Requester's Mailing Address: 300 Don Gaspar Santa Fe, NM 87501
State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request	
Name: Leighann Lenti	
Position and Office: Director of Policy, Office of the Secretary	
Contact's Mailing Address: 300 Don Gaspar Santa Fe, NM 87505	
Telephone: 505-412-2285	
Fax: 505-827-6520	
Email address: Leighann.Lenti@state.nm.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): <i>Hanna Skandera</i>	Telephone: 505-827-6688
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X <i>Hanna Skandera</i>	Date: <i>11/14/11</i>
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to meet all principles of the ESEA Flexibility.	

---

# **NEW MEXICO – ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST NOVEMBER 14, 2011**

---

Revised September 28, 2011

This document replaces the previous version, issued September 23, 2011.

U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0708  
Expiration Date: March 31, 2012

Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0708. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 336 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any

comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Insert page numbers prior to submitting the request, and place the table of contents in front of the SEA’s flexibility request.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Cover Sheet for ESEA Flexibility Request	3
Waivers	4-5
Assurances	6-7
Consultation	8-10
Evaluation	10
Overview of SEA’s ESEA Flexibility Request	10-15
<b>Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students</b>	
1.A Adopt college- and career-ready standards	16
1.B Transition to college- and career-ready standards	16-19
1.C Develop and administer annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth	20
<b>Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support</b>	
2.A Develop and implement a State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support	21-31
2.B Set ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives	31-34
2.C Reward schools	34-36
2.D Priority schools	36-40
2.E Focus schools	41-44
Table 2	45-56
2.F Provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools	57-58
2.G Build SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning	59-62
<b>Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership</b>	
3.A Develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	62-70
3.B Ensure LEAs implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	70-72

**TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED**

For each attachment included in the *ESEA Flexibility Request*, label the attachment with the corresponding number from the list of attachments below and indicate the page number where the attachment is located. If an attachment is not applicable to the SEA’s request, indicate “N/A” instead of a page number. Reference relevant attachments in the narrative portions of the request.

<b>LABEL</b>	<b>LIST OF ATTACHMENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1	Notice to LEAs	1-23
2	Comments on request received from LEAs (if applicable)	n/a
3	Notice and information provided to the public regarding the request	24-43
4	Evidence that the State has formally adopted college- and career-ready content standards consistent with the State’s standards adoption process	44-70
5	Memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs) certifying that meeting the State’s standards corresponds to being college- and career-ready without the need for remedial coursework at the postsecondary level (if applicable)	n/a
6	State’s Race to the Top Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (if applicable)	n/a
7	Evidence that the SEA has submitted high-quality assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review, or a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review (if applicable)	71-73
8	A copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups (if applicable).	74-78
9	Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools	79-85
10	A copy of any guidelines that the SEA has already developed and adopted for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems (if applicable).	n/a
11	Evidence that the SEA has adopted one or more guidelines of local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	n/a
12	New Mexico Public Education Department Strategic Plan	86-109
13	A-F School Grading Act	109-117
14	New Mexico Effective Teaching Task Force Final Report and Recommendations	118-169
15	Value Added Model for A-F	170-173
16	Individual Student Growth Model	174-176
17	Point Calculations for A-F School Grading Model	177-179
18	Turnaround Principles, 2011	180-183
19	Descriptors of Turnaround Supports	184-196
20	AIR Toward More Effective School Districts	197-222
21	Curriculum Audit, November 2011	223-274
22	Guskey 5 Levels of PD	275-278
23	IES Practice Guide Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools	279-328
24	SIOP Protocol	329-338
25	References	339-341

## COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

Legal Name of Requester: New Mexico Public Education Department	Requester's Mailing Address: 300 Don Gaspar Santa Fe, NM 87501
State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request	
Name: Leighann Lenti	
Position and Office: Director of Policy, Office of the Secretary	
Contact's Mailing Address: 300 Don Gaspar Santa Fe, NM 87505	
Telephone: 505-412-2285	
Fax: 505-827-6520	
Email address: Leighann.Lenti@state.nm.us	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Hanna Skandera	Telephone: 505-827-6688
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date: November 14, 2011
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to meet all principles of the ESEA Flexibility.	

**WAIVERS**

By submitting this flexibility request, the SEA requests flexibility through waivers of the ten ESEA requirements listed below and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements by checking each of the boxes below. The provisions below represent the general areas of flexibility requested; a chart appended to the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions* enumerates each specific provision of which the SEA requests a waiver, which the SEA incorporates into its request by reference.

- 1. The requirements in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(E)-(H) that prescribe how an SEA must establish annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) to ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement on the State's assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the end of the 2013–2014 school year. The SEA requests this waiver to develop new ambitious but achievable AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics in order to provide meaningful goals that are used to guide support and improvement efforts for the State, LEAs, schools, and student subgroups.
- 2. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA and its Title I schools need not comply with these requirements.
- 3. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that it need not comply with these requirements with respect to its LEAs.
- 4. The requirements in ESEA sections 6213(b) and 6224(e) that limit participation in, and use of funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) and Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) programs based on whether an LEA has made AYP and is complying with the requirements in ESEA section 1116. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA that receives SRSA or RLIS funds may use those funds for any authorized purpose regardless of whether the LEA makes AYP.
- 5. The requirement in ESEA section 1114(a)(1) that a school have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more in order to operate a schoolwide program. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA may implement interventions consistent with the turnaround principles or interventions that are based on the needs of the students in the school and designed to enhance the entire educational program in a school in any of its priority and focus schools, as appropriate, even if those schools do not have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more.
- 6. The requirement in ESEA section 1003(a) for an SEA to distribute funds reserved under that section only to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may allocate section 1003(a) funds to its

LEAs in order to serve any of the State's priority and focus schools.

- 7. The provision in ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) that authorizes an SEA to reserve Title I, Part A funds to reward a Title I school that (1) significantly closed the achievement gap between subgroups in the school; or (2) has exceeded AYP for two or more consecutive years. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may use funds reserved under ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) for any of the State's reward schools.
- 8. The requirements in ESEA section 2141(a), (b), and (c) for an LEA and SEA to comply with certain requirements for improvement plans regarding highly qualified teachers. The SEA requests this waiver to allow the SEA and its LEAs to focus on developing and implementing more meaningful evaluation and support systems.
- 9. The limitations in ESEA section 6123 that limit the amount of funds an SEA or LEA may transfer from certain ESEA programs to other ESEA programs. The SEA requests this waiver so that it and its LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the funds it receives under the authorized programs among those programs and into Title I, Part A.
- 10. The requirements in ESEA section 1003(g)(4) and the definition of a Tier I school in Section I.A.3 of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) final requirements. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may award SIG funds to an LEA to implement one of the four SIG models in any of the State's priority schools.

Optional Flexibility:

An SEA should check the box below only if it chooses to request a waiver of the following requirements:

- The requirements in ESEA sections 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(b)(2)(A) that restrict the activities provided by a community learning center under the Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program to activities provided only during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (*i.e.*, before and after school or during summer recess). The SEA requests this waiver so that 21st CCLC funds may be used to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.



**ASSURANCES**

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that:

- 1. It requests waivers of the above-referenced requirements based on its agreement to meet Principles 1 through 4 of the flexibility, as described throughout the remainder of this request.
- 2. It will adopt English language proficiency (ELP) standards that correspond to the State's college- and career-ready standards, consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 3113(b)(2), and that reflect the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the new college- and career-ready standards, no later than the 2013–2014 school year. (Principle 1)
- 3. It will develop and administer no later than the 2014–2015 school year alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2) and are aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards. (Principle 1)
- 4. It will develop and administer ELP assessments aligned with the State's ELP standards, consistent with the requirements in ESEA sections 1111(b)(7), 3113(b)(2), and 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii). (Principle 1)
- 5. It will report annually to the public on college-going and college credit-accumulation rates for all students and subgroups of students in each LEA and each public high school in the State. (Principle 1)
- 6. If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and uses achievement on those assessments to identify priority and focus schools, it has technical documentation, which can be made available to the Department upon request, demonstrating that the assessments are administered statewide; include all students, including by providing appropriate accommodations for English Learners and students with disabilities, as well as alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2); and are valid and reliable for use in the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. (Principle 2)
- 7. It will report to the public its lists of reward schools, priority schools, and focus schools at the time the SEA is approved to implement the flexibility, and annually thereafter, it will publicly recognize its reward schools. (Principle 2)
- 8. Prior to submitting this request, it provided student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, or it will do so no later the deadline required under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. (Principle 3)

- 9. It will evaluate and, based on that evaluation, revise its own administrative requirements to reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on LEAs and schools. (Principle 4)
- 10. It has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its request.
- 11. Prior to submitting this request, it provided all LEAs with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request and has attached a copy of that notice (Attachment 1) as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs (Attachment 2).
- 12. Prior to submitting this request, it provided notice and information regarding the request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its website) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice (Attachment 3).
- 13. It will provide to the Department, in a timely manner, all required reports, data, and evidence regarding its progress in implementing the plans contained throughout this request.

**If the SEA selects Option A or B in section 3.A of its request, indicating that it has not yet developed and adopted all guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, it must also assure that:**

- 14. It will submit to the Department for peer review and approval a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. (Principle 3)

**CONSULTATION**

An SEA must meaningfully engage and solicit input from diverse stakeholders and communities in the development of its request. To demonstrate that an SEA has done so, the SEA must provide an assurance that it has consulted with the State’s Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in the request and provide the following:

1. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from teachers and their representatives.

**Consultation**

Since taking office in January 2011, Governor Martinez and the Public Education Department (PED) have advanced a bold reform agenda: “Kids First, New Mexico Wins”. While there are multiple components to this agenda, two in particular are directly related to New Mexico’s flexibility request: 1) Real Accountability, Real Results and 2) Rewarding Effective Teachers and School Leaders.

Real Accountability, Real Results is now being implemented through New Mexico’s A-F School Grading Act, signed and passed during the 2011 legislative session. What is included in this request is directly aligned to the A-F School Grading Act and reflective of multiple conversations amongst various stakeholders. Upon passage of the legislation, PED immediately began engaging stakeholders to garner input on the regulations and school grading model that would be utilized. Since April 2011, PED has met nine times with the New Mexico Coalition of School Administrators on the A-F regulation and model and has attended and presented at nine New Mexico School Boards Association regional meetings. Additionally, PED provided a 30 day open comment period and held two public hearings (October 31, 2011 and November 2, 2011) on the proposed regulation and model

(<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/calendar/2011/Notice%20-%20Public%20Hearing%20Scheduled%20on%20Grading%20Public%20Schools.pdf>).

Rewarding Effective Teachers and School Leaders was jump started in April 2011 when Governor Martinez formed a Task Force to make recommendations on how to redesign New Mexico’s current evaluation system. The 15 member Task Force met throughout the summer. Each of the ten Task Force meetings was open to the public and there was an opportunity provided for both written and public comment

(<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/press/2011/Teacher%20Task%20Force%20-%20August%202011%20meeting%20notice.pdf>).

PED also created a webpage that included all reading materials and presentations reviewed by the Task Force members (<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ttf/index.html>).

In addition to what is described above, PED senior staff will be visiting twenty five districts by the end 2011 and will be presenting the A-F regulation and model, as well as the Task Force recommendations, which have formed the basis of the policy proposal included in section 3.A and 3.B of this request. These district visits will allow for additional stakeholder PED to garner additional feedback from key stakeholders.

2. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes.

### **Engagement of Stakeholders**

Specific to the waiver request, PED has taken several concrete actions to solicit stakeholder input. First, PED launched a webpage (<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/skandera/waiver/index.html>) that included not only the initial notice of our intent to pursue a waiver, put also a letter that was distributed to all superintendents and principals on September 28 notifying them of PEDs intent to pursue a waiver, as well as details on who to provide questions and input to (<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/skandera/waiver/Letter%20to%20superintendents%20and%20principals.pdf>).

Second, a front page story in the Albuquerque Journal on September 24, 2011 clearly articulated the need for flexibility and the state's intention to apply for the waiver. Third, each of the meetings described above directly influenced the policies outlined in this proposal.

Fourth, prior to the submission of this request, PED hosted stakeholder conference calls in which we described the components of our request, as well as answered questions and solicited feedback. Invited to those calls where:

- New Mexico Coalition of School Administrators;
- New Mexico School Boards Association;
- New Mexico Business Roundtable;

- New Mexico’s Committee of Practitioners;
- District Bilingual Directors;
- District Native American Directors;
- SIG Superintendents; and
- Assessment and Accountability Advisory Council.

Taken in total, PED has consulted on numerous occasions with stakeholders on the development of the policies that are described in this request. As implementation precedes, PED remains committed to continuing an open dialogue to not only build support, but to also solicit input on ideas as we continue to serve New Mexico’s students.

## EVALUATION

The Department encourages an SEA that receives approval to implement the flexibility to collaborate with the Department to evaluate at least one program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs implement under principle 1, 2, or 3. Upon receipt of approval of the flexibility, an interested SEA will need to nominate for evaluation a program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs will implement under principles 1, 2, or 3. The Department will work with the SEA to determine the feasibility and design of the evaluation and, if it is determined to be feasible and appropriate, will fund and conduct the evaluation in partnership with the SEA, ensuring that the implementation of the chosen program, practice, or strategy is consistent with the evaluation design.

Check here if you are interested in collaborating with the Department in this evaluation, if your request for the flexibility is approved.

## OVERVIEW OF SEA’S REQUEST FOR THE ESEA FLEXIBILITY

Provide an overview (about 500 words) of the SEA’s request for the flexibility that:

1. explains the SEA’s comprehensive approach to implement the waivers and principles and describes the SEA’s strategy to ensure this approach is coherent within and across the principles; and
2. describes how the implementation of the waivers and principles will enhance the SEA’s and its LEAs’ ability to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.

### Overview of Request

Through the “Kids First, New Mexico Wins” plan (See Attachment 12), the New Mexico

Public Education Department (PED) has taken a key first step by clearly articulating the expectation that all students in New Mexico have the potential to reach high levels of achievement, regardless of background. Further, by implementing key initiatives such as the A-F School Grading Act and redesigning the states teacher and school leader evaluation system, New Mexico is consistently placing children at the center of all initiatives. New Mexico's request for flexibility meets each of the principles outlined, and the state is prepared and ready to implement what is included in this request. Further, each principle articulated allows New Mexico to create coordination and consistency across the policies outlined in this request.

**Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students**

Since 1999, New Mexico has had content standards and assessments aligned to those standards in place. The standards were the first step in the development of an aligned system of standards and overtime, assessments. The current content standards laid a critical foundation, they did not include the depth and breadth necessary to ensure New Mexico students were prepared to compete with their peers in both college and career.

In October 2010, New Mexico adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The CCSS were adopted in order to increase the rigor of New Mexico standards and better prepare New Mexico students for college and careers after high school. These standards are aligned with college and work expectations and provide a consistent understanding of what students are expected to know and be able to do, regardless of what state they live in. The development of the CCSS was a state-led process involving state leaders, teachers, and content experts and draws upon the best state standards and most effective models from around the world. The CCSS ready students to compete in the global economy.

PED is planning for full implementation of the CCSS in 2014- 2015. Full implementation means that students will be assessed on the CCSS. As a first step, experts at the Southwest Comprehensive Center are performing a detailed alignment study between the current New Mexico state standards and the CCSS. Based on the results, NMPED will determine planning steps for full implementation.

Beginning during spring 2012, PED will use conferences, a Common Core website, and other communication tools to increase awareness on the transition to the CCSS. Professional

development on the CCSS for Math and English Language Arts (ELA) teachers for grades K-3 will begin during the summer of 2012, and grades K-3 will teach to the CCSS beginning in fall 2012. Math and ELA teachers in grades 4-8 will receive professional development on the CCSS during summer 2013, and begin teaching to the CCSS in fall 2013. During summer 2013, grades 9-12 will receive professional development on the CCSS, and begin teaching to the CCSS during fall 2013. The CCSS will be fully implemented and assessed in all grades through assessments provided by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) consortium during the 2014-2015 school year.

**Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support**

Signed and passed during the 2011 legislative session, the A-F School Grading Act ushered in a new school accountability era (See Attachment 13). Under the A-F School Grading Act, each public school in New Mexico will be given a grade of A, B, C, D, or F annually. The goals of A-F are simple:

- Measure schools based on both proficiency and growth;
- Meaningfully differentiate levels of success;
- Avoid holding schools accountable for characteristics beyond their control; and
- Provide meaningful data to champion success and identify areas of improvement.

While AYP provides specific goals, it fails to capture both proficiency and growth, it does not adequately differentiate among schools, and it has often narrowed the focus to students nearing proficiency.

Moving to a singular accountability system is of the utmost importance. As New Mexico has already passed legislation to establish a new, differentiated accountability system, and the regulations will be completed within the next 30 days, New Mexico intends to provide school grades to all schools in New Mexico in June 2012. If this flexibility request is approved, the school grades will meet the requirements of the state system, as well as the federal system, therefore eliminating the need to release AYP designations as well as school grades for the 2011-2012 school year.

The A-F School Grading Act specified that both measures of proficiency and growth are to be included when calculating a school's grade. Proficiency in both reading and math is

included in New Mexico's school grading model. Further, New Mexico remains committed to continuing disaggregating data by student subgroups and supporting low-performing schools in the implementation of interventions aligned to the specific needs of students.

Growth was specifically defined as learning a year's worth of knowledge in one year's time as demonstrated by student performance on the New Mexico Standard's Based Assessment in reading and mathematics. As such, the school grading model includes growth measures for students moving from one performance level to a higher performance level, students who remain proficient or advanced, as well as growth for students who remain in beginning step or nearing proficient but move a certain number of scale score points. Additionally, the legislation specifies that the state must also look explicitly at the bottom 25% of students within a school.

New Mexico will also be measuring cohort growth in addition to individual school growth. We feel it is important to capture a complete picture of a school, and measuring cohort growth will further differentiate among schools.

The legislation specified that graduation rates and measures of college and career readiness be included for high schools. As such, the models for elementary and middle schools and high schools vary. The model for elementary and middle schools includes:

- Proficiency;
- Growth;
- Growth of the lowest quartile;
- Attendance; and
- Opportunity to Learn Survey.

The model for high schools includes:

- Proficiency;
- Growth;
- Growth for the lowest quartile;
- Graduation rate and growth on graduation rate;
- College and career readiness indicators (PSAT, ACT, AP, Dual enrollment, career-technical certification programs, etc);
- Attendance; and



- Opportunity to learn student survey.

Each schools grade is based on measures of proficiency, growth, and additional indicators. While each school will be provided with an overall grade, New Mexico will also provide a separate grade for proficiency and a grade for growth. For example, a school could receive a B in growth, but a D in proficiency, therefore the school’s overall grade would be a “C”. This is critical as it will better allow the state to differentiate among schools and target interventions in a manner that specifically aligns to a schools area of need.

### **Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership**

Research has clearly demonstrated the importance of the teacher in the classroom and the importance of leadership in each school. (Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005) In fact, our teachers are our biggest “change agents” when it comes to improved student achievement. When it comes to student learning, the difference between an average teacher and an exemplary teacher is noteworthy. To underscore this belief, in April 2011, Governor Martinez established an Effective Teaching Task Force via Executive Order (<http://www.governor.state.nm.us/uploads/FileLinks/1e77a5621a1544e28318ba93fcd47d49/E O-2011-024.pdf>). The charge of the Task Force was to make policy recommendation to the Governor in for key areas:

- Identify measures of student achievement – representing at least 50 percent of the teacher evaluation – which shall be used for evaluating educator performance;
- Identify demonstrated best practices of effective teachers and teaching, which should comprise the remaining basis for such evaluation;
- How these measures of effective practice should be weighted; and
- How the State can transition to a performance-based compensation system, whereby acknowledging student growth and progress.

See Attachment 14 for the final Task force report and recommendations.

Using this as the foundation, the Task Force found that any redesigned teacher and school leader evaluation system *must* include multiple measures that prioritize student learning, as well as observations and other possible measures that effectively capture a true picture of teacher effectiveness. A rigorous and comprehensive system will not only provide a holistic view of a teacher’s true impact on their students, but also encourage flexibility and buy-in at

the local and school level.

Further, any new evaluation framework to measure teachers and school leaders must better enable districts to address and improve school personnel policies concerning professional development, promotion, compensation, performance pay, and tenure. Further, the framework should identify teachers and school leaders who are most effective at helping students succeed, provide targeted assistance and professional development opportunities for teachers and school leaders, inform the match between teacher assignments and student and school needs and inform incentives for effective teachers and school leaders

The need for a more nuanced and robust system is clear. In a recent 2010 sample of twenty-five percent of New Mexico's teachers, 99.998 percent of these teachers received a rating of "meets competency" on their evaluations (versus "does not meet competency") (Public Education Department data, 2010). Yet we are not seeing proportional success in terms of New Mexico student achievement. This suggests a lack of alignment between the system that measures teacher performance and the system that measures student learning outcomes.

## PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

### 1A ADOPT COLLEGE-AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

#### Option A

The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that are common to a significant number of States, consistent with part (1) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.

- i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)

#### Option B

The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that have been approved and certified by a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), consistent with part (2) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.

- i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State's standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)
- ii. Attach a copy of the memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of IHEs certifying that students who meet these standards will not need remedial coursework at the postsecondary level. (Attachment 5)

### 1.B TRANSITION TO COLLEGE-AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Provide the SEA's plan to transition to and implement no later than the 2013–2014 school year college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and schools and include an explanation of how this transition plan is likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. The Department encourages an SEA to include in its plan activities related to each of the italicized questions in the corresponding section of the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance*, or to explain why one or more of those activities is not necessary to its plan.

#### Adoption of College and Career Ready Standards

Since 1999, New Mexico has had content standards in place. PEDs Assessment and

Accountability Bureau (A&A) coordinates the development and implementation of New Mexico's statewide assessment program, which is designed to measure student attainment of New Mexico's Core Curriculum Content Standards. The A&A works collaboratively with school districts, charter schools, Bureau of Indian Education, and State-educational institutions to collect and report information about student assessments in order to inform instruction, increase student learning, and help parents and the public assess the effectiveness of their schools.

The mission of the Assessment and Accountability Bureau is to develop valid and reliable assessment instruments, to administer these assessments under standardized and secure conditions, and to score and report the results of these assessments accurately, efficiently, and effectively given the constraints of available resources. The work of A&A satisfies both New Mexico and Federal regulations, including the requirements of New Mexico's school assessment and accountability laws and the requirements of the Federal No Child Left Behind/Elementary and Secondary Education Act (NCLB/ESEA). See Attachment X for additional details.

A&A administers the following assessments:

- **Standards Based Assessment (SBA):** The SBA test approximately 165,000 students in reading, writing, and mathematics (grades 3 – 8 and 11), science (grades 4, 7, and 11) and in reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies (grade 11).
- **New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA):** The NMAPA is the alternate to the SBA. Students in grade-bands 3 – 4, 5 – 6, 7 – 8, and 11 – 12, may take the NMAPA, though not all are required to. The NMAPA is only for students with documented significant cognitive disabilities and adaptive behavior deficits who require extensive support across multiple settings (such as home, school, and community).
- **Assessing Comprehension and Communication on English State-to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs):** ACCESS for ELLs is a secure large-scale English language proficiency assessment given to Kindergarten – 12<sup>th</sup> graders who have been identified as ELLs. It is given annually to monitor

students' progress in acquiring English.

Building on this foundation, New Mexico adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in October 2010. The CCSS were adopted in order to increase the rigor of New Mexico standards and better prepare New Mexico students for college and careers after high school. PED is currently developing an implementation plan for transitioning the state to the CCSS, due to be completed by January 31, 2012. Beginning during spring 2012, PED will use conferences, a Common Core website, and other communication tools to increase awareness on the transition to the CCSS. Professional development on the CCSS for Math and English Language Arts (ELA) teachers for grades K-3 will begin during the summer of 2012, and grades K-3 will teach to the CCSS beginning in fall 2012. Math and ELA teachers in grades 4-8 will receive professional development on the CCSS during summer 2013, and begin teaching to the CCSS in fall 2013. During summer 2013, grades 9-12 will receive professional development on the CCSS, and begin teaching to the CCSS during fall 2013. The CCSS will be fully implemented and assessed in all grades through assessments provided by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) consortium during the 2014-2015 school year.

#### **Transition of the Common Core State Standards in New Mexico**

After adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010, PED received a CCSS Planning Grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation in order to create an implementation plan for transitioning to the CCSS. The implementation plan, due for completion in January 2011, will encompass a detailed timeline and budget for the transition, as well plans for communication, professional development, curriculum and instruction, and a plan to evaluate the success of implementation.

PED has made substantial progress in developing our transition plan to the CCSS. We have established a Planning Committee composed of educators, administrators, parents, and members of the business community from around the state. This committee has met four times, and has received input from districts on curriculum mapping, professional development, and communication plans in order to create a set of recommendations for the implementation plan.

We have also established a smaller Framework Development Team in order to help draft

the implementation plan framework and ultimately the implementation plan. This team is composed of Planning Committee members and local and national experts on implementing the CCSS, including West Ed. and the Advanced Programs Initiative in New Mexico. Additionally, the Framework Development Team includes educators with experience in bilingual education and Indian education, in order to ensure that our implementation plan is relevant and appropriate for all New Mexican students. This team will be meeting frequently during November 2011 and January 2012 in order to complete the implementation plan.

This work will be informed by an alignment study between the CCSS and the current New Mexico standards that West Ed. has performed for NMPED. This study was completed in October and will be used to determine how we proceed with curriculum mapping and determining what professional development and technical support is required for educators to teach the new CCSS.

In addition to this work, we have developed and administrated a Transition to Common Core State Standards Planning Survey to all our districts and state administrated charter schools. The results from this survey will provide critical information on the needs of districts in order to prepare their teachers for the transition, and their technical needs in order to administer new, computer-based assessments provided by PARCC (Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers). This information will contribute to the relevancy and accuracy of the professional development, assessment, and communications sections of our implementation plan. Lastly, we have established a CCSS webpage, and begun work developing pertinent resources and updates on the transition to be made available for stakeholders.

Upon the completion of our transition plan in January 2012, PED will use the plan to solicit funding from multiple sources to support our implementation process. Implementation will begin in spring and summer 2012 with increased communication on the transition and professional development on the CCSS for grades K-3. Grades K-3 will begin teaching to the CCSS in fall 2012, followed by grades 4-8 in fall 2013. Grades 9-12 will begin teaching to the CCSS in fall 2013, and grades 3-11 will be fully assessed on the CCSS during spring 2015.

### 1.C DEVELOP AND ADMINISTER ANNUAL, STATEWIDE, ALIGNED, HIGH-QUALITY ASSESSMENTS THAT MEASURE STUDENT GROWTH

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

<p><b>Option A</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The SEA is participating in one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition.</p> <p>i. Attach the State’s Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) under that competition. (Attachment 6)</p>	<p><b>Option B</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The SEA is not participating in either one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition, and has not yet developed or administered statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.</p> <p>i. Provide the SEA’s plan to develop and administer annually, beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year, statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs, as well as set academic achievement standards for those assessments.</p>	<p><b>Option C</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The SEA has developed and begun annually administering statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.</p> <p>i. Attach evidence that the SEA has submitted these assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review or attach a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review. (Attachment 7)</p>
--	---	--

n/a

## PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

### 2.A DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATE-BASED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

- 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 2012–2013 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.

#### **Introduction to New Mexico’s Model**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) has had several tangible effects on education and the monitoring of schools. There have been both intended and unintended consequences. While ESEA monitoring requirements under NCLB has set clear and concrete goals and firmly established that all students need to be considered, there is now opportunity to build upon these strengths and develop a school accountability system that further enhances policy makers ability to fairly and accurately monitor schools. The literature (Linn, 1998; Baker, Linn, Herman, and Koretz, 2002; Choi, Goldschmidt, and Yamashiro, 2005; Baker, Goldschmidt, Martinez, and Swigert, 2003) is clear that in order to effectively monitor schools for interventions and reward, several pieces must be in place in order to create a coherent, comprehensive, unbiased, and fair system. Differentiating among schools for the purposes of providing support where needed and recognition where warranted should, to the extent possible, avoid confounding factors beyond school control with factors for which schools ought to be held accountable (Goldschmidt, 2006).

We address the four elements (coherence, comprehensive, unbiased, and fair) that are the basis for the New Mexico school accountability system that enhances our ability to differentiate school performance in a more nuanced way than under the current ESEA system. A coherent system is one that seamlessly links together the elements of the system and incorporates stakeholders’ beliefs regarding what schools ought to be held accountable for. Hence, a coherent system collects elements that individually and jointly lead to the correct inferences about schools



and the correct motivations for improvement. This is realized by considering validity evidence that supports inference based on school grades; a notion similar to content and construct validity evidence (Messick, 1995; Mehren, 1997). That is, each element of the system should logically relate to better school performance (content validity evidence) and overall, the accumulation of elements should adequately represent the domain of interest (i.e. school performance). Hence, we directly link the New Mexico A-F School Grading System to the AMOs (which we term School Growth Targets, or SGTs). We detail below (in 2.B.) how basing SGTs on school grades captures exactly the types of school performance and growth that policy makers intended, but does so without creating a secondary set of (potentially) conflicted indicators of school performance. The A-F Grading System is also consistent in methodology to the portion of the highly effective teacher evaluation system that will be based on student assessment results. This is an extremely important concept as: one, it holds schools accountable in a manner similar to teachers (based to some degree on student achievement growth); two, it allows for similar types of inferences about schools and teachers; three, it provides for similar nomenclature, which helps teachers, school administrators, parents, and other stakeholders place meaning on school and teacher performance; and four, it creates consistent and coherent incentives for improvement (i.e. teachers' improvement leads directly to school improvement, and conversely, where school grades play a role in teacher evaluation, school grades are based on factors to which all teachers contribute).

### **Components of New Mexico's Model**

The notion of comprehensive system is linked with coherence in that a coherent set of elements that forms the basis for making inferences about school performance should be comprehensive and is consistent with the idea of basing school inferences on multiple measures (Baker, et. al. 2002). Tables one and two summarize<sup>1</sup> the elements in the New Mexico school grading system.

---

<sup>1</sup> Attachment X3 details how a school receives points in each category.

Table 1:

A-F School Grades, Elementary and Middle Schools			Points	
<u>Proficiency Math &amp; Reading</u>	Status	% Proficient	25	40
All Students	Status	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	15	
All Students	School Growth	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	10	
Highest 3 Quartiles	Student Growth	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	20	
Lowest 1 Quartile	Student Growth	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	20	30
<u>Attendance</u>	Status	Average , All Students	3	3
<u>Opportunity to Learn</u>	Status	Average Score	5	5
Total			100	
<u>Student/Parent Engagement</u>	Bonus	District Option	( +5)	

Table 2:

A-F School Grades: High Schools			Points	
<u>Proficiency Math &amp; Reading</u>	Status	% Proficient	25	40
All Students	Status	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	15	
Highest 3 Quartiles	School Growth	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	10	20
Lowest 1 Quartile	School Growth	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	10	
<u>Graduation</u>	Status, 4 Year	% Graduating	8	17
	Status, 5 Year	% Graduating	4	
	School Growth	Conditioned, 3 Yrs	5	
<u>College &amp; Career Readiness</u> (AP, ACT, PSAT, Dual Credit, Career Preparation)	Participation	% All HS Students	5	15
	Success	% Meeting Benchmarks	10	
<u>Attendance</u>	Status	Average , All Students	3	3
<u>Opportunity to Learn</u>	Status	Average Score	5	5
Total			100	
<u>Student/Parent Engagement</u>	Bonus	<u>District Option</u>	( +5)	

We also consider bias and fairness. There is considerable agreement that monitoring schools based on unconditional mean school performance or the percentage of student's proficient does not hold schools accountable for processes under school control and tends to place large diverse schools at a disadvantage (Novak and Fuller, 2003). Static average student performance measures tend to confound input characteristics (i.e. student enrollment characteristics) of schools with actual school performance (Goldschmidt, Roschewski, Choi, Autry, Hebbler, Blank, & Williams, 2005; Choi, Goldschmidt, and Yamashiro, 2005; Meyer, 1997; Goldstein & Spiegelhalter, 1996) and are unduly influenced by factors outside of school control more than

