

CDF Supports the Administration's ESEA Blueprint for Reform But Believes More is Needed for the Most Vulnerable Children*

Guiding Principle	Administration Proposals	Why Changes are Needed
Promote reform through incentives, rewards and support	Provide incentives and support for improvement and rewards for success for teachers, schools, districts and states (e.g., merit pay for teachers, competitive grants).	The sanctions in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) have not resulted in improved student learning; rather they have created perverse incentives for states to lower standards and teachers to teach to the test.
Measure outputs	Assess teacher quality based upon a teacher's effectiveness in improving student learning (outputs).	Teacher qualifications such as degrees and years of experience (inputs) have often not correlated with desired outputs (improved student learning).
Measure growth and improvement	Replace "annual yearly progress" with broader, more accurate and complete measures of school performance such as student achievement, student growth and school progress.	"Annual yearly progress," the measure of success set by NCLB, represents a single, static snapshot of student proficiency; it does not measure growth and improvement.
Ensure comparability in resources	Require districts to ensure state and local funding levels at high-poverty schools are comparable to those at low-poverty schools.	The current "comparability loophole" allows poor children to subsidize the education of wealthier children in the same district.
Jump-start reform through competition	Use competitive grant awards to create incentives for comprehensive reforms, foster innovation in improving student outcomes, promote high standards of quality, establish model systems of learning, improve teacher effectiveness, and support improvements in high-needs schools.	NCLB relies primarily on formula funded programs to provide education support for high needs children. These offer states, districts and schools few incentives to drive reform.
Set clear goals but give states and districts responsibility, control and flexibility over how to reach goals	Give the majority of schools and districts the flexibility to design their own data-based improvement plans to increase achievement and close gaps.	NCLB imposes top-down, inflexible rules and sanctions on states and districts.
Consolidate and eliminate programs for efficiency and greater flexibility for states and districts	Eliminate redundant or ineffective programs by consolidating 38 programs into 11.	Current narrow funding streams impede wide-scale reform. Consolidation allows greater flexibility, promotes local and state involvement and promotes efficiency.
Prioritize improving the education of high-needs children and improving high-needs schools	Target high-needs schools and children through competitive grant programs as well as formula-funded programs. Competitive grant programs such as Race to the Top, Investing in Innovation, and Promise Neighborhoods require that applicants make closing achievement gaps and turning around persistently performing schools an "absolute priority."	NCLB's top-down one-size-fits-all rules and interventions, its focus on teacher credentials instead of teacher effectiveness, its failure to measure and acknowledge growth and improvement, its overuse of sanctions for failure and underuse of rewards for success and incentives to spur improvement all undercut the law's ability to improve education for high-needs children.

*For CDF's priorities, see "Priorities for ESEA Reauthorization" fact sheet, March 2011.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, ESEA Blueprint for Reform, Washington, D.C., 2010 (see <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/publicationtoc.html>) and Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2012, Department of Education.

State Title I Funding Per Eligible Student

	State	Percent of Students Eligible for Title I	Title I Grant Per Eligible Student
1.	Wyoming	11.6 %	\$ 3,149
2.	Vermont	12.2	2,885
3.	North Dakota	12.0	2,822
4.	Delaware	12.5	2,336
5.	New Hampshire	9.8	2,252
6.	Alaska	13.5	2,108
7.	District of Columbia	29.1	2,082
8.	New York	20.8	2,034
9.	South Dakota	15.2	2,004
10.	Maryland	11.0	1,866
11.	Illinois	17.5	1,850
12.	Massachusetts	15.7	1,847
13.	Connecticut	14.6	1,833
14.	Wisconsin	13.9	1,825
15.	Rhode Island	17.9	1,807
16.	Pennsylvania	17.3	1,796
17.	New Jersey	14.9	1,769
18.	Maine	14.8	1,763
19.	Hawaii	11.8	1,731
20.	Michigan	18.2	1,727
21.	Montana	17.4	1,663
22.	Nebraska	13.5	1,652
23.	Ohio	17.3	1,640
24.	Virginia	12.9	1,591
25.	Georgia	18.5	1,586
26.	Kansas	14.9	1,574
27.	Minnesota	11.6	1,532
28.	Colorado	13.8	1,531
29.	Indiana	15.9	1,515
30.	Kentucky	20.9	1,508
31.	Arkansas	22.3	1,477
32.	Nevada	14.3	1,472
33.	West Virginia	23.0	1,423
34.	New Mexico	23.3	1,387
35.	Tennessee	19.7	1,380
36.	Louisiana	26.3	1,373
37.	Florida	17.0	1,364
38.	Arizona	19.6	1,363
39.	South Carolina	20.7	1,356
40.	Texas	22.8	1,352
41.	Alabama	21.9	1,344
42.	Oregon	16.8	1,342
43.	Missouri	18.8	1,337
44.	Mississippi	27.2	1,318
45.	California	18.5	1,310
46.	Utah	10.1	1,298
47.	Washington	14.2	1,298
48.	Oklahoma	19.8	1,274
49.	Iowa	12.5	1,267
50.	North Carolina	19.4	1,261
51.	Idaho	14.6	1,225

Source: Rural School and Community Trust, January 2010 analysis of data provided by the Congressional Research Service.