# State Planning Tool for Standards-Based Accountability Under the Every Student Succeeds Act

The Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) presents states with the opportunity to broaden their visions for college and career readiness (CCR). Under ESSA, statewide accountability systems must include multiple measures that can serve as benchmarks for the varied pathways that students take to CCR. States are required to use multiple measures to differentiate among all public schools annually and to periodically identify low-performing schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. ESSA expands the federally required school accountability indicators to include academic achievement status (which embeds statewide assessment participation rate), achievement growth or another academic indicator (for elementary and middle schools), graduation rates (for high schools), progress toward English language proficiency, and an additional indicator of school quality or student success.[[1]](#footnote-2)

This planning resource is designed to support state educational agency (SEA) leaders and staff as they modify state accountability systems to align with CCR goals in the context of ESSA requirements. It does so by:

* Building capacity regarding ESSA’s standards-based accountability requirements by summarizing relevant ESSA statutory requirements[[2]](#footnote-3) in a concise, understandable format; and
* Providing the tools for states to identify and respond to gaps between ESSA requirements and current state policies and implementation efforts.

It is recommended that SEA staff who lead or are deeply engaged in each of the policy areas addressed by this tool use it collaboratively and also consider consulting with other stakeholders who bring critical information and diverse perspectives to the process of developing the consolidated state plan.[[3]](#footnote-4)

## Using the ESSA Accountability Planning Tool

This tool is organized into two parts:

**Part A (Accountability Gap Analysis Template)** provides a deliberate space for states to identify and plan next steps to respond to policy and implementation gaps in the following ESSA accountability-related policy areas:

[I. Academic Standards](#_I._ACADEMIC_STANDARDS)

[II. Statewide Assessments](#_II._STATEWIDE_ASSESSMENTS)[[4]](#footnote-5)

[III. Accountability Indicators and Determinations](#_III._ACCOUNTABILITY_INDICATORS)

[IV. School Improvement](#_IV._SCHOOL_IMPROVEMENT)

[V. Public Reporting](#_V._REPORTING)

A concise itemization of requirements from the statute is provided, as well as prompts for collecting and analyzing current policy and implementation status information to identify next steps for closing gaps.

**Part B (Accountability Requirements Close-Up)** is an optional section that supports the gap analysis by describing the requirements in depth, explaining policy shifts from the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), and providing links to resources for integrating efforts to promote college and career readiness.

### Step-by-Step Gap Analysis Using Part A

For optimal use of the ESSA Accountability Planning Tool, refer to the **sample completion text on page four** and complete the following steps to identify and address policy and implementation gaps at the state level, using the blank gap analysis template provided in Part A:

1. **ESSA Requirements for States.** Build your understanding of the accountability-related ESSA requirements by reviewing the itemized statutory requirements for states. For additional context, review in-depth descriptions of the requirements and policy shifts from NCLB in corresponding sections of Part B.
2. **Current State Policy*.*** Describe current state policy related to the ESSA requirements described in Step 1. This description may include new policy intended to comply with ESSA or older noncompliant policy that results in a policy gap with ESSA. Consult with policy area leaders and technical experts for accuracy. Review, collect, and summarize policy information from:

* State legislation or code;
* State accountability and assessment guidelines or manuals;
* Annual state, district, and school report cards;
* Previous Title I plans for NCLB and [ESEA flexibility](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html) (if applicable); and the
* [Federal accountability workbook](http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html)

1. **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data.**Describe the implementation status of state policy supporting ESSA and/or any relevant supporting data.Your state may have already developed policy aligned with ESSA, but full implementation with fidelity may not be complete, resulting in an implementation gap. Consult with state and district leaders where applicable to describe implementation status in districts and schools, including whether infrastructure or key resources are in place. Incorporate evaluation data or research-based background data that are meaningful. Consider:

* For state policy that does not meet ESSA requirements, what efforts are ongoing or have been planned to develop aligned policy? Have relevant stakeholders been identified and contacted? Have necessary meetings been planned?
* For state policy thatalready meets ESSA requirements:
  + What is the implementation timeline?
  + Has the state embedded the policy content in resources to support districts and otherwise communicated the policy to districts?
  + Has state infrastructure (e.g., systems and processes) been updated to incorporate new policy?
  + If applicable, to what extent have schools and classrooms adopted and implemented required policies? What evidence or data support this?

1. **Gap Analysis.** Analyze and describe the gaps between ESSA requirements (Step 1) and the state’s current policy (Step 2) and efforts to support ESSA implementation (Step 3), in sufficient detail to support further action planning. Provide an overall rating for quick reference regarding whether ESSA provisions are fully met (“Met”), partially met (“Partial”), or require significant attention (“Gap”). Consider:

* Do the current policies and implementation efforts fulfill the requirements of ESSA?
* Are there ways in which current policy or implementation efforts need to be enhanced to more *meaningfully* align with ESSA? To improve the *coherence* of state policy?
* Are there any areas of uncertainty regarding ESSA requirements that should be clarified to better evaluate the gap?

1. **Next Steps**. Finally, describe concrete next steps that state staff should take to close the identified gaps. Consider:

* What specific policy conversations need to be initiated?
* What supporting, *policy-specific* actions need to be taken, such as meetings to make specific decisions or capacity building related to policy implementation efforts?
* What system-level actions that *cut across policies* need to be taken, such as improving data infrastructure, communicating policy, identifying personnel, formulating overall strategies, making funding decisions, or allocating other resources?
* How should strategies to promote college and career readiness be embedded in next steps? (See Part B for resources that address the intersection of college and career readiness and ESSA policy areas.)

## Sample Text for Completion of the Accountability Gap Analysis Template (Part A)

See "Using the ESSA Accountability Planning Tool” (pp. 2–3) to complete the Accountability Gap Analysis Template (Part A). The following is an example of a completed portion of the template.

Provide an overall rating of whether ESSA requirements are met, partially met, or if a significant gap remains.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I. ACADEMIC STANDARDS | | | | |
|  | I. A. Aligned Content Standards | | | |
| I. A. Adopt **challenging academic content standards** in   * Mathematics; * Reading or English language arts (ELA); and * Science.   Each set of standards must:   * Be aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing college coursework; * Be aligned with relevant state career and technical education (CTE) standards; and * Include at least three levels of academic achievement. | | | | |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
| Our state joined the Progressive English and Math Standards (PEMS) consortium in 2013, which adopted math and ELA standards aligned with college entrance requirements. We joined the Millennial Science Standards (MSS) consortium in 2014, which uses college-entrance-aligned standards.  Each consortium has stated its intent to align with CTE standards by the end of school year 2017. | | Summarize current state policy that relates to ESSA requirements. | 🞏 Met 🗹 Partial 🞏 Not Met  Policies are in place to comply with ESSA requirements by 2017; however, a number of districts have not fully implemented standards, and some alignment work remains.  Provide an actionable summary of policy and implementation gap(s) by comparing how steps 2 and 3 meet the requirements of step 1. | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
| The PEMS and MSS consortiums have held the first meetings in the process of aligning respective standards with national CTE standards by 2017.  Evaluation results indicate that 90% of districts “agree” or “strongly agree” that math and ELA teachers have successfully implemented standards in their classrooms (State PEMS Evaluation, 2016). | | Describe efforts to implement policies that fulfill ESSA requirements, including supporting data (evaluation results, research, etc.). Reference data sources when appropriate. |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
| State content experts will convene in February 2017 to continue work on analyzing standards’ alignment.  State leaders will meet with LEAs to determine local needs to increase classroom-level implementation.  Identify concrete next steps for addressing the gaps by either driving additional policymaking or promoting implementation with fidelity. | | | | |

## **State Planning Tool for Standards-Based Accountability Under ESSA**

## PART A: Accountability Gap Analysis Template

**Instructions:** Use Part A of the ESSA Accountability Planning Tool (1) as a quick reference guide to ESSA accountability provisions and to indicate (2) current state policy, (3) implementation status and supporting data, (4) the gap between ESSA policy and state policy and implementation, and (5) concrete next steps to close the gap. See Part B for detailed descriptions of requirements, key policy shifts from NLCB, and links to helpful resources for moving state college- and career-ready support efforts forward.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| I. ACADEMIC STANDARDS | | | | | |
|  | I. A. Aligned Content Standards | | | | |
| Adopt **challenging academic content standards** in   * Mathematics; * Reading or English language arts (ELA); and * Science.   Each set of standards must:   * Be aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing college coursework; * Be aligned with relevant state career and technical education (CTE) standards; and * Include at least three levels of academic achievement. | | | | | |
|  | | **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I. B. English Language Proficiency Standards | | | | |
| Adopt **English language proficiency** (**ELP) standards** that:   * Are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing; * Address the different proficiency levels of English learners (ELs); and * Align with the challenging state academic standards. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I. C. Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | | | |
| May adopt **alternate academic achievement standards** for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that:  All provisions are required unless “may” is used to indicate optional provisions.   * Are aligned with the challenging state academic standards; * Promote access to the general education curriculum; * Are the highest possible standards achievable by such students; * Are noted in individualized education programs (IEPs) of such students; and * Ensure that students are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment. | | | | |
|  | **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| II. STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS | | | | | |
|  | II. A. High-Quality Statewide Assessments | | | | |
| Implement **high-quality statewide assessments,** consistent with the technical/administrative requirements described in Part B of this tool:   * For mathematics and reading or ELA (reading/ELA), administered in Grades 3–8 and at least once in Grades 9–12; and * For science, administered at least once in each of the grade spans 3–5, 6–9, and 10–12. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | II. B. Native Language Assessments | | | | |
| Identify **non-English languages** present to a significantextent and make every effort to develop required statewide tests using them. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | II. C. English Language Proficiency Assessments | | | | |
| Administer **ELP assessments** aligned to ELP standards to all ELs annually. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | II. D. Assessments Based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | | | | |
| May administer **alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards** that:   * Are aligned with alternate achievement standards and consistent with the technical and administrative requirements described in Part B of this tool, and * Are administered to no more than 1% of the overall participating population for a particular subject (or request that this cap be waived). | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | II. E.Eighth-Grade Mathematics Exception | | | | |
| May**exempt any eighth-grader from grade-level math test** if:   * Student takes the high school math test in eighth grade and the score is used for accountability purposes in the same year, and * In high school, the student takes a higher level statewide math test used for accountability that year. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | II. F.Inclusion of Recently Arrived English Learners | | | | |
| May*,* for a **recently arrived EL**, either:   * Exclude the student from participation in the first-year reading/ELA assessment, and count proficiency results toward accountability in the second year and growth results in the third year, or * Assess and report results in the first year and count growth results toward accountability in the second year and proficiency results in the third year. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | II. G. Inclusion of Exited English Learners | | | | |
| May include math and reading/ELA results of **previous ELs,** in EL subgroup accountability results, for up to 4 years after exiting EL status. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| III. ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS AND DETERMINATIONS | | | | | |
|  | III. A. Subgroup Definition and *N*-Size | | | | |
| Set statistically sound ***N*-size** for accountability and reporting, for each of the following **disaggregated subgroups**:   * Students from each major racial and ethnic group; * Economically disadvantaged students; * Students with disabilities; and * English learners. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | III. B. Long-Term and Interim Goals | | | | |
| Set ambitious **long-term and interim goals** for all students and all subgroups, for each of the following measures:   * Mathematics proficiency on statewide tests; * Reading/ELA proficiency on statewide tests; * Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; and * Percentage of ELs making progress toward ELP (ELs only). | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | III. C. Accountability Indicators | | | | |
| Include the following **accountability indicators**, for all students and for each subgroup in each school:   * Academic achievement in mathematics and ELA (Grades 3–8 and once in high school), including participation below 95% where applicable; * Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and, optionally, extended-year graduation rate (high schools); * Student growth or another academic indicator (elementary and middle schools); * Progress in attaining English language proficiency (ELs only); and * An additional indicator of school quality or student success. | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. D. Annual Differentiation |
| **Annually differentiate** among all public schools based on all accountability indicators, such that:   * Substantial weighting is assigned to each of the indicators except the indicator of school quality or student success, and * Much greater weight is assigned to the required academic indicators in aggregate than the additional indicator. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. E. Comprehensive Support Schools |
| Identify, at least once every 3 years, schools for **comprehensive support**,in the following categories:   * The lowest performing 5% of Title I schools (based on all accountability indicators); * All public high schools that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students; and * Title I schools that fail to exit “additional targeted” status after a state-determined number of years. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. F. Targeted Support Schools |
| Identify schools for **targeted support** in which a subgroup is consistently underperforming overa number of years based on all required accountability indicators and the system of annual differentiation. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. G. Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support |
| Identify schools for **additional targeted support** in which a subgroup has performed, on its own, at a level below the performance of all students in any of the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools based on all indicators*.* | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. H. Participation Rate |
| Identify actions to take for schools that fail to meet the **95%** **participation rate** for statewide mathematics, reading/ELA, or science assessments. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IV. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT | | | | | | |
|  | IV. A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans | | | | | |
| For each **comprehensive support school**, approve its local educational agency (LEA)-developed **improvement plan,** if the plan:   * Is informed by all accountability indicators, including performance against long-term goals; * Includes one or more interventions based on statistically significant evidence from a well-designed, well-implemented study; * Is based on a school-level needs assessment; * Identifies and addresses resource inequities across schools; and * Is monitored and periodically reviewed by the SEA. | | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | IV. B. Required State Technical Assistance |
| Provide **technical assistance** (TA) to LEAs by:   * Providing TA to each LEA with a significant number of comprehensive support or targeted support schools, and * Periodically reviewing resource allocation to support school improvement in any LEA with a significant number of comprehensive support and targeted support schools. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | IV. C. Optional State Technical Assistance |
| May provide **additional TA** by:   * Initiating additional improvement in any LEA with— * A significant number of schools that are consistently identified for comprehensive support and not meeting exit criteria, or * A significant number of schools identified for targeted support; and * Establishing alternative, evidence-based strategies for comprehensive support and targeted support status schools. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | |
|  |  | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | IV. D. Exit Criteria for Low-Performing Schools |
| Establish **exit criteria** for:   * Comprehensive support schools, not to exceed 4 years, otherwise resulting in more rigorous state-determined action, and * Additional targeted support schools, not to exceed a state-determined number of years, otherwise resulting in identification for comprehensive support. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| V. PUBLIC REPORTING | | | | | | |
|  | V. A. Annual State Report Card | | | | | |
| Disseminate annually and widely **to the public**:   * The state report card; * All LEA annual report cards (including school report cards); and * Annual report to the Secretary.   The annual state report card must contain all elements detailed in Part B. | | | | | | |
|  | | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | | |
|  | | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | | |
|  |  | | | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | | | |
|  | | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | V. B. Annual Federal Reporting |
| Report annually **to the Secretary**:   * Information on the achievement of all students and subgroups on state tests; * Information on ELP attainment; * Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support; and * Teacher qualifications, including number and percentage of inexperienced, out-of-subject, or out-of-field teachers, and teachers with emergency credentials. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | * **Current State Policy** |  |  | **Gap Analysis** | |
|  | |  | Met  Partial  Not Met | | |
|  |  | | |
|  | |  |
|  | **ESSA Implementation Status and/or Supporting Data** |  |
|  | |  |
|  | | | | |
|  | **Next Steps** | | | |
|  | | | | |

## **State Planning Tool for Standards-Based Accountability Under ESSA**

## PART B: Accountability Requirements Close-Up

Use Part B of the ESSA Accountability Planning Tool to develop a deeper knowledge of the accountability-related statutory provisions summarized in Part A, understand the shifts from NCLB, and access additional resources to support state efforts to close policy and implementation gaps and integrate college and career readiness efforts.

All numbering corresponds to the same requirements in

Part A.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I. ACADEMIC STANDARDS | | |
|  | I. A. Aligned Content Standards | |
| Each state must ensure that it has adopted challenging academic content standards (in at least mathematics, reading/ELA, and science) that apply to all public schools and students, that include at least three levels of achievement, and that are aligned with:   * Entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the state system of public education, and * Relevant state CTE standards.   Sec. 1111(b)(1)(A)-(D) | | |
|  | | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, challenging academic standards were required; however, under ESSA, they must be aligned with college entrance requirements for remediation-free, credit-bearing coursework and any relevant CTE standards. | | |
|  | | |
|  | | **Additional Resources[[5]](#footnote-6)** |
| * [Bridging the Divide Between College and Career Readiness](http://www.achieve.org/files/CCSS-CTE-BridgingtheDivide.pdf) (Achieve, 2012) * [Integrating Employability Skills: A Framework for All Educators (College and Career Readiness and Success [CCRS] Center/Center for Great Teachers and Leaders, 2016)](http://www.ccrscenter.org/implementation-tools/integrating-employability-skills) * [College and Career Readiness Standards and Research-Identified Transition Skills (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2016)](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/College_and_Career_Readiness_Standards_and_Research-Identified_Transition_Skills.html) * [Achieving the Promise of the Common Core Standards (Achieve, 2010)](http://www.achieve.org/files/FINAL-CCSSImplementationGuide.pdf) * [Adoption and Implementation of Next Generation Science Standards](http://www.achieve.org/files/NGSS_Workbook_PDF-3.1.13.pdf) (Achieve, 2013) | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | I. B. English Language Proficiency Standards |
| Each state must demonstrate that it has adopted ELP standards that:  Are derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;  Address the different proficiency levels of ELs (e.g., set clear performance standards and levels); and  Are aligned with the challenging state academic standards.  States are not required to submit standards to the Secretary.  Sec. 1111(b)(1)(F) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| No significant shifts from NCLB. ESSA codifies in Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) statute requirements regarding ELP standards originally established in nonregulatory guidance under NCLB. This guidance has been updated for ESSA: [English Learners and Title III of the ESEA](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiiiguidenglishlearners92016.pdf). | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [The Role of Language and Literacy in College- and Career-Ready Standards: Rethinking Policy and Practice in Support of English Language Learners (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2012)](http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/LangAndLiteracyInStandardsELLs.pdf) * [Framework for English Language Proficiency Development Standards Corresponding to the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards (CCSSO, 2012)](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2012/ELPD%20Framework%20Booklet-Final%20for%20web.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | I. C. Alternate Academic Achievement Standards |
| Each state may adopt alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, provided those standards:   * Are aligned with the challenging state academic standards;   Promote access to the general education curriculum, consistent with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1414(d)(3)) regarding the development of IEPs;  Reflect professional judgment as to the highest possible standards achievable by such students;  Are noted in the IEP of each student; and  Are aligned to ensure that students meeting the standards are on track to pursue postsecondary education or employment, consistent with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-112).  Sec. 1111(b)(1)(E) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB included most of the same basic provisions. ESSA codifies in ESEA statute provisions regarding the alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; these were originally established under [nonregulatory guidance under NCLB](http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html).  ESSA adds the requirement that these standards ensure that students are on track to college or employment and that they are noted in applicable students’ IEPs. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Improving College and Career Readiness for Students with Disabilities (CCRS Center, 2013)](http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/Improving%20College%20and%20Career%20Readiness%20for%20Students%20with%20Disabilities.pdf) * [Guideposts for Success (National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability, 2005)](http://www.ncwd-youth.info/sites/default/files/Guideposts-for-Success-(English).pdf) * [Setting Alternate Achievement Standards (National Center for Improvement of Educational Assessment [NCIEA], 2007)](http://nciea.org/publications/CCSSO_MAP07.pdf) | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| II. STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS | | |
|  | II. A. High-Quality Statewide Assessments | |
| Each state shall demonstrate that it has implemented high-quality statewide assessments, aligned with the challenging state standards:  In mathematics and reading/ELA, to be administered in each of Grades 3–8 and at least once in Grades 9–12; and  In science, to be administered not less than once during each of the grade spans 3–5, 6–9, and  10–12.  The assessments shall:   * Be the same assessments administered to all public schools and students in the state, except with regard to alternate assessments; * Provide coherent and timely information about student attainment of the challenging academic standards and whether the student is performing at grade level;   Be valid and reliable, consistent with nationally recognized professional and technical testing standards;   * Objectively measure academic achievement, knowledge, and skills, and consist of tests that do not evaluate or assess personal or family beliefs or attitudes, or publicly disclose personally identifiable information; * Be of adequate technical quality for each purpose required under this Act, with the evidence of technical quality made public on the website of the SEA; * Include multiple, up-to-date measures of student academic achievement—including measures that assess higher order thinking skills and understanding—which may include measures of student academic growth and may be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended-performance tasks; * Provide for the participation in the assessments of all students, including accommodations for students with disabilities, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, and ELs; * For ELs, provide, to the extent practicable, assessments in the language and form most likely to yield accurate data; * Be administered through a single summative assessment or multiple interim assessments that result in a single summative score; * For recently arrived ELs, allow reading/ELA assessments to be administered in the student’s native language for up to 3 years initially, and for 2 additional years on a case-by-case basis;   Produce individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports that allow parents and educators to address the specific academic needs of the student, in a language that parents can understand;  Enable results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic groups, economically disadvantaged status, English proficiency status, gender and migrant status (wherever *N*-sizes are met), and status as homeless or in foster care;  Enable itemized score analyses (e.g., strand analyses) to determine student needs; and  Be developed, to the extent practicable, using the principles of universal design for learning.  Sec. 1111(b)(2)(B) | | |
|  | | |
|  | | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Basic testing requirements and test administration frequency are retained from NCLB.  ESSA adds the requirements that statewide tests:  Provide information about whether a student is performing at grade level;  Integrate universal design for learning principles, wherever practicable; and  Do not evaluate personal or family beliefs. | | |
|  | | |
|  | | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Assessing 21st Century Skills (National Research Council, 2011)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK84218/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK84218.pdf) * [“Assessing Students’ Readiness for College and Careers” (from Closing the Expectations Gap, Achieve, 2014)](http://www.achieve.org/files/Achieve-ClosingExpectGap2014%20Feb5.pdf) * [Guide to Evaluating Assessments Using the CCSSO Criteria for High-Quality Assessments  (NCIEA, 2016)](http://www.nciea.org/publication_PDFs/Guide%20to%20Evaluating%20CCSSO%20Criteria%20Test%20Content%20020316.pdf) * [Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education (Joint Committee on Testing Practices, 2014)](http://www.apa.org/science/programs/testing/fair-testing.pdf) * [A State Guide to the Development of Universally Designed Assessments (National Center on Educational Outcomes and CCSSO, 2006)](https://nceo.umn.edu/docs/OnlinePubs/StateGuideUD/UDmanual.pdf)   [State Summative Assessments Overview: 2015–16 School Year (Education Commission of the States [ECS], 2015)](http://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/12141.pdf)  [Designing Assessments for College and Career Readiness: Performance Tasks](http://www.ccrscenter.org/products-resources/designing-assessments-college-and-career-readiness-performance-tasks)  (CCRS Center video, 2016) | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | II. B. Native Language Assessments |
| State plans shall identify the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population and for which statewide tests are not available and are needed. States must make every effort to develop such assessments and may request assistance from the Secretary as needed (the Secretary cannot mandate a specific academic assessment).  Sec. 1111(b)(2)(F) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB required states to make every effort to develop statewide tests in the native languages of students. ESSA adds that these tests should be provided where non-English languages are present to a significant extent. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Guidelines for the Assessment of English Language Learners (Educational Testing Service, 2009)](https://www.ets.org/s/about/pdf/ell_guidelines.pdf) * [Standards-Based Assessment in the Native Language: A Practical Guide to the Issues (NLA-LEP Partnership, 2008)](http://www.edweek.org/media/maz-guide%20to%20native%20language%20assessment%20v15-blog.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | II. C. English Language Proficiency Assessments |
| Each state must administer to all ELs annually an ELP assessment that is aligned with the ELP standards.  Sec. 1111(b)(2)(G) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| ESSA codifies in ESEA statute requirements regarding the statewide assessment of EL students that were previously established in nonregulatory guidance on [Regulations Regarding Assessment and Accountability for Recently Arrived and Former Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students](http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/saa.html) under NCLB. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Framework for High-Quality English Language Proficiency Standards and Assessments: Brief (WestEd/National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, 2009)](https://www.wested.org/online_pubs/ASDS-09-02.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | II. D. Assessments Based on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards |
| A state may provide for alternate assessments in mathematics, reading/ELA, and/or science, aligned with the challenging state academic standards and alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.  With regard to these assessments, the state must:  Ensure that for each subject the total number of students assessed using an alternate assessment does not exceed 1% of all participating students in the state for that subject, unless the state has been approved to waive this requirement (individual districts, however, may provide an alternate assessment to more than 1% of students in a given subject);  Ensure that parents of students being administered an alternate assessment are informed that such assessment is occurring and how this impacts completion of regular high school diploma requirements;  Promote the involvement and progress of these students in the general education curriculum;  Describe how the state has incorporated universal design for learning (UDL) principles to the extent feasible in its alternate assessments;  Describe how staff know how to administer the assessments, which includes providing appropriate accommodations when needed;  Promote and disseminate information to increase the number of students with significant cognitive disabilities who participate in grade-level academic standards, instruction, and assessments; and  Not prevent a student who takes the alternate assessment from attempting to complete regular high school diploma requirements.  Sec. 1111(b)(2)(D) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| ESSA codifies in ESEA statute provisions that were originally established under NCLB by nonregulatory guidance on [Alternate Achievement Standards for Students With the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/altguidance.doc).  The ESSA and NCLB provisions are similar. Under NCLB, states were permitted to administer alternate assessments to more than 1% of subject-specific participating students, but use, for accountability purposes, no more than 1% of students’ results. Now, under ESSA, the total number of students *participating* in alternate assessments cannot exceed 1% of total participation for a given subject without a waiver.  ESSA also adds the requirement to integrate UDL principles wherever possible. | |
|  | |
|  | II. E. Eighth-Grade Mathematics Exception |
| A state may exempt any eighth-grader from the typical grade-level statewide mathematics assessment if:   * The student takes the high school-level statewide assessment in eighth grade and the score is used for accountability purposes in that same year, and * In high school, that same student takes a higher level statewide mathematics test used for accountability purposes in that same year.   Sec. 1111(b)(2)(C) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| This is a new provision of ESEA as amended by ESSA. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [State and Federal Policy: Gifted and Talented Youth (ECS, 2016)](http://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/State-and-Federal-Policy-for-Gifted-and-Talented-Youth.pdf) * [High Stakes for High Achievers: State Accountability in the Age of ESSA (Thomas B. Fordham Institute, 2016)](https://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/08.31%20-%20High%20Stakes%20for%20High%20Achievers%20-%20State%20Accountability%20in%20the%20Age%20of%20ESSA%20%28URLs%29.pdf?mc_cid=0e7029ab63&mc_eid=4f6e967790) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | II. F. Inclusion of Recently Arrived English Learners |
| For a student recently arrived to the United States and enrolled in any school(s) in any state for less than 12 months, states may elect either to:   * Exclude the student from one administration of the reading/ELA assessment; then include the student’s results in the second year toward the school’s proficiency results, for accountability purposes; and include the student’s growth results starting in the third year; or * Assess and report, but exclude for accountability purposes, the performance of the student in the first year of enrollment; include the student’s growth in the student’s second year of enrollment, for accountability purposes; and include proficiency starting in the third year of enrollment.   Sec. 1111(b)(3)(A) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB established the first option (to exclude students from the first year of testing) in nonregulatory guidance on [Assessment and Accountability for Recently Arrived and Former Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/federal_programs/esea/assessment_accountability/non-reg_guidance_recently.pdf). ESSA adds the second option, to include students in assessment the first year and use their growth toward accountability in the second year.  ESSA also updates the definition of “English learners recently arrived” to those students who have been *enrolled* for less than 12 months, instead of those who have *attended* school for less than 12 months as under NCLB. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Next Generation State High School Assessment and Accountability: English Language Learners (Achieve/The Education Trust, 2008)](http://www.achieve.org/files/EnglishLanguageLearnersinNextGenerationAssessmentandAccountability.pdf) | |
|  | |
|  | II. G. Inclusion of Exited English Learners |
| States may include the mathematics and reading/ELA results (but not science results) of students previously identified as ELs in the accountability results of the EL subgroup for up to 4 years after their exit from subgroup status.  Sec. 1111(b)(3)(B) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| ESSA increases the allowable number of years for continued inclusion in the EL subgroup accountability results from 2 years under NCLB to 4 years*.* | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Re-examining Reclassification: Guidance From a National Working Session on Policies and Practices for Exiting Students From English Language Learner Status (CCSSO, 2015)](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/EL%20Reclassification%20Working%20Paper_11%2005%2015%20Final.pdf) | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| III. ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS AND DETERMINATIONS | | |
|  | III. A. Subgroup Definition and *N*-Size | |
| For all accountability provisions under Sec. 1111(c) that require disaggregation of information by student subgroup, including accountability calculations and reporting purposes, each state must describe:   * A minimum number of students necessary to carry out such requirement that is statistically sound and is the same number for all students and for each subgroup; * How it collaborated with teachers, principals, and other school leaders, and with parents and other stakeholders in determining this number; and * How it ensures that this minimum number is sufficient to avoid revealing any personally identifiable information.   “Subgroups,” for all purposes described in ESSA unless otherwise noted, is defined to include all of the following categories of students:   * Economically disadvantaged students; * Students with disabilities; * ELs; and * Students from each major racial or ethnic group (the Federal Register provides further guidance that these subgroups might include the following subgroups: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Two or more races [72 Fed. Reg. 59267]).   Sec. 1111(c)(2)-(3) | | |
|  | | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, states were required to determine and justify a statistically sound *N*-size that protected privacy. ESSA adds the requirements thatstakeholders collaborate to make this determination.  Under ESEA flexibility, states were allowed to substitute data for individual disaggregated subgroups, for accountability purposes only, with a “super-group” that combined students from different subgroups. Substituting data in this manner for accountability or reporting purposes is prohibited under ESSA. | | |
|  | | |
|  | | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Ensuring Equity in ESSA: The Role of N-Size in Subgroup Accountability (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2016)](http://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/n-size/) * [Equity and ESSA: Leveraging Educational Opportunity Through the Every Student Succeeds Act (Learning Policy Institute, 2016)](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/equity-essa-report) | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. B. Long-Term and Interim Goals |
| States shall establish ambitious long-term goals that include measures of interim progress for all students and for all subgroups for:  Proficiency on statewide assessments in mathematics and reading/ELA;  Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; and  Percentage of ELs making progress toward ELP.  For proficiency and graduation rate goals, long-term goals must be the same multiyear length for all students. Subgroup targets must be set in a manner that takes into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.  States may establish additional, distinct targets for extended-year graduation rates provided they are based on a more rigorous long-term goal than that set for the 4-year graduation rate.  Sec. 1111(c)(4)(A) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, states were required to set targets for proficiency, graduation rates, participation rates, and at least one other academic indicator. ESSA eliminates participation rates as an explicit target but effectively embeds a 95% target within the proficiency calculation (see section III.C.). ESSA eliminates targets for the other academic indicator and moves the ELP progress target from Title III to Title I.  NCLB required ambitious long-term proficiency targets of 100% by the year 2013–14 and intermediate targets that increased at least once every 3 years. ESSA requires that targets be ambitious but does not prescribe a timeline or a target-setting methodology for long-term or interim goals. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Getting It Right: Crafting Federal Accountability for Higher Student Performance and a Stronger America (The Education Trust, 2011)](http://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Getting_It_Right.pdf) * [Issues in the Development of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for WIDA Consortium States (Cook, Boals, Wilmes, & Santos, 2007)](http://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Courses/Ed205X%20Website/Resources/WIDA%20AMAO%20Guidance%20v3%200a.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. C. Accountability Indicators |
| The statewide accountability system must annually measure, for all students and for each subgroup in all public schools, the following indicators:  Proficiency in mathematics and reading/ELA on statewide tests calculated by including in the denominator the greater of:   * The number of students participating in the assessments, or * Ninety-five percent of all students or students in a subgroup.   Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, with the option also to include an extended-year graduation rate (high schools);  Student growth or another academic indicator (elementary and middle schools);  Percentage of students making progress in attaining proficiency on statewide ELP assessment within a state-determined timeline, in each of Grades 3–8 and once in high school (measure for EL subgroup only);  An additional indicator of school quality or student success that is valid and reliable, is comparable statewide (by grade span), and allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance, which may include:   * Student engagement; * Educator engagement; * Student access to and completion of advanced coursework; * Postsecondary readiness; * School climate and safety; and * Any other indicator that meets technical requirements.   Technical Requirements  Each of the required indicators must be valid, reliable, and comparable statewide *across all LEAs* and calculated the same way in all schools (except that the additional indicator of school quality or success may vary by grade span).  All indicators except ELP progress must be disaggregated by each subgroup.   * The additional indicator of school quality or studentsuccess also must aid in the meaningful differentiation of schools.   Sec. 1111(c)(4)(B) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, states were required to measure, at minimum, proficiency, graduation rates (high schools), participation rates, and at least one other academic indicator (for elementary and middle schools) for Title I accountability. ESSA expands the number of measures per school and provides states the flexibility to use nonacademic measures under the additional indicator of school quality or student success. Participation rate is embedded in the proficiency calculation. For additional guidance regarding graduation rates, see [Every Student Succeeds Act High School Graduation Rate Non-Regulatory Guidance](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essagradrateguidance.pdf). | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| [“Accountability for Students’ College and Career Readiness” (from Closing the Expectations Gap, Achieve, 2014)](http://www.achieve.org/publications/closing-expectations-gap-2014)  [Creating a P–20 Continuum of Actionable Indicators of Student Readiness (Achieve, 2013)](http://www.achieve.org/publications/creating-p-20-continuum-actionable-academic-indicators-student-readiness)  [Predictors of Postsecondary Success (CCRS Center, 2013)](http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/CCRS%20Center_Predictors%20of%20Postsecondary%20Success_final_0.pdf)  [Grading Schools: How States Should Define “Quality” Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (Bellwether Education Partners, 2016)](http://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/Bellwether_GradingSchools_FINAL101916.pdf)  [Making the Grade: A 50-State Analysis of School Accountability Systems (Center for American Progress, 2016)](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2016/05/19/137444/making-the-grade/)  [Pathways to New Accountability Through the Every Student Succeeds Act  (Learning Policy Institute, 2016)](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Pathways_New-Accountability_Through_Every_Student_Succeeds_Act_04202016.pdf)  [Innovation in Accountability (Center for American Progress, 2016)](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2016/12/08/294325/innovation-in-accountability/)  [Conceptualizing and Validating the “Fifth Indicator” in ESSA Accountability Systems (NCIEA, 2016)](http://www.nciea.org/publication_PDFs/Marion%20Lyons_ESSA%20Accountability_5th%20Indicator_111416.pdf)  [Using ESSA’s Additional Indicator to Drive College and Career Readiness](http://www.ccrscenter.org/products-resources/ccrs-center-webinars-events/using-additional-indicator-under-essa-drive-college) (CCRS Center, 2016)  [Leveraging ESSA to Support State Visions for College and Career Readiness](http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/AskCCRS_LeveragingESSA.pdf) (CCRS Center, 2016) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | III. D. Annual Differentiation |
| States must establish a system for annually differentiating all public schools that provides information on the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the required accountability indicators, and that:   * For each indicator except for the additional indicator of school quality or student success (i.e., for each required academic indicator), assigns substantial weight; and * For required academic indicators in aggregate, assigns much greater weight than that assigned to the additional indicator of school quality or student success.   Sec. 1111(c)(4)(C) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB required the annual calculation of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for all public schools based on performance against the annual measurable objectives (AMOs) described in section III.B. This goals-based system—distinct from a weighted, or compensatory, system—identified schools for improvement status that, over a consecutive number of years, had missed any of the required AMOs. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Key Issues for Aggregating Indicators under ESSA (CCSSO, 2016)](http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/KeyIssuesinAggregatingIndicators.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **III. E. Comprehensive Support Schools** |
| States must establish a methodology to identify, at least once every 3 years, the following three categories of schools for comprehensive support and improvement, based on the system of annual differentiation:   * Not less than the lowest performing 5% of Title I schools based on all accountability indicators; * All public high schools that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students; and * Title I schools that fail to exit “additional targeted” status (see section III.G) after a state-determined number of years.   States must notify LEAs of schools identified for comprehensive support.  Sec. 1111(c)(4)(D) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, a school was identified for improvement status based on the number of consecutive years that it had failed to meet any criterion for AYP. Under ESSA, the number of years of underperformance is just one factor for identifying low-performing schools—improvement status categories are also defined by the performance measures and student populations (all students versus subgroups) they include. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **III. F.** **Targeted Support Schools** |
| Each state must notify each LEA of any school in which any subgroup of students is consistently underperforming over a number of years, based on all of the required accountability indicators and the system of annual differentiation, and ensure that each LEA provides notification to the school.  Sec. 1111(c)(4)(D) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, states were required to identify schools with low-performing subgroups based on subgroup performance against AMOs. Under ESSA, states have flexibility in defining low subgroup performance. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **III. G. Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support** |
| If a school (Title I or non-Title I) has a subgroup that on its own would have been among the lowest performing 5% of all Title I schools, then the school must receive additional targeted support by reviewing and addressing resource inequities through its school improvement plan.  Sec. 1111(d)(2) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB did not include an equivalent provision. ESSA introduces the identification of such schools based on subgroup performance across all measures. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **III. H.** **Participation Rate** |
| In addition to the inclusion of participation rate in the proficiency rate calculation, states must provide a clear and understandable explanation of how the state will factor the 95% participation rate requirement into its overall accountability system.  Sec. 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, schools were required to meet participation rate AMOs for all students and subgroups in order to meet AYP. ESSA addresses participation rates by embedding them in the proficiency rate calculation and requiring some other mechanism within the accountability system to address low participation rates.  The U.S. Department of Education also issued a [“Dear Colleague”](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/eseadclpartrate12222015.pdf) letter (dated December 22, 2015) providing examples of actions that SEAs may take to meet this requirement. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| IV. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT | | |
|  | IV. A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans | |
| For each comprehensive support status school, an LEA receiving notification about the school must develop a comprehensive support and improvement plan (CSIP), in partnership with stakeholders, including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents, and to be approved by the school, LEA, and state, that:   * Is informed by all accountability indicators, including performance against long-term goals; * Includes one or more evidence-based interventions meeting Tier 1, 2, or 3 of ESSA’s evidence rigor tiers (see below); * Is based on a school-level needs assessment; * Identifies and addresses resource inequities*;* and * Is monitored and periodically reviewed by the SEA.   At least one intervention in each comprehensive and targeted support status school must demonstrate a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes based on:   * Strong evidence from a well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (Tier 1); * Moderate evidence from a well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study (Tier 2); or * Promising evidence from a well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias (Tier 3).   *Note: States are not required to approve or monitor plans for Targeted Support schools; LEA requirements are included here for reference:*  Each school identified for targeted assistance must develop a school-level targeted support and improvement plan (TSIP), in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers, and parents), to be approved by the LEA, that:   * Is informed by all accountability indicators, including performance against long-term goals; * Includes one or more evidence-based interventions meeting Tier 1, 2, or 3 of ESSA’s evidence rigor tiers; * Is approved by the LEA prior to implementation; * For any school operating a schoolwide program under Sec. 1114, addresses the needs identified in the needs assessment required under Sec. 1114(b)(6); * For any school receiving additional targeted support, identifies and addresses resource inequities; * Is monitored by the LEA; and * Results in additional action by the LEA following unsuccessful implementation after a number of years determined by the LEA.   Sec. 1111(d)(1)(A)-(B) | | |
|  | | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB prescribed a series of escalating actions in schools that miss AYP over consecutive years, which included improvement plans, provision of school choice and supplemental educational services, and educational and operational interventions. Schools must develop improvement plans under ESSA; however, SEAs, LEAs and schools have the flexibility to determine appropriate interventions, consistent with the requirements of evidence-based interventions aligned with Tiers 1, 2 and 3. For additional guidance see [Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/guidanceuseseinvestment.pdf). | | |
|  | | |
|  | | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Leveraging ESSA: Strategies to Support Students’ K–12 Postsecondary Transitions (CCSSO, 2016)](http://higheredforhigherstandards.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/HEHS-Leveraging-ESSA-09282016.pdf) * [Improving College and Career Readiness by Incorporating Social and Emotional Learning  (CCRS Center, 2013)](http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/Improving%20College%20and%20Career%20Readiness%20by%20Incorporating%20Social%20and%20Emotional%20Learning_0.pdf) * [The District Role in Supporting College and Career Readiness for Students (CCRS Center, 2013)](http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/CCRS%20District%20Practices%20Brief.pdf) * [Better Evidence, Better Choices, Better Schools (Center for American Progress, 2016)](https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/30141500/EvidenceESSA-report.pdf) * [Advancing Equity Through ESSA (CCSSO, 2016)](http://www.schoolturnaroundsupport.org/sites/default/files/resources/AdvancingEquityThroughESSA101316.pdf) * [Promoting Equity in State Education Accountability Systems (NCIEA/Center for Educational Testing and Evaluation, 2012)](http://www.nciea.org/publication_PDFs/Promoting%20Equity%20CSDMP110712.pdf) * [Connecting Career and Technical Education With the College and Career Readiness Agenda (Achieve, 2010)](http://www.achieve.org/files/ConnectingCareerandTechnicalEducationwiththeCollegeandCareerReadinessAgenda.pdf) * [What Works Clearinghouse (Institute for Educational Sciences, 2016)](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW) | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | IV. B. Required State Technical Assistance |
| Each state must:   * Provide technical assistance to each LEA serving a significant number of comprehensive support schools or a significant number of targeted support schools, and * Periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA serving a significant number of comprehensive support and targeted support schools*.*   Sec. 1111(d)(3)(A) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, SEAs were required to provide support to LEAs that failed to make AYP for 2 consecutive years, and to schools in improvement status upon the school’s request. In addition, NCLB mandated statewide systems of support that met a number of requirements. ESSA mandates SEA intervention in those LEAs that serve high numbers of comprehensive and targeted support schools. SEAs may otherwise provide TA directly to schools only with LEA approval. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [The State Role in School Turnaround (Center on School Turnaround, 2014)](http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/The_State_Role_in_School_Turnaround.pdf) * [7 Tenets for Sustainable School Turnaround (Center for American Progress, 2016)](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2016/09/13/143922/7-tenets-for-sustainable-school-turnaround/) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | IV. C. Optional State Technical Assistance |
| States may:   * Take action to initiate additional improvements in any LEA with— * A significant number of schools that are consistently identified for comprehensive support and not meeting exit criteria, or * A significant number of schools identified for targeted support. * Establish alternative, evidence-based strategies that can be used by LEAs to assist comprehensive and targeted support schools.   Sec. 1111(d)(3)(B) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, states could similarly initiate appropriate improvement actions in LEAs that failed to improve the status of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. | |
|  | |
|  | **Additional Resources** |
| * [Assessing Strategies for State-Initiated Turnarounds (Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2016)](http://www.crpe.org/sites/default/files/crpe-measures-last-resort.pdf) * [Emerging State Turnaround Strategies (ECS, 2016)](http://www.ecs.org/ec-content/uploads/12139.pdf) * [When and How School Closure and Charter Takeovers Benefit Students (Education Research Alliance, 2016)](http://educationresearchalliancenola.org/files/publications/Education-Research-Alliance-New-Orleans-Policy-Brief-Closure-Takeover.pdf) | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | IV. D. Exit Criteria for Low-Performing Schools |
| Each state must establish exit criteriafor:   * Schools receiving comprehensive support, which, if not satisfied after a state-determined number of years not to exceed 4 years, shall result in more rigorous, state-determined action, and * Schools identified for additional targeted support, which, if not satisfied after a state-determined numbers of years, shall result in identification for comprehensive support.   Sec. 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| Under NCLB, schools exited improvement status by meeting requirements for AYP. Under ESSA, states have flexibility in defining exit criteria for comprehensive status and additional targeted support status schools, and LEAs define exit criteria for targeted support status schools. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| V. PUBLIC REPORTING | | |
|  | V. A. Annual State Report Card | |
| Each state must disseminate (annually and widely to the public, including availability on a single webpage):   * The state report card (developed in consultation with parents and, to the extent practicable, written in a language that parents can understand); * All of the LEA annual report cards; and * The annual report to the Secretary.   The annual state report card must contain the following elements:   * A clear and concise description of the state’s accountability system; and * For all students and subgroups[[6]](#footnote-7): * Performance-level results on statewide assessments and all other federally required indicators of the accountability system; * Progress toward meeting long-term goals; * Percentage of students assessed and not assessed; * Measures of school quality, climate, and safety, including rates of in-school suspensions, out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, school-related arrests, referrals to law enforcement, chronic absenteeism, and incidents of violence, including bullying and harassment; * Number and percentage of students enrolled in preschool programs; * Number and percentage of students enrolled in accelerated coursework, including Advanced Placement (AP)[[7]](#footnote-8) or International Baccalaureate (IB), or dual or concurrent enrollment programs; * Homeless status; * Foster care status; and * Status as a student with a parent in the Armed Forces on active duty. * Professional qualifications of teachers in the state, including number and percentage of: * Inexperienced teachers, principals, and other school leaders; * Teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials; and * Out-of-subject or out-of-field teachers. * Per-pupil expenditures of federal, state, and local funds; * Number of students taking alternate assessments; * National Assessment of Educational Progress results, compared to national average; * College-going rate within 1 year of graduation, where available; and * Any other information useful to parents, which may include CTE proficiency attainment.   Sec. 1111(h)(1)  *See Sec. 1111(h)(2) for requirements regarding the contents of LEA report cards.* | | |
|  | | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB required that state report cards contain a description of the accountability system, aggregate performance results for schools on all required measures, AYP and improvement status of all schools, percentage of students not taking statewide tests, and teacher qualifications. All other requirements noted above are introduced by ESSA. ESSA also adjusts the teacher qualifications that must be reported, including eliminating “highly qualified teacher” determinations. For additional guidance, see [Every Student Succeeds Act State and Local Report Cards Non-Regulatory Guidance](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essastatereportcard.pdf). | | |
|  | | |
|  | | **Additional Resources** |
| * [How Are States Reporting on College and Career Readiness? (CCRS Center, 2015)](http://www.ccrscenter.org/sites/default/files/AskCCRS_Metrics.pdf) * [Transforming Public Reporting to Include College and Career Readiness for All (Achieve, 2013)](http://www.achieve.org/files/CCR-ReportCardPolicyBriefMarch2013.pdf) * [Sample School-Level College and Career Readiness Reports (Achieve, 2016)](http://www.achieve.org/public-reporting) | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | V. B. Annual Federal Reporting |
| Each state must annually report to the Secretary:   * Information on the achievement of all students and subgroups on statewide assessments; * Information on the acquisition of English proficiency by ELs; * The number and names of all public schools in the state identified for comprehensive and targeted support; and * Teacher qualifications, including number and percentage of inexperienced, out-of-subject, or out-of-field educators, and teachers teaching with emergency credentials.   Sec. 1111(h)(5) | |
|  | **Shifts From NCLB** |
| NCLB and ESSA contain similar provisions for reporting to the Secretary. ESSA modifies the teacher qualifications to be reported, including elimination of “highly qualified teacher” requirements. | |

**If you have any questions** about this resource or regarding the integration of college and career readiness goals and supports into state accountability and assessment systems, please contact us at [ccrscenter@air.org](mailto:ccrscenter@air.org).

**Tweet** us @CCRSCenter Like us on **Facebook**

|  |
| --- |
| This resource was developed collaboratively by the College and Career Readiness and Success (CCRS) Center with funding Support by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education at the U.S. Department of Education. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service, or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.  **ABOUT THE CCRS CENTER**  The CCRS Center provides technical assistance through actionable and differentiated services and resources that support implementation of states’ college and career readiness and success initiatives. As one of seven federally funded content centers, our primary audiences are the 15 regional comprehensive centers and the state educational agencies they serve. |

1. This additional indicator may include nonacademic factors, such as student engagement or school climate. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. All citations in the format “Sec. 1111(c)” refer to sections of the [Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by ESSA](https://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. State plans under ESSA are required to incorporate timely and meaningful consultation with the state governor; state legislature; state board of education, if applicable; local educational agencies (LEAs), including some in rural areas; representatives of Indian tribes; teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, and specialized instructional support personnel; charter school leaders, if applicable; administrators; other staff; and parents (Sec. 1111(a)(1)(A)). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Assessment-related provisions that relate directly to standards-based accountability are presented here. See the ESSA statute and [final regulations on academic assessments Parts A and B](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html) for comprehensive assessment requirements. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The findings and opinions expressed in the additional resources provided in Part B are those of the respective authors and organizations and do not represent the views of the American Institutes for Research. These resources are included for consideration of alternative strategies for meaningful implementation of ESSA only. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. ESSA specifies, on an indicator-by-indicator basis, how reported data should be disaggregated by subgroup. States should review these subgroup reporting requirements in detail. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Advanced Placement® and AP® are trademarks registered and/or owned by the College Board, which was not involved in the production of, and does not endorse, this product. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)