

AGENDA

2016 Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability

March 23, 2016

10:00 a.m.

**Texas Education Agency, William B. Travis Building, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701,
State Board of Education Meeting Room, First Floor, Room 1-104**

- I.** Opening Remarks

 - II.** Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Reauthorization
 - Robert Stonehill, Managing Director, Education, American Institutes for Research
 - David English, Technical Assistance Consultant, American Institutes for Research

 - III.** Commission Work Session

 - IV.** Closing Remarks
-

Shifts in Assessment and Accountability Policy Under the Every Student Succeeds Act

March 23, 2016

Robert Stonehill, Ph.D., Managing Director

David English, Technical Assistance Consultant

Objectives

- Describe the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) implementation timeline
- Describe the negotiated rulemaking process under the ESSA
- Describe ESSA effects on statewide assessment and accountability policy, in context of shifts from No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility

Every Student Succeeds Act Timeline

Date	Milestone
December 10, 2015	ESSA was passed.
March 21, 2016; early and late April 2016	Negotiated rulemaking sessions
July 1, 2016	ESSA generally applies to formula programs
August 1, 2016	ESEA flexibility waivers become null and void (but continue support for priority and focus schools)
Fall 2016	Earliest possible date of regulations
October 1, 2016	ESSA applies generally to competitive federal grants given out after this date
Prior to SY2017–18	State plan review will occur, including peer review (March calls between ED and states will include state plan timeline)
No later than 120 days after submission	State plan approval (includes right to a hearing)
SY2017–18	ESSA requirements must be implemented.

Negotiated Rulemaking

- The U.S. Department of Education (ED) must use negotiated rulemaking:
 - If it chooses to develop proposed regulations regarding standards and assessments under section 1111(b)(2) of ESEA
 - To regulate the requirement under section 1118 of ESEA that Federal funds be used to supplement, and not supplant, State and local funds
- Note that accountability regulations are not required to be established through “NegReg”

Negotiated Rulemaking

- Before proposing any rules, ED convenes a panel of stakeholder constituency representatives to develop proposed regulations
- This is done through a series of facilitated meetings with the “negotiators” and ED officials
- A list of the negotiators is available on the ED website at: <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-names-committee-members-draft-proposed-regulations-every-student-succeeds-act>

Negotiated Rulemaking

- Negotiators met March 21, 2016 and will meet again at least once in April 2016
- Negotiators will define “consensus” and determine protocol for discussion and agenda
- If consensus is achieved on new regulations, ED initiates the traditional rulemaking process (i.e., develops a Notice of Proposed Rule Making subject to public comment requirements)
- If consensus is achieved, the earliest possible regulations can be published in fall 2016

Negotiated Rulemaking

- If consensus is not reached, ED must submit proposed regulations to the relevant Congressional committees
- Congress has a 15-day opportunity to provide comments on the proposed regulations, which must be addressed by ED as part of the public rulemaking record

Key to Symbols



Clear policy shift from NCLB or ESEA flexibility (underlined text indicates a specific shift)

“Quoted italics”

Language shift from earlier ESEA (implications for actual policy shifts might be unclear)



First inclusion in ESEA of a preexisting policy (from other guidance, another federal statute, etc.)

Statewide Assessments

- Administer high-quality assessments in:
 - Mathematics and reading or English language arts (ELA) annually in grades 3-8 and once in high school
 - » Accountability system to be based on mathematics and ELA at minimum
 - Science (grade-span testing) once in each of three grade bands (grades 3–5, 6–9, and 10–12)
- Aligned with challenging standards, which are aligned with:
 - Higher education entrance requirements for “*credit-bearing coursework*”
 - Relevant career and technical education standards

Shift



Statewide Assessments

- Valid, reliable assessments, aligned to national technical standards, that “...[do not] assess personal or family beliefs and attitudes”
- Provide information about higher-order thinking skills, student attainment of standards and “*whether the student is performing at grade level*”
- Differentiate three achievement levels (out of four possible performance levels, e.g., Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Advanced)
- Enable disaggregation and reporting by major racial and ethnic groups, economically disadvantaged (ED), students with disabilities (SWD), English learners (EL), gender, and migrant status (where n size is sufficient)
- Same assessment is given to all students and schools


Statewide Assessment Administration

State educational agencies (SEAs) “may”:

- Allow districts to use **nationally-recognized high school assessments** (e.g., ACT and SAT) aligned to state standards and comparable to regular statewide tests
- Be administered as a single summative assessment or **multiple interim assessments** that result in single summative score
- Allow **grade 8 math students** to test on grade 9-12 test if he/she then takes a higher-level test in HS and both results drive accountability for their respective administration years
- Administer statewide assessment partly in the form of **projects, portfolios, and extended-performance tasks**
- Allow **computer-adaptive testing** using items “above or below the student’s grade level” (e.g., to better measure growth)
- Set a target limit on aggregate **test administration time**, expressed as a percentage of instructional time

Statewide Assessments


Students With Disabilities

- Facilitate inclusion of students with disabilities in regular statewide assessments, including accommodations
- May provide alternate assessments for students with the most severe cognitive disabilities 

Shift 




- Embed universal design for learning (UDL) principles in alternate assessments “to the extent feasible” (using UDL definition from Higher Education Act)

Shift 

- Cap administration of alternate assessment at 1 percent of participating population per subject (not just 1 percent inclusion for accountability with unlimited administration)
- Eliminates “modified” assessments for disabled students (“2 percent” cap) 

Statewide Assessments

English Learners

- Facilitate inclusion of ELs in regular statewide assessments, including use of accommodations 
 - “To the extent practicable” use native-language assessments if they yield more accurate information 
- Indicate languages that are present to a “*significant extent*” in participating student population for which assessments are needed and “*make every effort*” to develop such assessments (may ask Secretary for assistance)
- Use native language reading/English language arts (ELA) assessments for ELs for no longer than three years of enrollment + two extra years on case-by-case basis
- May include former ELs in the EL subgroup for accountability for up to four years, for math and ELA (three years previously)
- Administer annual assessment of English language proficiency (ELP) aligned to ELP/state standards 

Shift 

Statewide Assessments

“Recently Arrived” ELs enrolled in a U.S. school for <12 months:

- For one year, exclude the student from taking the ELA assessment and not count ELA, math and/or ELP results towards accountability

OR



- Include in first year participation; report on but exclude first-year ELA and math results from accountability; for the second year, include student growth in ELA and math; and for the third year, include proficiency in ELA and math

Statewide Assessments

- SEAs “may” use federal funds to:
 - Develop balanced assessment systems (i.e., formative, interim, and summative)
 - Develop competency-based assessments
 - Conduct audits to ensure assessments are necessary and high quality
 - Develop science assessments to integrate concepts related to engineering and technology

Statewide Assessments

Innovative Assessment System

- Up to seven SEAs (any consortia not to exceed four SEAs) may apply to develop and implement an innovative statewide assessment
- Pilot may be used for competency-based, performance-based, interim assessments, for accountability purposes
- Pilot development may take up to a five-year period (plus two years extension based on evidence)
- The assessment does not have to be administered:
 - To all schools or students
 - To all grade bands as identified for mathematics, ELA, and science

Statewide Assessments

Potential key issues for negotiated rulemaking

- What constitutes a “nationally-recognized” test? (e.g., ACT, SAT)
 - How ensuring comparability to statewide tests?
 - How ensuring accessibility by SWDs and ELs?
- What data around computer-adaptive testing must be reported?
 - Performance against grade-level?
- Definition of “students with disabilities” in assessment context
- Definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities”
- How to operationalize 1% alternate assessment cap across districts
- Clarification on conditions for developing additional native-language assessments and “every effort” to develop

(Ujifusa and Klein, 2016)

Accountability Dimensions

- “*Long-term goals*”

Shift



- Academic and nonacademic indicators

Shift

from

Flex



- Meaningful differentiation of all public schools (not just Title I)

- Periodic identification of low-performing schools
- Supports for improvement activities
- Annual reporting

Long-Term Goals

- “*Long-term*” and “*interim*” goals for all students and disaggregated subgroups

Shift



- At minimum, proficiency, graduation rate, and progress toward English language proficiency (EL subgroup only)
 - Participation and additional academic indicator no longer discrete goals
 - Extended-year graduation rate optional, more rigorous than 4-year rate

- “Ambitious”

Shift



- No prescribed target-setting methodology
 - Targets must make “significant progress” towards closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps

Shift
from
Flex



- Performance against proficiency and graduation goals informs annual differentiation and identification of low-performing schools (not English language proficiency goals)

Performance Against Long-Term Goals Informs School Differentiation and Identification

- This is a key mechanism for:
 - Gap closure
 - Overall improvement as a state



NCLB

Performance against Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) drives identification.

ESEA flexibility

Many SEAs include additional factors to identify low-performing schools.

ESSA

“[A]nnually measure [and identify schools]...based on the long-term goals [for]...proficiency on the annual assessments...[and] four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.”

Using Performance Against Proficiency Goals for Accountability

Example: Maryland proficiency calculation

2013 Achievement Calculation	Math	Reading	Science	Combined Indicator
% of Students who Scored Advanced or Proficient	44.12%	52.21%	44.83%	
÷ 2013 Achievement AMOs	74.18%	73.59%	21.88%	
= Measure Progress Scale Values	0.5948	0.7094	2.0493	
× Proportional Significance Assigned to Each Measure	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	
= Measure Contribution	0.1983	+ 0.2365	+ 0.6831	= 1.1178
× Proportional Significance Assigned to Achievement in Calculating the School Progress Index				30.00%
= Achievement Contribution Value				0.3353

Using Performance Against Graduation Rate Goals for Accountability

Example: Colorado graduation rate calculation

Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report				
Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness	<i>Graduation Rate and Disaggregated Graduation Rate: The school's graduation rate/disaggregated graduation rate was:</i>		Overall	Disaggr.
	• at or above 90%.	Exceeds	4	1
	• at or above 80% but below 90%.	Meets	3	0.75
	• at or above 65% but below 80%.	Approaching	2	0.5
	• below 65%.	Does Not Meet	1	0.25
	<i>Dropout Rate: The school's dropout rate was:</i>			
	• at or below 1%.	Exceeds	4	
	• at or below the state average but above 1% (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets	3	
	• at or below 10% but above the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching	2	
	• above 10%.	Does Not Meet	1	
	<i>Colorado ACT Composite Score: The school's average Colorado ACT composite score was:</i>			
	• at or above 22.	Exceeds	4	
	• at or above the state average but below 22 (using 2009-10 baseline).	Meets	3	
	• at or above 17 but below the state average (using 2009-10 baseline).	Approaching	2	
	• below 17.	Does Not Meet	1	

If graduation rate “Meets” the target →
 School awarded three of four possible points =
 75 percent measure score

At Least Four Indicators for Annual Differentiation

- Proficiency in ELA and math
- Graduation rate (high schools) OR
Growth or another “valid and reliable” statewide academic indicator (elementary and middle schools)
- English-language proficiency progress
- Nonacademic indicators of school quality or student success (must be able to disaggregate) *may* include the following:
 - Postsecondary readiness
 - Student access to a completion of advanced coursework
 - School climate and safety
 - Student engagement
 - Educator engagement



Annual Differentiation of All Public Schools



- Based on all students' performance across all indicators.
- Based on subgroups “consistently underperforming” across all indicators (except English language proficiency indicator only for EL subgroup):
 - Economically disadvantaged students
 - Major racial and ethnic groups
 - Students with disabilities
 - English learners

Support for Schools With “Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups



Comprehensive Support

Title I schools with “Additional targeted support” subgroup that continues to underperform for a state-determined number of years

Additional Targeted Support

Schools with subgroup consistently underperforming across all indicators comparable to **lowest 5% of Title I schools for all students** (annual identification)

Targeted Support

Schools with subgroup that is consistently underperforming across all indicators (annual identification)

Identification for Comprehensive Support Every Three Years (Triennial)



- **Lowest performing 5 percent** of Title I schools based on all annual differentiation indicators, applied to “**all students**”
- All public schools with **graduation rates** 67 percent or lower for all students
- All Title I “additional targeted support” schools (i.e., identified for low **subgroup performance** comparable to lowest 5% of all Title I schools based on all students) that continue to underperform over a state-determined number of years

No category of high-performing schools (e.g., “Reward” schools)

Support Structure for Low-Performing Schools



Support Category	Support Structure Components				
	Common Elements of Improvement Plan	Other Plan Elements	Who Approves and Monitors Plan (Including Interventions)	Who Determines Exit Criteria, Including Maximum Time to Exit	Consequences of Failure to Exit
Targeted Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informed by all indicators, including performance against long-term goals 	N/A	District	District	Additional action determined by local education agency
Additional Targeted Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Evidence-based” interventions 	Identifies and implements resource inequities	District	State	Escalation to comprehensive support status (Title I schools)
Comprehensive Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on school-level needs assessment Identifies and implements resource inequities 	State	State (not to exceed four years)	More rigorous, state-determined action, such as operations-related actions





“Evidence-Based” Interventions

- **Strong evidence base**
 - Shows statistically significant effect on student outcomes from at least one experimental study
- **Moderate evidence base**
 - Shows evidence from a quasi-experimental study
- **Promising evidence base**
 - Shows evidence from a correlational study that makes statistical corrections for selection bias

State Role in Supports for School Improvement



- No direct support activities from states except if permission is received from local educational agency.
 - Except state-determined action for schools that fail to exit comprehensive support status, including operations.
- State-defined interventions are not precluded.
- Review resource allocation for and provide technical assistance to LEAs serving significant number of comprehensive and/or targeted support schools.
- May initiate LEA improvements if significant number of:
 - Comprehensive support schools not exiting
 - Targeted support schools
- Use 7 percent of Title I allocations for improvement activities (up from 4 percent).

Combining Measures to Differentiate and Identify Schools



- Does not explicitly require the calculation or reporting of an overall school rating (e.g., based on a composite index)
 - “Nothing...permit[s] the Secretary...to...prescribe...as a condition of approval of State plan....the specific methodology...to meaningfully differentiate or identify schools” (Sec. 1005(e)(1)(B)(iii)(V)).
- Annual differentiation
 - “Substantial” weight to each of the three academic indicators
 - “Much greater weight” in aggregate to academic indicators
 - “Nothing...permit[s] the Secretary...as a condition of approval of State plan...to prescribe...the weight of any measure or indicator used to identify or meaningfully differentiate schools” (Sec. 1005(e)(1)(B)(iii)(IV)).

Unifying Federal and State Accountability Criteria

Differentiation criteria for schools in a hypothetical SEA

Annual Differentiation Rating	Index Score Criterion	Additional Criteria Aligned to Comprehensive and Targeted Support Categories
A	90%–100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No “A” schools can have subgroups targeted for support.
B	80%–89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No “B” schools or higher:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Can have graduation rate $\leq 67\%$• Can be identified for comprehensive support for low subgroup performance
C	70%–79%	
D	60%–69%	
F	59% or less	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Set “F” cut score to include bottom 5% of Title I schools

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Proficiency

- Percentage of student scoring at least “proficient,” “satisfactory,” etc.

Shift



- Based on performance against goals

Other options pending ED clarification?

- Scale scores (South Carolina)
- Proficiency index (various states)

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Ohio Performance Index: How to measure against goals?

Performance Index Points	State Test Performance Level	Additional Points Awarded Over Lower Performance Level
1.3 points	Advanced Plus (Advanced score at higher grade level)	+ .1
1.2 points	Advanced	+ .1
1.1 points	Accelerated	+ .1
1.0 points	Proficient	+ .4
0.6 points	Basic	+ .3
0.3 points	Limited	+ .3
0 points	Did not take test	-

	Current	Targeted
Student 1	0.6	0.6
Student 2	0.6	0.6
Student 3	0.6	1
Student 4	1	1
Student 5	1.2	1.2
Student 6	1.2	1.2
Index Score (Average)	87%	93%
Proficiency	50%	66%

Proficiency and participation more highly incentivized

Two potential AMO approaches


Average the index points received by each student for overall school measure score.

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Participation Rate

Shift



- If the participation rate is lower than 95 percent, then the denominator of proficiency calculation must be 95 percent of enrollment (Section 1005(c)(4)(E)(ii))
 - Effectively assigns score of “0” to nonparticipants.
- Provide a clear and understandable explanation of how the State will factor [the requirement to test 95 percent of students] into the statewide accountability system (Section 1005(c)(4)(E)(iii)) 

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Shift




Participation Rate and “Opt-Out”

- Rule of Construction on Parent Rights (Section 1005(b)(2)(K))
 - ESSA cannot preempt state or local law regarding parental rights regarding testing participation
- School districts must notify parents that they may request information about any state or local district policy that would allow parents the right to opt their child out of any assessments (Sec. 1112(e)(2)(A))

Indicators for Annual Differentiation





Student Subgroups

- Only disaggregated subgroup data may be used for the required accountability indicators (not combined subgroups)
- It is unclear if combined subgroups may be used outside of required indicators (i.e., low-stakes indicators)
 - Example: Use of combined subgroups for nonrequired college- and career-readiness indicators that do not historically have as high a percentage of disaggregated subgroup representation.
- SEA describes n size for each subgroup 

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Graduation Rate (four-year adjusted cohort)

- Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (required) 
 - Based on performance against goals
- Five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (optional) 

Shift



Other options pending ED clarification?

- Graduation rate index
- Highest of the four-year or extended-year graduation rate

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Shift



Student Growth (Elementary Schools)

- Common state approaches
 - Value table (e.g., learning gains)
 - Student growth percentiles
 - Value-added models
 - Growth-to-standard
- Secretary prohibited from prescribing “...the specific metrics used to measure...growth”

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Shift



Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

- Lack of consensus in field regarding whether this will measure:
 - Percentage of students making progress from year to year
 - Gains in percentage of students attaining English-language proficiency from year to year
 - Combination of the two
- Some current advocacy to allowing weighting of this indicator according to the size of EL population in the school

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

Shift



School quality or success (nonacademic indicator)

- “May” include the following:
 - Student access to and completion of advanced coursework
 - Postsecondary readiness
 - School climate and safety
 - Student engagement
 - Educator engagement
- Valid, reliable, comparable, statewide (for each gradespan, same indicator(s) used across schools)
- Must be able to disaggregate these data

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

School Quality or Success (Nonacademic Indicator)

Other reported data required under ESSA that might be used:

- Behavior data (suspensions, expulsions, etc.)
- Participation in AP/IB coursework and tests
- Preschool participation
- College-going rates
- Chronic absenteeism (absent one month)

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

School Quality or Success (Nonacademic Indicator)

Social-emotional indicators

CORE districts (California) incorporating student self-reporting in 2015–16 school index (8 percent weighting) for:

- Growth mindset
- Self-efficacy
- Self-management
- Social awareness

Indicators for Annual Differentiation

School Quality or Success (Nonacademic Indicator)

Social-emotional self-reporting (CORE)

Growth mindset dimension

Please indicate how true each of the following statements is for you:

10. My intelligence is something that I can't change very much.
11. Challenging myself won't make me any smarter.
12. There are some things I am not capable of learning.
13. If I am not naturally smart in a subject, I will never do well in it.

(Not At All True, A Little True, Somewhat True, Mostly True, Completely True)

(CORE, 2015)

Selected New Reporting Requirements



- Achievement of accountability subgroups (Race, ED, SWD, EL)
 - State report card: progress towards meeting interim targets
 - Federal reporting: “disaggregated [achievement] results” for all subgroups
- Participation in AP/IB coursework and tests
- Preschool participation
- College-going rates within first post-secondary year
- Chronic absenteeism (absent one month)
- Rates of suspension, expulsion, arrests, violence, bullying
- Achievement and graduation rates of homeless and foster youth, and students with parent(s) in military
- English language proficiency acquisition rates
- Percentage of “inexperienced” and out-of-field/subject teachers

Summary

- While assessment requirement changes under ESSA are relatively peripheral, there are more significant shifts with respect to:
 - Accountability measures for the differentiation and identification of schools
 - Intervention strategies to support students in meeting State's challenging academic standards
 - Reporting requirements

References

- Coalition Office to Reform (CORE) Districts. (2015). *Social-emotional skills*. Retrieved from <https://s3.amazonaws.com/uploads.hipchat.com/392387/2399075/UEvBNz8KwRWqcTY/SE-CC-Domain-Social-Emotional-Skills-updated-1.2.15.pdf>
- Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), Pub. L. No. 114-95 (2015).
- Ujifusa, A. & Klein, A. (2016). *ESSA Rulemaking: A Guide to Negotiations*. Education Week. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2016/03/16/essa-rulemaking-a-guide-to-negotiations.html>.

Robert Stonehill, Ph.D.
202-403-6210
rstonehill@air.org

David English
202-403-6930
denglish@air.org

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
General Information: 202-403-5000
www.air.org

Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability

March 23, 2016 Work Session Agenda

Work Session Goal

- Begin to provide guidance about direction of recommendations for the final report.

Work Session Objectives

1. Seek agreement on the purpose(s) and roles of a state accountability system and the purpose(s) and roles of student assessment.
2. Begin to identify perceived strengths and gaps in the current student assessment system and the current state accountability system.
3. Brainstorm ideas for removing or reducing the gaps in the student assessment system and the state accountability system. Get input on which ideas have the greatest support among the members.

Work Session Agenda

- 1:00 Introduce Juli.
Dr. Fellows is an independent meeting facilitator and mediator who has been in private practice since 1993. She specializes in helping diverse groups agree on public policy recommendations.
Juli reviews and gets agreement to the session goal, objectives, agenda and discussion guidelines.
- 1:05 Move to small groups (assigned).
Brainstorm the PURPOSE of a student assessment system (WHY we do it) and the roles it serves (HOW it is used.)
- 1:20 Back to full group.
Report out. (2 minutes per group)
Are there any ideas common to at least two groups? Find ideas or principles that the majority of members support.
- 1:40 Move to small groups.
Brainstorm the PURPOSE of a state accountability system (WHY we do it) and the roles it serves (HOW it is used.)
- 1:55 Back to full group.
Report out. (2 minutes per group).
Are there any ideas common to at least two groups? Find ideas or principles that the majority of members support.
- 2:10 Move to small groups.
Brainstorm perceived strengths of the current assessment system and (separate list) of the current accountability system.
- 2:30 Brainstorm perceived gaps in the current assessment system and (separate list) of the current accountability system.

- 3:00 Break
- 3:10 Large group discussion.
Brainstorm options to meet overcome perceived gaps in the assessment system. (Large group - round robin. One idea per person, go around at least twice. Anyone may pass. Juli records.
- 3:30 Large group discussion.
Brainstorm options to meet overcome perceived gaps in the accountability system. (Large group - round robin. One idea per person, go around at least twice. Anyone may pass. Juli records.
- 3:50 Dot voting on both lists. Each person gets five dots for each list (separate colors.).
- 4:05 Look at results of dot voting. Where is the greatest support?
- 4:30 Closing remarks.

Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability¹

Commission Charge

The Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability (the Commission) adopts and implements the Commission Operating Policies and Procedures to develop and make recommendations that address:

- The purpose of a state accountability system and the role of student assessment in that system;
- Opportunities to assess students that:
 - Provide actionable information for a parent or person standing in parental relation to a student, an educator, and the public;
 - Support learning activities;
 - Recognize application of skills and knowledge;
 - Measure student educational growth toward mastery; and
 - Value critical thinking.
- Alignment of state performance standards with college and career readiness requirements in collaboration with the Texas Workforce Commission and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board;
- Policy changes necessary to enable a student to progress through subject matter and grade levels on demonstration of mastery; and
- Policy changes necessary to establish a student assessment and public school accountability system that meets state goals, is community based, promotes parent and community involvement, and reflects the unique needs of each community.

Commission Report

Not later than September 1, 2016, the Commission shall prepare and deliver a report to the governor and legislature to recommend statutory changes to improve systems of student assessment and public school accountability.

In preparing this report, the Commission must consider the recommendations of the Texas High Performance Schools Consortium established under TEC, 7.0561, including recommendations related to innovative, next-generation learning standards and assessment and accountability systems.

Commission Expiration

The Commission is abolished January 1, 2017.

¹ Texas Education Code, Chapter 39, Subchapter N, Texas Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability January 13, 2016

**The Commission on Next Generation Assessments and Accountability
Decision Framework**

	Assessment	Accountability	Reference Materials
Purpose of Assessment and Accountability	What is the purpose(s) of an assessment system?	What is the purpose(s) of an academic accountability system?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability by Dr. Ho 2. CAP and CCSSO. Next-Generation Accountability Systems: An Overview of Current State Policies and Practices
Role of Assessment and Academic Accountability	<p>How does assessment fulfill its purpose(s)? What should be the role(s) of assessment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state accountability • Provide actionable information for a parent or person standing in parental relation to a student, an educator, and the public • Support learning activities • Recognize application of skills and knowledge • Measure student educational growth toward mastery • Value critical thinking 	<p>How does state accountability fulfill its purpose(s)? What is the role of an academic accountability system?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide information to improve the quality of teaching and learning • Inform the public of the status of a campus, district, or public school system • Ensure equity within the public school system • Ensure that participants in the system carry out their responsibilities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability by Dr. Ho 2. A History of Texas Assessment by Dr. Zyskowski 3. A History of Texas Accountability by Shannon Housson 4. Commissioner Morath on Texas Career and College Readiness
Consideration if Current Systems Meet All or Part of the Purpose and Roles of Assessment and Accountability	Does the current assessment system address its intended purpose and fulfill the stated role(s)? If not, why? Identify the gaps.	Does current state accountability meet the stated purpose(s) and fulfill the stated role(s)? If not, why? Identify the gaps.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability by Dr. Ho 2. STAAR Test Design and Standards 3. A History of Texas Assessment by Dr. Zyskowski 4. A History of Texas Accountability by Shannon Housson 5. Commissioner Morath on Texas Career and College Readiness 6. Overview of Assessment Graduation Requirements by Test Program 7. Difference Between Percent Correct and Rigor
Current Statutory Requirements	<p>What are the current requirements for assessment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State and federal requirements 	<p>What are the current requirements for accountability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State and federal requirements 	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 39, Assessment 2. TEC for Student Advancement

	Assessment	Accountability	Reference Materials
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully aligned assessments with the TEKS curriculum standards Alignment of performance standards to career and college readiness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators of career and college readiness Comparable measures across campus and districts Comparable measures across time Triggers for sanctions and interventions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> TEC for the Student Success Initiative TEC for Assessment Graduation Requirements TEC for Individual Graduation Committees State and Federally Required Assessments <p>Accountability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TEC for Accountability <p>Related Presentations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Commissioner Morath on Texas Career and College Readiness A History of Texas Assessment by Dr. Zyskowski A History of Texas Accountability by Shannon Houson
Future Design Considerations	<p>What are future design considerations for assessment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criterion-referenced assessments versus norm-referenced assessments Diagnostic versus summative assessments Method of assessment (CAT, portfolio, other platform or method) Sampling versus testing all students When students should be assessed (on demand, multiple times a year, annually) How to measure a student's growth and critical thinking Test length Reporting of assessment results Costs 	<p>What are future design considerations for accountability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicators of career and college readiness Comparable measures across campus and districts Comparable measures across time Rank order Triggers for sanctions and interventions Costs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability <p>Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling and the STAAR program STAAR progress measure Q and A A parent's guide to the STAAR progress measure A parent's guide to the ELL STAAR progress measure Understanding the grades 3-8 confidential student report <p>Accountability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> HB 2804 Summary HB 2804 Domains of Indicators Text of HB 2804 2015 Accountability Manual <p>HPSC Recommendations</p>

	Assessment	Accountability	Reference Materials
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation on Texas High Performance School Consortia Recommendations 2014 HPSC report to the commissioner <p>Research</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CCSSO. Evolving Coherent Systems of Accountability for Next-Generation Learning: A Decision Framework CCSSO. 2015 Survey of State Test Directors: Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Bourque. Reflections on Norm-Referenced vs. Criterion-Referenced Testing in an NCLB Environment Next-Generation Accountability Systems: An Overview of Current State Policies and Practices by CAP and CCSSO.
State Goals and Community Based	<p>What is community-based assessment? How can assessment promote parent and community involvement, and reflect the needs of a community while meeting state goals?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to analyze comparable measures across districts, campuses, and time Indicators of career and college readiness 	<p>What is community-based accountability? How can accountability promote parent and community involvement, and reflect the needs of a community while meeting state goals?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Triggers for sanctions and interventions 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability by Dr. Ho Commissioner Morath on Texas Career and College Readiness <p>Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> STAAR progress measure Q and A A parent's guide to the STAAR progress measure A parent's guide to the ELL STAAR progress measure Understanding the grades 3-8 confidential student report <p>Accountability</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> HB 2804 Summary HB 2804 Domains of Indicators HB 2804 Bill Text

	Assessment	Accountability	Reference Materials
High Performance School Consortium Findings and Recommendations	Consideration of HPSC recommendations or policies related to an HPSC finding as it relates to assessment?	Consideration of HPSC recommendations or policies related to an HPSC finding as it relates to accountability?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2012 HPSC report to the commissioner 2. 2014 HPSC report to the commissioner 3. Presentation on Texas High Performance School Consortia Recommendations
Texas Education Code Revisions	<p>Will changes to Texas Education Code better address the identified role of state assessment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades assessed • Subjects assessed • Test design/item types • Measurement of current performance • Measurement of college readiness • Measurement of growth • Reporting 	<p>Will changes to Texas Education Code authorizing the 2018 accountability system better address the identified purpose(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework • Indicators and indicator weights • Distinctions • Alternative education procedures • Evaluation of current performance and student growth • Evaluation of college readiness • Evaluation of closing the achievement gaps • Reporting 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Texas Education Code for Assessment 2. Texas Education Code for Accountability
A-F		How should the A-F accountability grading requirements be applied in 2018 and beyond?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability by Dr. Ho 2. Next-Generation School Accountability – A Report Commissioned by the Oklahoma State Department of Education 3. The Evidence on the "Florida Formula" for Education Reform – Policy brief by the Albert Shanker Institute
Other Recommended Policy Changes	What other policy changes outside of TEC revisions are needed to establish an assessment and accountability system that fulfills its purpose and meet its goals? Are there policies being implemented in other states that Texas should consider?		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 10 Principles of Test-Based Accountability by Dr. Ho 2. Next-Generation School Accountability – A Report Commissioned by the Oklahoma State Department of Education

	Assessment	Accountability	Reference Materials
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Evidence on the "Florida Formula" for Education Reform – Policy brief by the Albert Shanker Institute 4. Criteria for High-Quality Assessment – Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education 5. Next-Generation Accountability Systems: An Overview of Current State Policies and Practices by CAP and CCSSO. 6. State Legislation: Assessment by Education Commission of the States. 7. State Legislation: Accountability by Education Commission of the States.

DRAFT

APPENDIX

ESSA Reference Materials from CCSSO

- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) ESSA Resources
- Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act
- Transitioning to the Every Student Succeeds Act
- Comparisons of Select Elements of ESEA, No Child Left Behind vs. Every Student Succeeds Act

2014-15 Texas State Performance Report

The Every Student Succeeds Act



The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) strongly supports the Every Student Succeeds Act, a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) creates a long-term stable federal policy that gives states additional flexibility and encourages states and schools to innovate, while at the same time holding us accountable for results.

The new law is aligned with **key priorities for reauthorization** that CCSSO released in January 2015.

CCSSO stands ready to support all states as they move forward in implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act. Our support includes:

- **Providing tools and resources** so every state can learn about the content of the new law and how it will directly impact their students.
- **Hosting a series of webinars and in-person meetings** to provide states with one-on-one support as they plan for changes at the state and local level.
- **Providing comprehensive supports throughout the transition period** as states develop implementation strategies and new state plans under the new law.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

- Download **CCSSO's Frequently Asked Questions about ESSA** (updated February 19, 2016)
- Click **here** to read the U.S. Department of Education's Frequently Asked Questions on ESSA (February 26, 2016)

Advocacy

- **CCSSO's Key Priorities for ESEA Reauthorization**, January 9, 2015
- CCSSO's **public comments** on Every Student Succeeds Act regulations, January 11, 2016
- CCSSO Board President **testifies** on ESSA implementation in the Senate (February 23, 2016)
- Oklahoma Superintendent **testifies** on ESSA implementation in the House (February 10, 2016)
- Read CCSSO's **Letter of Support** to the House of Representatives (November 30, 2015)
- Read CCSSO's **Letter of Support** to the Senate (December 7, 2015)
- CCSSO members appointed to serve on **Negotiated Rulemaking Committee** (March 4, 2016)

Resources for States

- Read the **Memo on State Report Card Requirements** (January 26, 2016)
- Read the **NCLB and ESSA side-by-side comparison** (December 8, 2015)
- Click **here** to download a sample ESSA Overview Presentation for SEAs (February 8, 2016)
- Download the **Federal Funds Toolkit** (November 2013)
- Download the **ESSA NCLB Section Crosswalk** (January 5, 2016)
- Download the **Major Provisions of ESSA related to the Education of English Learners** (March 2016)
 - **Webinar PowerPoint**

- [Webinar Recording](#)
- CCSSO releases [Principles for Teacher Support and Evaluation Systems](#) (March 1, 2016)
- Review the [Stakeholder Engagement Considerations under ESSA](#) (March 3, 2016)
- Download the [Summary of Significant Spending and Fiscal Rules in the Every Student Succeeds Act](#) (February 2016)
- Download the [Summary of "Evidence Based" under ESSA](#) (March 11, 2016)

ESSA Implementation Considerations

- [Accountability Summary](#)
- [Arts Education Summary](#)
- [English Learners Summary](#)
- [Funding Streams Summary](#)
- [Governance Summary](#)
- [Innovation Summary](#)
- [School Intervention Summary](#)
- [Standards and Assessments Summary](#)
- [Teacher Preparation Summary](#)
- [Teacher Evaluation and Equity Summary](#)
- [Testing and Participation Summary](#)

Contact:

Peter Zamora
Peter.Zamora@ccsso.org
202-336-7003



Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act February 16, 2016

Below please find responses to questions frequently posed by States as they prepare to implement the Every Student Succeeds Act, the federal law that replaces No Child Left Behind. These responses are based upon our current understanding of the law, as of February 12, 2016, and our current best thinking on these issues.

Challenging Academic Standards

Q. Does ESSA make any significant changes from prior law related to state academic standards?

- A. ESSA essentially maintains prior law with respect to the requirement that each state adopt challenging state academic standards. Critically, it preserves states' authority and control over the content of state standards. States must demonstrate that their standards are aligned to "entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the State and relevant State career and technical education standards," but the law expressly prohibits the Secretary from requiring states to add or delete specific elements to the standards.

ESSA maintains the requirement from NCLB that states have English proficiency (ELP) standards for the education of English learners and also adds a requirement that these standards address different levels of English proficiency; thus, some states may have to revise their ELP standards.

Assessments

Q. Does ESSA make any significant changes from prior law with respect to academic assessments?

- A. The specific requirements related to academic assessments are similar to prior law in many ways. For example, ESSA maintains the requirement that states administer an annual assessment of students in grades three through eight, and once in high school, in math and English/language arts, as well as science assessments given at least once in each grade span from grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12. The new law also maintains the requirement that the assessments align to the State's challenging academic standards. However, ESSA does make several meaningful changes to assessment requirements. Specifically, the ESSA statute now permits States to include assessments that measure student academic growth and assessments to be partially delivered in the form of portfolios, projects, or extended performance tasks. In addition, at the state's discretion, assessments may be administered through a single summative assessment or through multiple, statewide interim assessments during the course of the academic year, which result in a single, summative score that provides valid, reliable, and transparent information on student achievement or growth. In addition, as noted above, the law authorizes states to permit LEAs to implement locally selected high school assessments if certain criteria are met.

However, it is important to note that while Title I continues to require the assessment of English proficiency of EL students, these assessment results will now be used as part of the Title I accountability system, rather than as part of Title III (see below for further discussion).

Q. Under ESSA, are local educational agencies allowed to select their own high school assessments?

- A. ESSA includes a new provision that permits local educational agencies (LEAs) to administer locally selected, nationally recognized high school academic assessments, in lieu of state assessments. However, prior to their use, a state educational agency (SEA) must determine that such assessments meet the same technical criteria as the state-selected assessment and meet ED's peer review criteria, which includes things like alignment to the state's academic standards, provision of comparable, valid and reliable data on achievement, and provision of "unbiased, rational and consistent differentiation between schools within the state" for state accountability purposes. The provision also provides that once a specific assessment is approved by the state, any other district in that same state may use that assessment.

Q. Does ESSA allow States to implement adaptive assessments?

- A. States continue to have the option to implement adaptive assessments under the new law. Such assessments must meet all other criteria for state assessments except that not all students taking the computer-adaptive assessment must receive the same assessment items. Under the law, computer-adaptive assessments must measure academic proficiency based on the challenging state academic standards for the student's grade level, as well as growth toward such standards, and may measure the student's level of academic proficiency and growth using items above or below the student's grade level, including for use as part of a state's accountability system.

Q. Does ESSA maintain the ability for states to defer commencement, or suspend the administration of assessments in any year in which funding for State Assessment Grants falls below a specific level?

- A. Yes. The new trigger is \$369 million, which reflects funding made available for State Assessment Grants in FY16.

Q. Do states still need to submit assessment systems for peer review in the spring of 2016?

- A. Yes. In accordance with an orderly transition to the new law, ED has indicated that states should still submit their assessments for peer review based on the guidance that was released by ED in October 2015. The purpose of the peer review process remains to assist the Secretary in the review of state plans in order to determine if they meet the statutory requirements, including whether or not states demonstrate implementation of student academic assessments that meet the law's requirements. As was the case under NCLB, the Secretary may not use this, or any other process, to prescribe specific assessments or items to be used in state assessments.

Accountability

Q. ESSA requires states, as part of their statewide system of accountability, to factor in specific, academically-focused indicators as well at least one indicator of “school quality or student success.” ESSA requires that states give “substantial weight” to academic indicators and that these indicators be given, in the aggregate, “much greater weight” in the differentiation process than any measures of school quality or student success. To what extent does the Secretary have the authority to determine how states define what constitutes “substantial” and “much greater” in this context?

A. Language under ESSA prohibits the Secretary from prescribing “the weight of any measure or indicator used to identify or meaningfully differentiate schools...” It is important to note, however, that ED has not yet publicly stated how it interprets the restraints placed on its regulatory authority under this or other ESSA provisions.

Q. Under ESEA Flexibility waivers, States were able to use combined (or “super”) subgroups and other subgroups (e.g., the lowest-scoring 25% of students) for accountability purposes. Under ESSA, may States continue to use these types of subgroups?

A. Under ESSA, Statewide accountability systems must use certain specific subgroups, including *economically disadvantaged students; students from major racial and ethnic groups; children with disabilities; and English learners*. However, the House-Senate Conference Report includes language stating that the intent of the law was not to preclude states from “including additional elements or methods for identifying student and school performance, which may include using additional categories of students.” Such additional elements or methods “must not prevent the State from meeting the minimum requirements for meaningful differentiation, identification for improvement, and school support and interventions under this section, and the State must not use such additional elements or methods to reduce the number or percent- age, or change, the schools that would otherwise be subject to the requirements of the State’s accountability system...”

Q. Does ESSA allow States to apply different supports and interventions for small schools, as well as for certain high schools serving high-risk students? If so, how will these provisions be regulated by the Secretary?

A. Under ESSA, states may allow high schools that are identified for comprehensive support (due to low graduation rates) to have differentiated improvement activities that utilize evidence-based interventions. However, such schools must “predominantly” serve students who have previously dropped out of school or are who are significantly off track to accumulate the academic credits necessary to graduate.

In addition, the law allows LEAs to forgo implementation of improvement activities if a school otherwise required to carry out such activities has a total enrollment of less than 100 students.

Q. Under ESSA, what is the Secretary’s role with respect to supporting states in complying with the law through the approval of each state’s accountability system?

A. ESSA maintains language from No Child Left Behind (NCLB) with respect to providing the Secretary the authority to review and approve each state's accountability system, in order to ensure compliance with the law. It also contains restrictions on what the Secretary can require as part of this review, however, such as requiring a state to add or delete specific elements to or from their standards or prescribing that states use specific long-term goals or interim measures of progress.

Q. Does ESSA require states to identify “reward” schools, similar to what states were required to do as part of NCLB Flexibility Waivers? If so, does the law set-aside funds for this purpose?

A. No. ESSA does not require states to identify “reward” schools or any other similar category.

Q. Does ESSA require states to develop an index system in order to differentiate among schools as part of its statewide system of accountability? If so, must it be an interval index (e.g., 0 - 100) or can it be ordinal (e.g., 'level 1', 'level 2', 'level 3', etc.)?

A. ESSA does not specifically require the adoption of an index for states establishing a system for accountability purposes. However, in order to meet the law's requirements, each state's accountability system will have to include a methodology for identifying the lowest 5 percent of Title I schools, which would require the relative ranking of schools, which could be accomplished through an index or similar structure.

Q. ESSA requires States to establish “ambitious State-designed long-term goals, which shall include measurements of interim progress toward meeting such goals...” How is this different from NCLB in terms of having a long-term goal and Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)?

A. Under NCLB, the “long-term” goal was defined (100% proficiency by 2014). ESSA requires a long-term goal and interim goals but the state has discretion in how those goals are set. The new law maintains the requirement that goals be disaggregated by subgroup and specifies that goals must be set for achievement and high school graduation rates, as well as progress in achieving English language proficiency where applicable. States have discretion in determining the length of the goals but the goal length must be the same for all students across the various groups. In addition, the goals must take into account the starting point for each student population and provide for more progress for those groups that are farther behind.

Q. If our exit criteria are tied to AMOs and we no longer have to have AMOs, this is a bit of a conundrum. We had named new priority/focus schools for flex. Will ED still need to approve the AMOs we proposed to use for exit in 2015?

A. In its December 18th Dear Colleague letter, ED noted that it would not require states to submit AMOs (for school years 2014–2015 or 2015–2016) for ED's review and approval, nor will ED require states to report performance against AMOs for the 2014–2015 or 2015–2016 school years. The letter goes on to note, however, that all states and districts must continue to publish report cards, including report cards for the 2014–2015 school year (if those report cards have not yet been published), for the 2015–2016 school year,

and beyond. Report cards must continue to include information that shows how a district's student achievement on the state assessments compares to students and subgroups of students in the state as a whole. At the school level, the district must include information that shows how a school's student achievement on the state assessments compares to students and subgroups of students in the district and in the state as a whole.

Q. What happens to prior reporting requirements created through regulation under old law?

- A. ESSA maintains many of the same reporting requirements as NCLB. However, ED guidance, potentially including regulations, will have to be updated to address several changes, including the addition of new data elements and data that must be reported to ED through its EdFacts system.

Q. Do non-waiver states still have to identify a new group of schools for improvement in 2016-17?

- A. On January 28th, ED released a Dear Colleague letter clarifying that schools in non-waiver states that were identified in school year 2015-16, must continue to implement the same interventions in the 2016-17 school year (with exceptions for providing supplemental educational services and public school choice and the related notice to parents). ED released a follow-up letter on February 5th that further clarifies that if a state chooses not to require LEAs to provide SES and public school choice in the 2016-17 school year, it must develop and implement a one-year transition plan for ensuring that LEAs provide alternative supports for students eligible for SES in the schools with the greatest need. While the details of the plan will not be reviewed by ED, the state must submit certain assurances to ED about the transition as part of ED's orderly transition authority.

Q. Are all public schools in a state subject to carrying out improvement activities if they are identified under the state's system of differentiation, or are just those schools receiving Title I funding subject to these requirements?

- A. When the new law is fully implemented, all Title I schools will be subject to having to carry out comprehensive support and improvement activities when identified. In addition, any high school, regardless if they receive Title I or not, identified due to having a low graduation rate, must carry out comprehensive support and improvement activities. Similarly, any school with an underperforming subgroup must plan and implement targeted supports for the relevant subgroup whether the school receives Title I funding or not.

Teachers and Leaders

Q. Are states required to continue to implement Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) requirements given that ESSA discontinues it?

- A. ED's January 28th Dear Colleague Letter clarifies that such provisions are not required to be implemented in the 2016-17 school year. State are, however, still required to report HQT data for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years.

Q. Does ESSA include any reporting requirements for the evaluation of teachers?

- A. ESSA does not specifically require states to carry out or report on teacher evaluations. However, states and districts must include in their report cards the professional qualifications of teachers, including information (disaggregated by high- and low-poverty schools) on the number and percentage of inexperienced teachers, principals, and other school leaders; teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials; and teachers who are not teaching in the subject or field for which the teacher is certified or licensed. In addition, ESSA continues language similar to NCLB, which had fewer report card requirements in this area but required parents to be informed regarding the professional qualifications of their student's classroom teachers based upon the same information noted above.

States must also include as part of their plans information on how low-income and minority children are "not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the State educational agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress" in this area.

Note: the law clarifies that this language should not be "construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation system." Local plans must include how the district will address any cases of such disparities.

English Language Learners

Q. Under ESSA, what assessment is used to determine English Language Proficiency (ELP)?

- A. ESSA requires that states demonstrate their LEAs conduct annual assessments of ELP aligned with the states ELP standards. These could be state-developed assessments, assessments developed through multi-state consortia, or other assessments.

Q. Does Title III continue to include separate accountability provisions for English learners as under NCLB?

- A. No. The prior accountability provisions under Title III have been removed from that Title. The accountability system which states are required to develop under Title I now requires the inclusion of English proficiency of English learners as an indicator. In addition, states now need to include specific ELP goals and measures of interim progress as part of Title I. There is also a switch in the focus on district-level accountability to school-level accountability as part of the new law.

Timeline/Transition to ESSA

Q. Under ESSA, states are not required to have their new accountability systems in place until the 2017-18 school year. Does this mean *that the first report cards are based on the SY17-18 data (and therefore reported AFTER that school year) or based on the SY16-17 and reported FOR the SY17-18 school year?*

- A. ED's December 18th Dear Colleague Letter clarified that report cards will continue to be required for the 2015-16 school year and beyond (meaning that a report card will also be

required in the transition year of 2016-17). As with current practice, annual report cards are based upon data from the prior school year.

Q. *What is the anticipated timeline for the submission of State Plans to ED (presumably through the consolidated application process)? The non-accountability provisions of ESSA kick in on 7/1/16 for formula grants, and states must submit a plan to access those formula funds, so when will that be due?*

A. Most likely in the spring of 2017. The FY 2016 Omnibus appropriations bill clarified that FY 2016 formula grant funds will be awarded and administered in accordance with the provisions of NCLB. This means that ED formula grant allocations to states and LEAs, as well as state subgrants allocated by formula to LEAs under ESEA formula grant programs, will be made in FY 2016, for the 2016-2017 school year, in the same manner and using the same allocation formulas as for the 2015-2016 school year. In its January 28th Dear Colleague letter, ED provided additional guidance about certain exceptions to this rule (pertaining to funding for supports and interventions for priority and focus schools, for example).

The new law will kick in for FY17 funds, which are made available on July 1, 2017. As such, it is likely that states will submit plans prior to that date to be prepared for new allocations starting on July 1, 2017.

Transitioning to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Frequently Asked Questions



February 26, 2016



TABLE OF CONTENTS: ESSA TRANSITION FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

[INTRODUCTION](#).....3

[A. GENERAL GUIDANCE ON ESSA TRANSITION](#).....4

[B. GUIDANCE REGARDING ESEA FLEXIBILITY](#).....7

[C. TRANSITION GUIDANCE REGARDING TITLE I PROGRAMS AND REQUIREMENTS](#).....10

[D. GUIDANCE REGARDING TITLE II, PART A PROGRAMS AND REQUIREMENTS](#).....14

[E. GUIDANCE REGARDING TITLE III, PART A PROGRAMS AND REQUIREMENTS](#).....16

INTRODUCTION

On December 10, 2015, President Obama signed the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The ESSA builds upon the critical work States and local educational agencies (LEAs) have implemented over the last few years. The reauthorized law prioritizes excellence and equity for our students and supports great educators.

The Secretary is offering guidance on transitioning from the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, including actions the U.S. Department of Education (ED) has taken or will take consistent with its authority under section 4(b) of NCLB to the ESSA to support States, LEAs, and schools in this transition. ED has prepared these frequently asked questions (FAQs) to support States and LEAs in understanding expectations during the transition to full implementation of the ESSA.

If you are interested in commenting on this guidance, or if you have further questions that are not answered here, please e-mail essa.questions@ed.gov using the subject “ESSA transition question” or write to us at the following address: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202.

Please note that this guidance is available in electronic form on ED’s website at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html>. ED will update this document on a rolling basis.

A. GENERAL GUIDANCE ON ESSA TRANSITION

A-1. Where can the public access the text of the ESSA?

The full text of the ESSA is available at <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-114s1177enr/pdf/BILLS-114s1177enr.pdf>. In addition, the full text of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, is available at <http://legcounsel.house.gov/Comps/Elementary%20And%20Secondary%20Education%20Act%20Of%201965.pdf>.

A-2. How will ED award and administer the fiscal year (FY) 2016 appropriations for State and district formula grant programs under ESEA that do not have competitive subawards?

As stated in ED's [January 28, 2016, Dear Colleague letter \(DCL\)](#), under the ESSA transition provisions, as clarified by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, ED will award and administer FY 2016 formula grant funds in accordance with the ESEA as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the ESSA (*i.e.*, the requirements promulgated under NCLB). Specifically, ED will make FY 2016 formula grant awards for the 2016–2017 school year to States and districts receiving funds under the ESEA non-competitive formula grant programs in the same manner and using the same allocation formulas it did with FY 2015 formula grant funds for the 2015-2016 school year.

A-3. How must a State make formula grant allocations to LEAs for FY 2016 for the 2016-2017 school year?

Each State must make formula subgrant allocations to LEAs in the same manner and using the same allocation formulas as it used for the 2015-2016 school year.

A-4. Must a State and its LEAs continue to implement ESEA State formula grant programs in accordance with NCLB in the 2016-2017 school year?

In general, each State and its LEAs that receives FY 2016 funds under a State formula grant program under the ESEA must continue to implement that program in the 2016-2017 school year in accordance with NCLB requirements as they existed in the 2015-2016 school year. There are some specific exceptions to this general rule as discussed in questions A-4a, A-4b, and B-11.

A-4a. What accountability requirements must a State and its LEAs meet in the 2016-2017 school year?

Section 5(e)(1)(A) of the ESSA provides that ESEA section 1111(b)(2), as authorized by NCLB, is effective only through August 1, 2016. Section 1111(b)(2) contains the requirement that each State that receives Title I, Part A funds must develop and implement a single, statewide accountability system, including establishing annual measurable objectives (AMOs), defining adequate yearly progress (AYP), and holding Title I schools and LEAs accountable under ESEA section 1116. Accordingly, sections 1111(b)(2) and 1116 are no longer in effect after August 1, 2016. Instead, under section 5(e)(2) of the ESSA, a school or LEA that is identified in the 2015-2016 school year as a priority or focus school under ESEA flexibility (see B-3) or as a school or LEA in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as applicable, under NCLB (see C-4) must continue to implement

interventions applicable to the school or LEA through the 2016-2017 school year. A State that is not implementing ESEA flexibility may, but is no longer required to, ensure that its LEAs offer public school choice, supplemental educational services (SES), or the related notice to parents during the 2016-2017 school year (see C-4 and C-5).

A-4b. Are there any NCLB requirements with which a State or LEA need not comply during the 2016-2017 school year?

Yes. In order to ensure an orderly transition from ESEA requirements under the NCLB to those under the ESSA, ED has identified the following provisions with which a State or LEA need not comply during the 2016-2017 school year because those provisions are not continued under ESSA:

1. Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) and (h)(2) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which require each State and LEA to report performance against AMOs (see C-9);
2. Section 1111(h)(6)(B)(ii) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires a school to notify parents when their child has been assigned to, or has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who is not highly qualified (see D-3);
3. Section 1117 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires a State to provide certain types of school supports and recognition (see C-6);
4. Section 1119 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires that each LEA hire highly qualified teachers; that each State and LEA report on progress toward all teachers being highly qualified; and that each LEA ensure that paraprofessionals meet certain qualifications and perform certain duties (see C-7);
5. Section 2141 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires an LEA not making progress toward all teachers being highly qualified to create and implement an improvement plan and requires the State to provide technical assistance to such LEA (see D-2);
6. Section 3122(a) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires each State to establish annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) (see E-1); and,
7. Section 3302(b) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires each LEA receiving Title III funds that fails to meet one or more of the AMAOs to provide notice to parents of such failure (see E-3).

As ED continues to analyze the ESSA, it may update this list as necessary. Please note, however, that any requirements not explicitly excluded through this document, or forthcoming guidance, remain required through the 2016-2017 school year. **See B-11 for specific provisions that ED will not require a State or LEA to comply with so that a priority or focus school is able to continue to implement appropriate interventions in the 2016-2017 school year.**

A-5. Through the 2016-2017 school year, must a State and its LEAs continue to collect data for the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) to submit to EDFacts in accordance with the ESEA, as amended by NCLB?

In general, through the 2016-2017 school year, each State and its LEAs that receives funds under a State formula grant program under the ESEA must continue to collect data for submission to ED in accordance with NCLB requirements. There are some specific exceptions to this general rule as discussed in questions A-4a, A-4b, A-5a, and B-11.

A-5a. Are there any NCLB reporting requirements with which a State or LEA need not comply?

In order to ensure an orderly transition from ESEA requirements under the NCLB to those under the ESSA, ED has identified the following data elements that a State or LEA need not report to EDFacts based on data from the specified years because those elements are not required under ESSA:

1. AMO and AYP files (file specification numbers N109 and N111) based on data from the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. (See C-11)
2. Data on supplemental educational services and public school choice based on data from the 2016-2017 school year (file specifications C010, C128, and C164. (See C-12)
3. AMAO data (data groups 569, 518, and 688 in file specification number N103) based on data from the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years. (See E-4)
4. Highly qualified teacher data files (file specification numbers N063 and N064) based on data from the 2016-2017 school year. (See D-4)

A-6. Must a State submit a consolidated State application in July 2016 to receive FY 2016 funds?

No, a State is not required to submit a consolidated State application for funding to ED in July 2016 to receive FY 2016 formula funds. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, clarifies that FY 2016 formula grant funds will be administered in accordance with the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. ED will provide additional information about consolidated State applications for future funding under the ESSA.

B. GUIDANCE REGARDING ESEA FLEXIBILITY

This section provides guidance related to changes to support the transition to the ESSA for States operating with approved ESEA flexibility requests in the 2015-2016 school year.

IMPLEMENTING INTERVENTIONS IN IDENTIFIED SCHOOLS

B-1. Must a State continue to implement its ESEA flexibility request?

Each State with an approved ESEA flexibility request must continue to implement that request through the 2015-2016 school year. All ESEA flexibility requests are null and void as of August 1, 2016.

B-2. For a State with an approved ESEA flexibility request, what are the general requirements regarding priority and focus school interventions for the 2016-2017 school year?

In accordance with section 5(e)(2)(B)(ii) of the ESSA, a State with priority and focus schools as identified under an approved ESEA flexibility request must continue to implement interventions applicable to such schools through the 2016-2017 school year.

B-3. What are the general requirements regarding priority and focus school lists for the 2016-2017 school year?

As stated in the [December 18, 2015, DCL](#), a State implementing ESEA flexibility must select one of the following options with regard to their priority and focus school lists:

Option A: Do not exit schools and maintain current identification. A State may “freeze” its current lists of priority and focus schools as of December 9, 2015 (the day before the date of enactment of the ESSA). The State may not exit schools from the current lists. These are the schools that will continue to implement their approved interventions through the remaining months of the 2015-2016 school year and in the 2016-2017 school years.

Option B: Exit schools and identify new priority and focus schools. A State may exit priority and focus schools that meet the State’s approved exit criteria and identify new priority (at least 5 percent of Title I schools) and focus (at least 10 percent of Title I schools) schools based on more recent data. These schools would implement their approved interventions through the 2016-2017 school year. As stated in the [December 18, 2015, DCL](#), a State selecting this option must provide updated lists of priority and focus schools to ED by **March 1, 2016**.

B-4. During renewal of ESEA flexibility requests in 2015, some States provided an assurance that they would submit updated priority and focus school lists no later than January 31, 2016. What are these States now required to do?

States that provided an assurance to submit updated priority and focus school lists no later than January 31, 2016, are no longer required to meet this assurance. Instead, all States with approved

ESEA flexibility requests must “freeze” their lists or, by March 1, 2016, exit schools and identify new priority and focus schools, as outlined in B-3.

B-5. If a State chooses Option A and freezes its current lists of priority and focus schools, what must it submit to ED?

A State choosing Option A does not need to submit anything to ED regarding its lists of priority and focus schools. However, all schools on these lists must continue to implement their approved interventions through the 2016-2017 school year.

B-6. If a State chooses Option A, can it exit schools at the end of the 2015-2016 school year?

No. As stated in the [December 18, 2015 DCL](#), a State choosing Option A may not exit schools at the end of the 2015–2016 school year.

B-7. If a State chooses Option A, can it add schools to its priority and focus school lists in order to ensure that 5 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of all Title I schools implement interventions through the 2016-2017 school year?

Yes. A State choosing Option A may add priority and focus schools to its lists to ensure that 5 percent and 10 percent of all Title I schools are implementing interventions. However, a State is not required to add schools to these lists if it chooses Option A. Additionally, as described in B-3, a State that chooses Option A does not need to submit updated lists of schools to ED, even after adding schools to its lists. Please note that, under Option A, a State may add schools to its lists of priority and focus schools but must not exit schools from these lists.

B-8. If a State chooses Option B and exits priority and focus schools that meet its approved exit criteria and identifies new schools based on more recent data, what must it submit to ED?

A State choosing Option B must provide its updated lists of priority and focus schools to ED by **March 1, 2016**. These lists must demonstrate that the State has identified the requisite number of priority and focus schools (at least 5 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of Title I schools).

B-9. If a State chooses Option B and exits priority and focus schools that meet its approved exit criteria but still has a sufficient number of schools on its lists, must it identify new schools?

No. If, after a State exits priority and focus schools based on its approved exit criteria, the State has still identified 5 percent and 10 percent of its Title I schools as, respectively, priority and focus schools, then it need not identify additional schools. However, as described in B-3, a State that chooses Option B must still submit its updated lists of priority and focus school to ED no later than March 1, 2016.

B-10. Must an LEA in a State implementing ESEA flexibility include on its LEA report card the names of schools it serves as focus and priority schools for the 2016-2017 school year?

Yes. An LEA in a State implementing ESEA flexibility must report on its LEA report card following the 2016–2017 school year the names of schools served by the LEA as priority and focus schools for the 2016-2017 school year.

B-11. All ESEA flexibility waivers are null and void on August 1, 2016, but priority and focus schools must continue to implement interventions beyond August 1, 2016. Is ED providing these States with any allowances to permit States to support these schools?

Yes. In order to ensure that an LEA in a State that was implementing ESEA flexibility on the day before enactment of the ESSA is able to comply with the ESSA transition requirement to continue to implement interventions applicable to priority and focus schools during the 2016-2017 school year, ED will not require a State or LEA to comply with the following requirements of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, so that a priority or focus school is able to continue to implement appropriate interventions in the 2016-2017 school year:

1. Section 1003(a), which requires a State to distribute at least 95 percent of the funds it reserves to allocate to LEAs for use in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring;
2. Section 1114(a)(1), which requires that a school have at least a 40 percent poverty rate to be eligible to operate a schoolwide program;
3. Section 6123(b), which limits the amount of certain federal funds an LEA may transfer between programs;
4. Sections 6213(b) and 6224(e), which require a State to permit an LEA that fails to make AYP to continue to participate in the Small, Rural School Achievement program and to receive a grant under the Rural and Low-Income School program only if the LEA uses funds to carry out ESEA section 1116; and
5. Sections 1113(a)(3)-(4) and (c)(1), which require an LEA to rank and serve eligible schools according to poverty and allocate Title I funds to schools in rank order of poverty.

C. TRANSITION GUIDANCE REGARDING TITLE I PROGRAMS AND REQUIREMENTS

This section provides guidance on ED's expectations during the transition to the ESSA regarding certain Title I requirements.

TITLE I, PART A REQUIREMENTS

C-1. How must a State and its LEAs administer FY 2016 Title I formula funds in the 2016-2017 school year?

As described in A-3, a State and its LEAs must administer FY 2016 Title I formula funds in accordance with NCLB requirements as they existed in the 2015-2016 school year, except for specific provisions of NCLB that ED has communicated to States are no longer required, as listed in A-4b and B-11.

C-2. Must a State develop and submit to ED for review and approval AMOs for performance in the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017 school years?

No. As explained in ED's [December 18, 2015, DCL](#), ED is not requiring a State to develop, or to submit for ED's review and approval, AMOs for school years 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017.

C-3. If a State is required to calculate AYP either under NCLB or its approved ESEA flexibility request, must that State continue to calculate AYP based on 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017 assessment results?

No. AYP calculations are not required for schools and LEAs based on 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017 school year assessment results. However, a State may choose to calculate AYP for schools and LEAs.

C-4. What are the general requirements for schools and LEAs identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the 2016-2017 school years?

Section 5(e)(2)(i) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, requires a school or LEA that was identified in 2015-2016 by the State as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under the ESEA as it existed prior to the enactment of the ESSA (*i.e.*, under NCLB) to continue to implement the same interventions in the 2016-2017 school year. A State is no longer required to ensure LEAs provide supplemental educational services, public school choice, or the attendant parental notice requirements (see C-5). In addition, for the reasons described in A-4a, LEAs are no longer required to provide a parent of a student in a school identified as in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with the notice described in section 1116(b)(6) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB.

C-5. Is a State required to ensure that LEAs provide students in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring with supplemental educational services and public school choice in the 2016-2017 school year?

No. A State is not required to ensure that LEAs with schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring provide supplemental educational services, public school choice, and the related notice to parents in the 2016-2017 school year, but a State *may* choose to do so. A State that elects not to require LEAs to provide students with supplemental educational services, public school choice, and the related parental notice must develop and implement a one-year transition plan to support the orderly transition to the ESSA.

C-6. Must a State continue to provide recognition and supports to schools as required under section 1117 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB?

A State must continue to comply with section 1117 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, through the 2015-2016 school year. For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in section 1117 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, which requires a State to provide support for LEAs and schools receiving Title I, Part A funds and recognition of schools that close achievement gaps and exceed AYP targets.

C-7. Must a State and its LEAs continue to comply with the requirements in section 1119 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which describe certain requirements for teachers and paraprofessionals?

A State and its LEAs must continue to comply with section 1119 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, through the 2015-2016 school year, including the requirement that a State and LEA report information related to highly qualified teachers based on the 2014–2015 and 2015–2016 school years. For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in section 1119 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, which set forth requirements for highly qualified teachers, the qualifications and duties for paraprofessionals, and use of funds to support compliance with the highly qualified teacher requirements.

C-8. Must a State continue to implement its State Plan to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators through the 2016-2017 school year?

Yes. State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, which each State developed to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, remain in effect for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years for all States. Section 1111(g)(1)(B) of the ESSA contains a similar requirement that low-income and minority children not be served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, inexperienced, and out-of-field teachers. ED will provide additional information on this new requirement in the future.

TITLE I, PART A REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

C-9. What must a State and its LEAs continue to publish in State and local report cards for the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years?

Each State must continue to implement the report card requirements under Title I, Part A of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, based on data from the 2014-2015 (if they have not yet been published), 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years, except for specific provisions that ED has communicated to States that are no longer required in order to ensure an orderly transition to the ESSA (see A-4). For example, State report cards must continue to include each LEA's student achievement on the State assessments compared to students and subgroups of students in the State as a whole. At the school level, the LEA must include a school's student achievement on the State assessments compared to students and subgroups of students in the LEA and in the State as a whole.

For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in sections 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) and (h)(2). States and LEAs are, therefore, no longer required to include the following elements in State and local report cards based on data from the 2014-2015 (if they have not yet been published), 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years: AYP (see C-3) and AMOs (see C-2). Additionally, as discussed in C-7 and D-5, States and LEAs are not required to include teacher quality information in report cards based on data from the 2016–2017 school year.

C-10. What must a State and its LEAs include in State and local report cards with respect to AYP, since a State is no longer required to submit AMOs to ED for review and approval?

A State and its LEAs are not required to report on State and local report cards whether an LEA or school made AYP based on the 2014-2015 (if not already published), 2015-2016, or 2016-2017 assessment results. However, a State and its LEAs must continue to report on State and local report cards the most recent LEA and school improvement statuses, including priority and focus school statuses, as indicated in the 2013 Report Card Non-Regulatory Guidance available at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/state_local_report_card_guidance_2-08-2013.pdf.

C-11. What must a State report to ED as part of the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school year CSPR submissions with respect to AMOs and AYP, since a State is no longer required to submit AMOs to ED for review and approval?

A State is no longer required to submit AMO files (file specification numbers N109 and N111) to ED Facts for the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 submissions. A State is no longer required to respond to accountability questions in section 1.4 of the CSPR (specifically, 1.4.1 Number and percentage of schools and districts that made AYP; 1.4.1 Number and percentage of schools and districts that met all AMOs, 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator; 1.4.2, Number and percentage of Title I schools that made AYP; 1.4.2, Number and percentage of Title I schools that met all AMOs, 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator; 1.4.3 Number and percentage of districts that received Title I funds that made AYP; and 1.4.3 Number and percentage of districts that received Title I funds that met all AMOs, 95 percent participation rate, and other academic indicator).

Please note that each State is still required to report the other component parts of AYP, including performance against the participation targets in reading and math (file specification numbers N108 and N110) and performance against the other academic indicators (file specification numbers N106 and N107). Each State is also still required to submit all related numeric data, including assessment results for each grade level, subgroup, and subject; participation rates for each grade level, subgroup,

and subject; and graduation rates for each subgroup. For further clarification about which EDFacts files are still required, please contact the EDFacts Partner Support Center toll free at 877-457-3336; e-mail at EDEN_SS@ed.gov; or visit <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/eden/contacts.html>.

For a State that has already submitted this information for the 2014-2015 school year, there is no additional action required.

C-12. What must a State report to ED as part of the 2016-2017 school year CSPR submissions with respect to supplemental educational services and public school choice, since a State is no longer required to ensure that its LEAs provide those options?

States are no longer required to submit data on supplemental educational services and public school choice to EDFacts for the 2016-2017 submissions (file specifications C010, C128, and C164). States are no longer required to respond to supplemental educational services questions and public school choice questions in section 1.4 of the CSPR (1.4.9.1.2, Public School Choice – Students, 1.4.9.1.3, Funds Spent on Public School Choice, 1.4.9.1.4, Availability of Public School Choice Options, 1.4.9.2.2, Supplemental Educational Services – Students, and 1.4.9.2.3, Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services), when reporting on the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years.

D. GUIDANCE REGARDING TITLE II, PART A PROGRAMS AND REQUIREMENTS

This section provides guidance regarding Title II programs and requirements during the transition to the ESSA.

TITLE II, PART A REQUIREMENTS

D-1. Must a State ensure that special education teachers are “highly qualified,” as defined in section 9101 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2016-2017 school year?

No. The ESSA amended the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) by removing the definition of “highly qualified” in section 602(10) and the requirement in section 612(a)(14)(C) that special education teachers be “highly qualified” by the deadline established in section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. Accordingly, a State is not required to ensure that special education teachers are “highly qualified” as defined in the ESEA beginning with the 2016-2017 school year but must ensure that they meet the requirements described in D-1a.

D-1a. If the definition of “highly qualified” is no longer applicable to special education teachers, what are the federal requirements related to the professional qualifications of those teachers?

The ESSA amended section 612(a)(14)(C) of the IDEA by incorporating the requirement previously in section 602(10)(B) that a person employed as a special education teacher in elementary school, middle school, or secondary school must: 1) have obtained full certification as a special education teacher (including certification obtained through alternative routes to certification), or passed the State special education teacher licensing examination and hold a license to teach in the State as a special education teacher; 2) not have had special education certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis; and 3) hold at least a bachelor’s degree. Each State must continue to comply with these certification requirements during the 2016-2017 school year.

D-2. Must a State continue to comply with the requirements in section 2141 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, under which the State must ensure that LEAs take certain actions if they do not make progress toward all teachers being highly qualified and do not make AYP?

Each State must continue to comply with section 2141 through the 2015-2016 school year. For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in section 2141 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2016-2017 school year. Specifically, section 2141 of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, requires an LEA to take certain actions if it does not make progress toward all teachers being highly qualified and does not make AYP, including developing an improvement plan. Thus, beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, an LEA is not required to develop an improvement plan or restrict the use of Federal education funds pursuant to such a plan, and a State is not required to provide the LEA the technical assistance that would be required to develop such a plan. Additionally, the State is not required to enter into the agreement required by

section 2141(c) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, with an LEA. In addition, an LEA is no longer restricted in its use of Title I, Part A funds for hiring paraprofessionals.

D-3. Must a school continue to comply with section 1111(h)(6)(B)(ii) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires a school to notify parents when their child has been assigned to, or has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by, a teacher who is not highly qualified?

No. For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in section 1111(h)(6)(B)(ii) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, beginning with the 2016-2017 school year. Schools will no longer be required to provide notice to parents related to the highly qualified status of their child's teacher. Please note that LEAs are required to continue with section 1111(h)(6)(A) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires an LEA to notify parents that they may request and the LEA will provide certain information regarding the professional qualifications of the student's teachers and paraprofessionals, as appropriate.

TITLE II, PART A REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

D-4. What must a State report to ED as part of the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school year CSPR submissions as it relates to reporting on highly qualified teachers?

A State must continue to report highly qualified teacher information to ED through the CSPR based on data from the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years. States will not be expected to submit highly qualified teacher data files (file specification numbers N063 and N064) to EDFacts based on data from the 2016-2017 school year. States are no longer required to respond to teacher quality questions in section 1.5 of the CSPR.

D-5. What must a State and its LEA continue to publish in State and local report cards for the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school years related to teacher quality?

State and local report cards for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years must continue to include information on teacher quality, as indicated in the 2013 Report Card Non-Regulatory Guidance available at http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/state_local_report_card_guidance_2-08-2013.pdf. States are no longer required to report information on teacher quality beginning with State and local report cards based on 2016-2017 school year information.

E. GUIDANCE REGARDING TITLE III, PART A PROGRAMS AND REQUIREMENTS

This section provides guidance regarding Title III programs and requirements during the transition to the ESSA.

TITLE III, PART A REQUIREMENTS

E-1. Must a State make new AMAO determinations based on 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 assessment results?

No. For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in section 3122(a) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB. As such, a State is not required to make new accountability determinations based on 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 assessment data (as appropriate). A State that chooses not to make new AMAO accountability determinations may freeze district accountability determinations under Title III based on the most recent AMAO calculations, and must continue to implement corresponding supports and interventions in those LEAs for the remaining months of the 2015-2016 school year and the 2016-2017 school year (see E-2).

E-2. If a State chooses not to make new AMAO accountability determinations, what are the general requirements for LEAs in the 2016-2017 school year that did not meet AMAOs for at least two or four years based on the most recent AMAO determinations that the State made?

An LEA that was implementing an improvement plan in the 2015-2016 school year or other interventions or reforms pursuant to section 3122(b)(4) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, must continue to implement the improvement plan or other interventions and reforms in the 2016-2017 school year, and the State must continue to provide technical assistance and support to each such LEA.

E-3. Must an LEA that fails to meet one or more of its AMAOs based on assessment results from the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017 school year (or would not meet its AMAOs if the State made AMAO determinations) provide notice to parents of such failure in accordance with section 3302(b) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB?

No. For the reasons described in A-4b, ED is not requiring States to comply with the requirements in section 3302(b). Because ED is not requiring the calculation of AMAOs based on assessment results from the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, or 2016-2017 school years, States and LEAs are not required to comply with the parental notification requirements in section 3302(b) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, which requires each LEA that fails to meet one or more of the AMAOs to provide notice to parents of such failure.

Please note, however, that each State and LEA must continue to comply with the parental notification requirements in section 3302(a) of the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, through the 2016-2017 school year, which requires that an LEA provide notice to the parent or parents of a student identified as an English learner within 30 days of the start of the school year (or, for students identified later in the school year, within two weeks) that includes, for example, the reason for identification, parents' rights, and other important information.

TITLE III, PART A REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

E-4. What must a State report to ED as part of the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 school year CSPR submissions as it relates to AMAOs?

A State is no longer required to submit AMAO data collected through EDFacts (data groups 569, 518, and 688 in file specification number N103) for the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 submissions. This means a State is no longer required to provide information in section 1.6.4.1 of the CSPR (specifically, Title III subgrantee performance). For a State that has already submitted this information for the 2014-2015 school year, there is no additional action required. For a State that has not yet submitted this information, there is no need to submit it in the future. ED does not expect a State to report this information for the 2015-2016 school year CSPR collection that will begin in fall 2016 or for the 2016-2017 CSPR collection that will begin in fall 2017.

Please note, however, that there are no changes to other components of the Title III CSPR reporting requirements. Each State is still required to report, for example, the number and target number of English learners making progress and English learners attaining proficiency on the State's annual English language proficiency assessment.

COMPARISON OF SELECT ELEMENTS OF ESEA

No Child Left Behind v. Every Student Succeeds Act

December 8, 2015

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
<p>Authorization Structure</p>	<p>Generally includes separate authorizations for separate programs, with the exception being the 21 programs authorized under one authorization of appropriations under the Fund for the Improvement for Education (Title V, Part D of current law)</p>	<p>Maintains the separately authorized large and medium formula grant programs in ESEA, including (among others) Title I, Migrant Education, Neglected and Delinquent, Title II (Teacher and Leader Quality), Title III (English Learners), Charter Schools, Indian Education, Impact Aid and others.</p> <p>In contrast to current law, many “small” ESEA programs are not separately authorized and instead would be funded through reservations of other programs/authorizations or their activities are funded through the Student Supports and Academic Achievement Grants authority.</p> <p>The authorization period for programs under the bill is FY 2017 through FY 2020. Effective dates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/1/2016 for competitive programs • 7/1/2016 for noncompetitive (formula) programs • School year 2017-2018 for Accountability requirements (sections 1111(c) and (d)) • FY 2017 appropriations for Impact Aid <p>Multi year awards for programs which are authorized or are substantially similar to authorized programs continue through length of original award</p> <p>Multi-year awards for programs which are not authorized end after 2016 (regardless of award cycle).</p> <p>Secretary is provided “orderly” transition authority from NCLB to ESSA.</p> <p>Below is the authorization/reservation structure of the conference report. Unless otherwise noted as being funded through a reservation, a program listed below has a separate authorization of appropriations.</p> <p>Title I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Education Agency Grants (Part A) (within Part A States are required to reserve funds for School Improvement Activities (7%) and may reserve funds for Direct Student Services (up to 3%)) • State Assessments (within the State assessment program, up to 20% of funding is reserved for State and local assessment audits) • Education of Migratory Children • Neglected and Delinquent • Federal Activities – Evaluations. • Flexibility for Equitable Per-Pupil Funding (this is a demonstration authority for a limited number of LEAs, so not a program)

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<p>Title II – Preparing, Training and Recruiting Teachers, Principals or Other School Leaders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A – State Grants • Part B contains all national activities and is split into four subparts funded through reservations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 1 – Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program (2017-2019– 49.1%, 2020–47%) • Subpart 2--Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (2017-2019– 34.1%, 2020–36.8%) • Subpart 3--American History and Civics Education (2017-2020–1.4%) • Subpart 4--Programs of National Significance (2017-2019–15.4%, 2020–14.8%) Programs of National Significance include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Supporting Effective Educator Development (not less than 74% of the subpart 4 allocation) ○ School Leader Recruitment and Support (not less than 22% of the subpart 4 allocation) ○ Technical assistance (not less than 2% of the subpart 4 allocation) ○ STEM Master Teacher Corps (not more than 2% of the subpart 4 allocation) <p>Title III – English Learners and Immigrant Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Grants for Language instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students. <p>Title IV – 21st Century Schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A – Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants • Part B – 21st Century Community Learning Centers • Part C – Charter Schools • Part D – Magnet Schools • Part E – Statewide Family Engagement Centers • Part F – National Activities – Divided into 4 subparts and funded through reservations a follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Subpart 1 – Education Innovation and Research - (2017-2018–36%, 2019-2020–42%) ○ Subpart 2 – Community Support for School Success (2017-2018– 36%, 2019–2020–32%) ○ Subpart 3 – National Activity for School Safety (\$5 million) ○ Subpart 4 – Academic Enrichment - (2017-2018–28%, 2019-2020–26%) Made up of 3 sections. Secretary is required to fund each (but a minimum is not set): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arts Education ▪ Ready to Learn Programing ▪ Javitz Gifted and Talented <p>Title V – State Innovation and Local Flexibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transferability (authority – not a program) • Rural Education <p>Title VI – Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<p>Title VII – Impact Aid</p> <p>Title VIII – ESEA General Provisions</p> <p>Title IX –McKinney-Vento Act and Other Provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preschool Development Grants
Standards	<p>All states are required to have academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading or language arts and science which must include four levels of performance: advanced, proficient, basic and below basic.</p> <p>U.S. Department of Education officers and employees are barred from any action that might mandate or control a state’s, LEA’s or school’s instruction and standards.</p>	<p>States must provide an assurance that they have adopted challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading or language arts and science. The achievement standards would have to include not less than 3 levels of achievement.</p> <p>States must provide an assurance that the state’s standards are aligned with: entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the state and relevant State career and technical education standards</p>
Standards and Assessments Related to Students with Disabilities	<p>Two separate regulations apply to standards related to students with disabilities, alternative standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (1% regulation) and modified achievement standards for other students with disabilities (2% regulation). In a state’s accountability system, the scores of students with disabilities assessed against the 1% standards are limited to the number that is 1% of all students in a state. Scores of students with disabilities assessed against the 2% standards are limited to the number of students that is 2% of all students in a state.</p>	<p>Places a cap of 1% of the total number of all students in the State that can be assessed using alternative assessments for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The statutory language does not authorize an LEA cap on the administration of these assessments, but does require LEAs to submit information to the SEA justifying the need to exceed such cap. SEAs are required to provide additional oversight for LEAs which must submit this information. The overall authority to administer these assessments (and the 1% cap) is specifically subject to ESEA’s waiver authority.</p>
English Language Proficiency Standards	<p>Each state is required to have English language proficiency standards.</p>	<p>Maintains the requirement to have English language proficiency standards. Standards would have to be aligned with the challenging State academic standards.</p>
Assessments	<p>Each state is required to have implemented a set of high-quality, yearly student academic assessments that include, at a minimum, academic assessments in mathematics, reading or language arts, and science</p> <p>Math and reading/English language arts are assessed annually in grades 3-8 and once in grades 10-12. Science is assessed once in each of the following grade spans: 3-5; 6-9; and 10-12. In order to make Adequately Yearly Progress (AYP), schools must assess at least 95% of each subgroup in their school.</p>	<p>Each state is required to have implemented a set of high-quality student academic assessments in math, reading or language arts, and science.</p> <p>Assessment timelines from current law are maintained.</p> <p>Assessments may, at the state’s discretion, measure individual student growth.</p> <p>State systems can measure achievement through an annual summative assessment or multiple statewide assessments, the results of which would be required to be combined to produce a summative score.</p> <p>States may use computer-adaptive assessments and may measure a student’s academic proficiency above or below grade level and use such scores in the state accountability system.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<p>Does not generally allow for the use of local assessments, except states may allow an LEA to use a nationally-recognized high school academic assessment in lieu of a state assessment as long as such assessment is aligned to the State's standards and meet other requirements.</p> <p>Allows, but does not require, states to set a limit on the amount of time devoted to the aggregate amount of time devoted to assessment administration for each grade.</p> <p>Prohibits assessments under Title I from assessing personal or family beliefs.</p> <p>A State may exclude a recently arrived English Learner from one administration of the reading/ELA assessment or exclude the results of such English learner from the State's accountability system for the first year of enrollment.</p>
Grants for Assessments	<p>Authorizes grants to states for the development of the annual assessments for reading/English language arts and math and for enhanced assessment activities, such as those funding the development of the Common Core Assessments, English language proficiency assessments, pre-K assessments and greater accessibility on assessments for students with disabilities.</p>	<p>Continues authorization for grants to states for the development of assessments with some modifications, including allowing states to use funds to refine science assessments in order to integrate engineering design skills and practices into such assessments.</p> <p>Also authorizes grants for enhanced assessments similar to current law. Includes language prohibiting funds to be used to mandate, direct, control, incentivize, or make financial awards conditioned upon a State developing an assessment common to a number of states.</p> <p>Authorizes funds for states and local educational agencies to audit their state and local assessment system with the goal of eliminating unnecessary assessments and streamlining assessment systems. This authority allows for the buying out of existing assessment contracts.</p>
Innovative Assessment Pilot	<p>No applicability</p>	<p>Includes Secretary authority to provide up to 7 states initial authority (with potential of expansion) to carry out innovative assessments such as competency-based, cumulative year-end assessments.</p>
NAEP	<p>States are required to provide an assurance that they will participate in 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics assessments under the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) if the Secretary pays for the costs of such assessments.</p>	<p>Maintains current law with respect to NAEP participation.</p>
Opting Out of Assessments	<p>No provisions on opt out. As noted above, requires 95% participation rate.</p>	<p>Requires 95% assessment participation for all students and subgroups. Participation rates must be a factor in state accountability systems, but the state determines how they are factored in. Also notes that nothing in the assessment section of Title I preempts state or local law with respect to a parental decision on assessment participation.</p> <p>Requires LEAs to provide parents, on request and in a timely manner, with information regarding state or local policy, procedures and parental rights regarding student participation in mandated assessments.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
Title I State Plan Provisions	<p>The Secretary is required to approve a Title I state plan within 120 days of its submission unless the Secretary determines it does not meet the statutory requirements. States must be provided an opportunity to revise and resubmit their plan.</p>	<p>The Secretary is required to establish a peer-review process to assist in the review of state plans.</p> <p>The Secretary is required to approve a state plan not later than 120 days after submission unless the Secretary meets specific criteria in the bill in which to disapprove such plan.</p> <p>States are not required to submit their standards for review to the Secretary.</p> <p>State plans are in effect for the duration of the state's participation in Title I</p> <p>State plans must be available for not less than 30 days prior to being submitted to the Secretary.</p> <p>Among other provisions, States must provide an assurance that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A foster child can remain in their school of origin; 2. An enrolling school immediately contacts a foster child's last school of origin to obtain relevant records; 3. An enrolling school enroll a foster child even if relevant records are not immediately available; and 4. The SEA appoints a point of contact to oversee these requirements and coordinate with child welfare agencies. <p>Title I LEA plans require LEAs and child welfare agencies to coordinate on the provision of transportation for foster children to attend their school of origin.</p> <p>Failure to meet requirements of the state plan could result in withholding of all funds for state administration, compared to 25% in current law.</p> <p>In their state plans, states must provide an assurance that certain data that can be cross tabulated by subgroup is provided publicly, which may include providing it through the state report card.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
Limitation on Secretary's Authority		<p>Includes many limitations to the authority of the Secretary, including:</p> <p>With respect to the state accountability system, may not add requirements or criteria that are inconsistent or outside of the scope of Title I-A or in excess of statutory authority granted to the Secretary;</p> <p>As a condition of the state plan or any waiver, the Secretary may not –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • require a state to add new requirements; • require a state to add or delete specific elements to the standards; • prescribe goals of progress or measurements of interim progress that are set by states under the accountability system; • prescribe specific assessments or items to be used in assessments; • prescribe indicators that states must use; • prescribe the weight of measures or indicators; • prescribe the specific methodology states must use to differentiate or identify schools; • prescribe school improvement strategies or exit criteria; • prescribe min. N-sizes; • prescribe any teacher or principal evaluation system; • prescribe any measures of teacher or principal effectiveness; • prescribe the way in which the State factors the 95% requirement into their accountability system. <p>The Secretary is also not empowered to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issue new non-regulatory guidance that seeks to provide explanation of the requirements under section 1111, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ provide a strictly limited or exhaustive list for implementation purposes; and ○ purports to be legally binding or • requires new data collection beyond data from existing Federal, State and local reporting. <p>The Secretary is also prohibited from defining a term that is inconsistent with or outside the scope of Title I, Part A.</p>
Schoolwide Programs	Schools with 40% and higher levels of students from low-income families can operate a schoolwide programs	Maintains general school wide eligibility at 40% poverty, but allows States to approve schools to operate a schoolwide program with a lower poverty percentage.
Report Cards	Each state and LEA is required to publish report cards that include information on student achievement, graduation rates and the professional qualifications of teachers. Student achievement data must be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency and status as economically disadvantaged. LEA report cards also contain information on the number of schools identified for school improvement and comparisons of achievement at individual schools to the LEA and state.	<p>Maintains a requirement for state and LEA report cards. Elements included on the state report card include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A concise description of the accountability system, goals, indicators and weights of indicators used in such system; • For all students and the accountability subgroups (racial and ethnic groups, economically disadvantaged status, English proficiency status, gender and migrant status), plus homeless and

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<p>foster youth, and students with a parent in the military, disaggregation on student achievement on the academic assessments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all students and the accountability subgroups, percentage of students assessed and not assessed; • For all students and, the accountability subgroups, information on the elementary school indicator and high school graduation rates used as part of a state’s accountability system (with disaggregation on homeless and foster youth with respect to graduation rates); • Information on acquisition of English proficiency by English learners; • Information on measures of school quality, or student success; • Progress of all students and subgroups on long term goals and measurements of interim progress under accountability system; • Minimum number of students for subgroups to be included in accountability and reporting; • Percentage of all students and subgroups assessed and not assessed; • Information that the state and each LEA reports under the Civil Rights Data Collection biennial survey; • Professional qualifications of teachers, principals and other school leaders disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools on certain categories, including the number, percentage and distribution of inexperienced teachers, principals and other school leaders; teachers with emergency credentials; teacher who are teaching out of subject; • Per-pupil expenditures of federal, state and local funds, disaggregated by source of funds; • Number and percentage of students with significant cognitive disabilities that take an alternative assessment; • Results on NAEP in grades 4 and 8 in reading and math; • Starting in 2017, the rate at which students in high schools enroll in postsecondary education; and • Any additional information the state wishes to provide. <p>Local report cards require all of the information reported on the state report cards with the exception of NAEP results as applied to the LEA and school and how the performance of each school’s students compare to performance of the LEA and State as a whole.</p> <p>States are also required to report similar information to that required on the state report card to the Secretary.</p> <p>The Secretary is required to annually transmit a national report card to the House and Senate committees.</p> <p>States, through the Title I state plan, are required to describe how they will assess the state system for collecting data for state report cards and provide support to minimize data collection burden for LEAs for state report cards.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
<p>Adequate Yearly Progress/ State Accountability</p>	<p>Each state is required to have a definition of AYP in place that sets annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for subgroups in all schools to meet 100% proficiency on state assessments by the 2013-1014 school year.</p> <p>In addition, secondary schools are required to include graduation rates and elementary schools are required to use an academic indicator in addition to the assessments results described above in their definitions of AYP.</p>	<p>The agreement replaces ESEA’s current adequate yearly progress system with a State-defined index system with certain federally-required components.</p> <p>Goals – Under this system, States must establish “ambitious State-designed long term goals” with measurements of interim progress for all students and subgroups of students on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved academic achievement on State assessments. • Graduation rates. • Progress in achieving English language proficiency for English learners (EL). <p>State Index – The State-defined index must include the following indicators (measured for all students and subgroups, except for the EL proficiency indicator):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Academic achievement based on the annual assessments and on the State’s goals. ○ A measure of student growth or other statewide academic indicator for elementary and middle schools. ○ Graduation rates for high schools based on the State’s goals. ○ Progress in achieving English proficiency for English Learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and the same high school grade in which the State assesses for Math/ELA. • Measure of School Quality and Student Success <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one measure of school quality or student success (several examples are listed including student and educator engagement, access and completion of advanced coursework, postsecondary readiness, school climate and safety, and another State selected indicator). <p>Based on the performance of schools and subgroups in schools on the indicators described above, States are required to “meaningfully differentiate” public schools in the State on an annual basis.</p> <p>“Substantial weight” is required to be given the Academic Indicators (described above) and these 4 indicators must, in the aggregate be given “much greater weight” in the differentiation process than any Measures of School Quality or Student Success (described above).</p> <p>While not specifically named as an indicator in the accountability system, States are required to annually measure the achievement of not less than 95% of all students and subgroups of students in public schools using Title I State assessments. States are permitted to and must provide a clear and understandable explanation of how the 95% assessment requirement will factor into the accountability system.</p> <p>Under the State’s accountability system, for recently arrived English learners taking the reading/ELA assessment, a state may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the first year of enrollment exclude the results of such assessments; • In the second year of enrollment, include a measure of student growth on such assessments; and • In the third and subsequent years of enrollment, include proficiency on such assessments.

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		States are permitted to include a student in the EL subgroup for up to 4 years after the student is proficient in English for the purposes of the State accountability system.
School Improvement Structure/ Identification and Notification for Comprehensive Support and Improvement and Targeted Support and Improvement	<p>Each LEA must identify schools that do not make AYP for a certain number of years for school improvement, corrective action and restructuring. Schools are identified for school improvement after missing AYP for two years; for corrective action after missing AYP for four years; and for Restructuring after missing AYP for five years.</p>	<p>Under the conference report, ESEA's identification for school improvement, corrective action, restructuring, public school choice and supplemental educational services is replaced with two categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement and 2. Targeted Support and Improvement. <p>Identification for Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Beginning with school year 2017-2018 and at least once every 3 years, States must identify schools for “comprehensive support and improvement.” States are also required to set exit criteria for schools that are identified to exit such status. Schools that meet the following criteria are required to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 5% lowest performing in the State (as determined by the index and differentiation process). • High schools that graduate less than two-thirds of their students. • Schools for which a subgroup is consistently underperforming in the same manner as a school under lowest 5% category for a State-determined number of years. <p>LEAs must develop comprehensive support and improvement plans for schools identified. Plans are required to include evidence-based interventions, be based on a school-level needs assessment, identify resource inequities, be approved by the school, LEA and State Educational Agency (SEA), and be periodically monitored and reviewed by the SEA. LEAs can forgo implementation of the improvement activities for schools with less than 100 students enrolled. SEAs may allow differentiated improvement activities for high schools that predominantly serve students returning to education after dropping out who are significantly off-track to graduate from high school. LEAs may provide students with the option to transfer to another public school, including paying for transportation costs (up to 5% of their Title I allocation).</p> <p>After a state-determined period of years (not to exceed 4 years) States must take more rigorous state determined action if a school identified for comprehensive support and intervention has not met the exit criteria.</p> <p>Notification of Targeted Support and Improvement - In addition to identification for comprehensive support and improvement, the State must annually notify LEAs with schools which have “consistently underperforming” subgroups. Schools which are notified must develop and implement a “targeted support and improvement plan” to improve outcomes for subgroups which generated the notification. These plans must include evidence-based interventions and be approved and monitored by the LEA. In addition, if the plan is not successfully implemented after a LEA determined number of years, additional action must take place. Schools for which plans are developed where subgroup performance, on its own, would lead to identification for comprehensive support and improvement as in the lowest 5% must also identify resource inequities to be addressed through plan implementation. As with other schools</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		which are identified, notification for target support and improvement will begin with the 2017-2018 academic year.
School Improvement Strategies	<p>Under Restructuring, LEAs are required to adopt one of five alternative governance arrangements for such schools:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reopening the school as a charter school; 2. Replacing all or most of the school staff relevant to the failure to make AYP; 3. Operating the school under a private management company; 4. State takeover; and 5. Other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement. <p>Under the regulations for the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program, schools identified for assistance must implement one of four turnaround models:</p> <p><u>Turnaround Model</u>, which would include, among other actions, replacing the principal and at least 50% of the school's staff, adopting a new governance structure, and implementing a new or revised instructional program.</p> <p><u>Restart Model</u>, in which an LEA would close the school and reopen it under the management of a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO) or an educational management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process.</p> <p><u>School Closure</u>, in which an LEA would close the school and enroll the students who attended the school in other, high-achieving schools in the LEA.</p> <p><u>Transformation Model</u>, which would address each of four specific areas critical to transforming the lowest achieving schools including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Developing teacher and school leader effectiveness</u>, which would include evaluations that are based in significant measure on student growth to improve teachers' and school leaders' performance; • <u>Comprehensive instructional reform strategies</u>, which would include the use of: instructional programs that are vertically aligned from one grade to the next and individualized student data (such as from formative, interim and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction; • <u>Extending learning time and creating community-oriented schools</u>, which would include providing: more time for students to learn core academic content by expanding the school day, the school week or the school year; more time for teachers to collaborate, including time for horizontal and vertical planning to improve instruction; more time or opportunities for enrichment activities for students; and ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement; • <u>Providing operating flexibility and sustained support</u>, which would include: giving the school sufficient operating flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes; and ensuring the school receives technical assistance from the LEA, SEA or an external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO). 	<p>The conference report does not prescribe specific school improvement strategies.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
Supplemental Educational Services (SES) and Public School Choice	Students in schools that have not made AYP for two consecutive years must be offered the ability to choose another public school, and the LEA must provide or provide for transportation. Students in schools that have not made AYP for three years must be offered free tutoring (supplemental educational services).	States are required to reserve 3% of their Title I allocation to provide competitive grants to LEAs to provide “direct student services” (tutoring and/or to pay for the costs of transportation associated with public school choice). Also includes activities which may be supported to include the ability for students to enroll in courses not otherwise available at their school, such as advanced placement as well as credit recovery and academic acceleration courses that lead to a regular diploma.
Title I State Set-Aside for School Improvement	States must reserve 4% of their Title I, Part A grant, of which 95% must be allocated to LEAs to assist schools identified for school improvement. The amount reserved by the State must not decrease the amount of funds received by LEAs in the prior year.	Increases the set-aside from 4% to 7% (or, if a greater amount, the sum of the prior set-aside in addition to the funds received by the State under 1003(g) in the prior fiscal year). Funds are for states to carry out a statewide system of technical assistance and support for LEAs. Note, that as under current law, the amount reserved by the State must not decrease the amount of funds received by each LEA in the prior year.
High School Provisions	As mentioned in the AYP/state accountability section, graduation rates are required to be included as an additional indicator in state AYP definitions.	Graduation rates (including the 4-year-adjusted cohort graduation rates and extended-year adjusted graduation rates) are included in report cards and in the state-determined accountability system as described above.
Follow the Child State Option (Portability)/Equitable Funding Demonstration Program	No applicability.	Portability provisions are not included in the Conference report. The conference report establishes a Flexibility for Equitable Per-Pupil Funding Demonstration Authority. Under this authority, the Secretary can enter into local flexibility agreements with not more than 50 local educational agencies in order to provide them with flexibility to consolidate eligible Federal funds and State and local education funding into a single school funding system based on weighted per-pupil allocations for low-income and otherwise disadvantaged students.
Title I Formulas	Four formulas allocate Title I funds to states based on counts and concentrations of children from low-income families, state per-pupil spending on education, and, under the Equity and Effort (EFIG) formula, measures of state effort and equity in supporting education.	Makes technical and conforming changes to the four Title I formulas, but leaves these formulas in place with no significant structural change.
Teacher and Principal Evaluation	No such requirement.	Under Title II, SEAs and LEAs are permitted to develop and implement teacher and principal evaluation systems that are based in part on evidence of student achievement.
Highly Qualified Teachers	All Teachers in Title I programs must be highly qualified. All states must have a plan in place to ensure that teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified.	Eliminates any requirements related to highly qualified teachers and replaces them with a requirement for teachers working in Title I programs to meet applicable state certification and licensure standards. States are also required, as part of their state plan, to describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in Title I schools are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field and inexperienced teachers, principals or other school leaders. States are required to describe the measures they will use to evaluate and publicly report on this requirement.
Title II Structure	Under Part A, a program of formula grants to states is authorized with states making formula-based subgrants to LEAs. Also included is a separate authorization for a collection of National Activities (School Leadership, Early Childhood Educator Professional Development, etc.).	Continues separate authorization for state grants and national activities. Under Part A, authorizes a program of formula grants to states, which in turn would make formula-based subgrants to LEAs. Authorizes the following national activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance (up to 20% of the National Activities appropriation);

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competitive grants for nontraditional preparation and certification programs, evidence-based professional development and enhancement, etc. (at least 40%); • Competitive grants for school leader recruitment and support (at least 40%). <p>Part B contains all national activities and is split into four subparts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subpart 1 – Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program (2017-2019–49.1%, 2020–47%) • Subpart 2 – Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (2017-2019–34.1%, 2020–36.8%) • Subpart 3 – American History and Civics Education (2017-2020–1.4%) • Subpart 4 – Programs of National Significance (2017-2019–15.4%, 2020–14.8%) <p>Programs of National Significance include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting Effective Educator Development (not less than 74% of the subpart 4 allocation); • School Leader Recruitment and Support (not less than 22% of the subpart 4 allocation); • Technical assistance (not less than 2% of the subpart 4 allocation); • STEM Master Teacher Corps which includes support for SEA/non-profit ability to provide effective professional development across the state (not more than 2% of the subpart 4 allocation)
Title II Federal-to-State Formula	<p>For Part A, allocates 35% of funds based on each state’s relative share of school-aged population and 65% based on each state’s relative share of population of school-aged children living in poverty, except that no state may receive less than:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A “hold-harmless” amount equal to its combined allocation under two predecessor programs in FY 2001; or 2. 0.5% of the total. 	<p>For Part A, a formula change is phased in over 4 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2017, 35% of funds are allocated based on each state's share of all children and 65% on each state's share of children living in poverty; • In 2018, 30% of funds are allocated based on each state's share of all children and 70% on each state's share of children living in poverty; • In 2019, 25% of funds are allocated based on each state's share of all children and 75% on each state's share of children living in poverty; • In 2020, 20% of funds are allocated based on each state’s share of all children and 80% on each state’s share of children living in poverty. <p>The conference report includes a hold harmless that phases out over 6 years.</p>
Title II State Set-Aside and Activities	<p>Permits SEAs to reserve 2.5% for state-level activities. 18 separate activities authorized (reforming certification, teacher supports, alternative route programs, recruitment, professional development, etc.). Within the 2.5%, 1% of the state's allocation may be used for state administration.</p> <p>Sets aside 2.5% for Institution of Higher Education (IHE)-LEA partnership grants.</p>	<p>Permits the SEA to reserve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1% for administration; • Remaining state-level funds, which would be capped at 5% total, except as described below for additional state-level activities – 21 activities authorized (reform of certification, licensure and tenure systems; development and implementation of teacher evaluation and support systems; residency programs, etc.) Note: Not more than 2% of the State's 5% allotment may be used to establish or expand teacher, principal or other school leader preparation academies if it is allowable under state law, candidates are eligible for state financial aid to the same extent as participants in other state-approved teacher or principal preparation programs, and the state enables teachers, principals and other school leaders to teach and work in the state while enrolled in the preparation academy. • Up to an additional 3% for additional state activities for principals and other school leaders

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
Title II Within-State Formula	SEAs allocate subgrant funds to LEAs 20% based on total school-aged population and 80% school-aged population living in poverty. No LEA may receive less than it received under two predecessor programs in FY2001.	Same formula as in current law, but deletes the hold harmless.
Title II Local Uses of Funds	<p>Authorizes multiple allowable activities, most related to improvement of teaching and school leadership. Specific activities include developing and implementing mechanisms to assist schools in recruiting highly qualified teachers, providing professional development and other activities to improve the quality of the teaching force.</p> <p>Also authorizes the use of funds for recruitment and hiring of teachers to reduce class sizes, particularly in the early grades.</p>	<p>Specifies that all funds must be used for comprehensive evidence-based programs that are consistent with the principles of effectiveness and addresses the learning needs of all students. Provides an illustrative list of possible uses of funds, including developing or improving teacher and school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on student achievement, recruitment and retention initiatives; recruitment of mid-career professionals into education; high-quality professional development; residency programs; reform of preparation programs; and supporting the instructional services provided by school librarians.</p> <p>Authorizes the use of program funds for “reducing class size to an evidence-based level.”</p>
Title II Principles of Effectiveness	Not included. The local application must describe how local activities will be based on a review of scientifically based research, but the law does not require that activities meet certain principles of effectiveness.	No comparable provisions.
Title II Accountability	Requires an LEA, that the SEA determines, after two years, is not making sufficient progress toward meeting program objectives (re: highly qualified teachers, percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development) to develop a plan for meeting specific annual objectives. After a third year of failing to make progress, the SEA and LEA must enter into an agreement on the LEA's use of program funds and the SEA must provide funds directly to one or more of the LEA's schools.	No comparable provisions.
TIF	Appropriations bills have funded the Teacher Incentive Grant program. This program largely allows LEAs to operate alternative compensation models for teachers, including augmenting or basing teacher pay on academic performance.	<p>Maintains a separate Teacher Incentive Fund program, renaming it the Teacher and School Leader Incentive Fund.</p> <p>This version of the program in this bill would maintain a focus on performance-based compensation systems and provide an expanded focus to include the implementation, improvement or expansion of human capital management systems for teachers, principals and other school leaders. These systems would have to be developed in collaboration with teachers, principals and other school leaders.</p> <p>Grantees can conduct several activities with grant funds, including developing or improving an evaluation system; conducting outreach on how to construct an evaluation system; providing principals and other school leaders with autonomy and authority to make budgeting, scheduling, and staffing decisions; paying through a differentiated salary structure; improving recruitment, selection and placement of effective teachers and school leaders; and instituting career advancement opportunities.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
RTTT	The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 created the Race to the Top program (RTTT). This program provided competitive awards to states that agreed to institute a series of education reforms focused on college- and career-ready standards, improved teacher quality, better education data systems and improving school turnaround.	No applicability. Program is not authorized under the conference report.
i3	The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act of 2009 created the Investing in Innovation (i3) program. This program provided competitive awards to grants to develop and validate promising practices, strategies or programs with potential to improve student outcomes but for which efficacy has not yet been systematically studied.	<p>The conference report reserves 36% of funds in FYs 2017 and 2018 and 42% in FY2019 of Title IV, Part F National Activities for the Education Innovation and Research Initiative.</p> <p>This initiative would provide grants to develop, create implement, replicate or scale entrepreneurial, evidence-based innovations and evaluate such innovations. Eligible entities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs and SEAs (or consortia of these), • BIE, • nonprofits, and • consortiums of SEAs, LEAs, and nonprofits, businesses, educational service agencies or IHEs. <p>Eligible entities can receive one of three grant types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early phase grants (for initiatives which research suggests has promise, • Mid-phase grants (for initiatives which have been implemented under an early-phase grant or similar initiative); and • Expansion Grants (for implementing initiatives which have produced sizeable important impacts). <p>There is a 10 percent matching requirement, unless waived by the Secretary.</p>
Preschool Program	No applicability.	<p>The conference report authorizes a Preschool Development Grants program. Funds are authorized through the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the program is jointly administered by HHS and ED. ED is specifically prohibited from making taking any unilateral programmatic or regulation actions with respect to the operation of the program.</p> <p>The purposes of the program are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Facilitation of collaboration and coordination among existing early childhood programs and improving transition into elementary school (2) Encouraging partnerships among early childhood providers (3) Maximizing parental choice among early childhood programs. <p>Initial Grants States apply for one year competitive grants which may be renewed by the Secretary. States must match at least 30% of the grant amount (cash or in-kind). States use grants for the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Statewide needs assessment

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<p>(2) Strategic plan development for collaboration, coordination and quality improvement activities (3) Maximizing parental choice among the existing programs and providers (4) Sharing best practices (5) After activities 1 and 2 are completed, improving overall quality of early childhood programs.</p> <p>Renewal Grants States can also apply for separate renewal grants if their initial grant has concluded, they received a preschool development grant previously (under the existing appropriations funded program), or HHS permits the State to apply directly. States must also provide a 30% match with these grants (cash or in-kind).</p> <p>Under renewal grants, a State may use grant funds to make subgrants for the following activities: (1) Addressing areas in need of improvement for programs (2) Expanding programs (3) Developing new programs</p>
<p>School Library Programs</p>	<p>Improving Literacy Through School Libraries – authorized grants to LEAs (in which at least 20% of students served are from families with incomes below the poverty line) to improve literacy skills and academic achievement by providing students with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to up-to-date school library materials; • Well-equipped, technologically advanced school library media centers; and • Well-trained, professionally certified school library media specialists. <p><u>Note:</u> Last funded in FY 2010.</p>	<p>Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2226 continues activities currently implemented through appropriations legislation and authorizes Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) that would promote literacy programs in low income communities. Funds are authorized for the development and enhancement of effective school library programs, which may include providing professional development for school librarians, books, and up-to-date materials to high need schools.</p> <p>Also includes the following provisions related to libraries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Title I LEA Plan includes a description of how the LEA will assist schools in developing effective school library programs to provide students an opportunity to develop digital literacy skills and improve academic achievement. • Authorizes state and local uses of funds under Title II, Part A (Supporting Effective Instruction) for “supporting the instructional services provided by effective school library programs.” • Uses of funds under Title II, Part B, Subpart 2 (Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation) include coordination with, and professional development for school librarians. • Eligible entities under Title II, Part B, Subpart 2, Section 2232 (Presidential and Congressional Academies for American History and Civics) include libraries. • Authorizes states to use funds to assist LEAs with identifying and addressing technology readiness needs, including Internet connectivity and access to school libraries under Title IV, Part A (Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants).
<p>Local Academic Flexible Grant</p>	<p>No such provision.</p>	<p>The conference report authorizes a Student Support and Academic Enrichment grant program under a new Title IV that funds a wide range of activities and purposes. The program is authorized at \$1.65 billion in FY 2017 and \$1.6 billion in FY 2018 through 2020.</p> <p>Under this authority, .5% is reserved for the Bureau of Indian Education and the Outlying Areas, with 2% reserved for technical assistance and capacity building by the Secretary. Of the remainder, states which submit plans receive formula grants and allocate 95% to LEAs and reserve 5% for State level activities and administration.</p>

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
		<p>Among others, State level activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of, and training technical assistance and capacity building for, LEAs. • Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate test fee reimbursement as well as support for dual enrollment and early college high school programs (there is no separately authorized Advanced Placement program under the agreement, unlike current law). • Geography, Civics and well-rounded activities • Fostering safe, healthy and drug free environments. • Technology related activities. <p>States are permitted to use funds received in FY 2017 to cover the fees of accelerated learning (AP and IB) examinations taken by low-income students in the 2016-2017 school year. LEAs receiving grants must submit an application and do a needs assessment (which must be conducted at least every 3 years). LEAs must provide assurance that funds will be prioritized to schools that have the greatest needs, the most low-income children, or are identified under the accountability system or as persistently dangerous.</p> <p>With grant funds, LEAs are expected to fund activities in each of three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-Rounded (at least 20% of funds), which include AP and IB test fee reimbursement, STEM, Arts and Computer Science. • Healthy Students (at least 20% of funds), which includes bullying and drug abuse prevention. • Technology (at least one activity, and a limitation is placed on the purchase of technology infrastructure).
<p>Transferability/ Flexibility in Using Funds</p>	<p>Under current law, states (with the state share of funds) and LEAs (with the local share of funds) can generally transfer up to 50% of a program's allocation among certain programs. The only programs presently receiving funding to which this authority applies are Title I, Part A and Teacher Quality Grants (Title II, Part A). States or LEAs are not permitted to transfer funds out of Title I.</p>	<p>The conference agreement makes several changes to transferability.</p> <p>At the SEA level, the conference report allows States, with the State share of program funds, to transfer any amount (up to 100%) of a program's share of funds between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title II (teacher and other school leaders), • Student Support and Academic Enrichment grant (Title IV, Part A), and • 21st Century Community Learning Centers State level activities (Section 4202(c)(3)). <p>At the LEA level, the conference report allows LEAs to transfer any amount of the LEA portion of funds from programs between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title II, (teacher and other school leaders) • Student Support and Academic Enrichment grant (Title IV, Part A) <p>States and LEAs may transfer funds into but not out of, the following programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title I, Part A, • Migrant Education, • Neglected and Delinquent, • English Language Learner State Grants and • Rural Education.

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
Maintenance of Effort (MOE)	Under most ESEA programs, states and/or LEAs must maintain the amount of state and/or LEA funding that is being expended in the prior fiscal year. Allows the Secretary to waive MOE in the event of natural disasters or precipitous decline in state resources.	Maintains maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements and only allows reductions in MOE if a state has failed to meet MOE for 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years. Adds an additional authority for the Secretary to waive MOE in the event of a change in the organizational structure of an LEA.
STEM Education	Provides authorization for the Math and Science Partnership (MSP) Program.	<p>Repeals the MSP program. Includes a new authority for a STEM Master Teacher Corps, (authorized for under \$2 million) which allows the Secretary to award grants to SEAs to develop such teacher corps, or to fund grants to SEAs or nonprofits in partnership with SEAs to support the implementation, replication, or expansion of effective STEM professional development across the State (not more than 2% of the subpart 4 allocation)</p> <p>As noted above, under Title IV grant funds, LEAs are expected to fund activities in each of three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-Rounded (at least 20% of funds), which include AP and IB test fee reimbursement, STEM, arts and computer science. • Healthy Students (at least 20% of funds), which includes bullying and drug abuse prevention. • Technology (at least one activity, and a limitation is placed on the purchase of technology infrastructure <p>Specifies STEM and computer science professional development as uses of funds under Title II.</p> <p>Replaces current law “core academic subject” with a new term, “well-rounded education” which includes, among other subjects, STEM and computer science.</p>
ESEA Waivers	<p>States, LEAs or Indian tribes may request waivers of ESEA provisions. These waivers must demonstrate how they will increase the academic achievement of students. Waivers are not permitted for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocations or distributions of funds to states, LEAs or other recipients • Maintenance of effort • Comparability • Supplement not Supplant • Private school participation • Parental participation and involvement • Civil rights • Charter School requirements • Prohibitions regarding state aid and religious worship or instruction • Prohibitions on using ESEA funds for the development and distribution of materials that encourage sexual activity or are legally obscene • Prohibitions on using ESEA funds to providing sex education or to distribute condoms • Selection of school attendance areas under Title I that are more than 10% lower in poverty than those selected without a waiver 	The conference report retains a modified version of ESEA waivers. Under the conference report, the Secretary has 120 days to approve a waiver request unless it does not meet the requirements of the wavier section. The Secretary is prohibited from disapproving a waiver request based on conditions outside the scope of the request. Requests for waivers by LEAs must be submitted through the State and approved by the State. The conference report maintains the list of prohibited wavier topics with conforming changes.

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act
Department Staff	No applicability.	<p>Requires the Secretary to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Within 60 days of the enactment of the Student Success Act, identify the number of Department employees who worked on or administered each program that was in effect on the day before the passage of the Student Success Act and publish that information on the Department's website; (2) Within 60 days of the enactment of the bill, identify the number of employees who worked on or administered programs that were eliminated by the Student Success Act; (3) Within one year of the passage of the bill, reduce the number of Department of Education full-time-equivalent employees calculated under (2); and (4) Within one year of the enactment of the Student Success Act, report on how the Secretary reduced the number of employees as described under (3). <p>Reporting is required on salaries of Department of Education employees.</p>
State Legislative and Gubernatorial Signoff on Participation	No such provision.	<p>The agreement requires SEAs to consult with their Governor on the development of State plans for Title I, Title II and the consolidated application authority. This consultation is required to occur during the development of a plan and prior to its submission. A Governor is provided 30 days to sign off on a plan. If the Governor does not sign off during this time period, the SEA will submit the plan to the Secretary for approval.</p>
Criminal Background Checks/Aiding in Obtaining Employment in Sexual Misconduct Situations	No such provision.	<p>Requires States, SEAs or LEAs which receive ESEA funds to have laws regulations or policies which prohibit school employees, contractors or agents from aiding a school employee, contractor or agent in obtaining a new job if there is probably cause to believe or there has been sexual misconduct with a minor or student. Exception to this apply, including if no charges in an open case have been filed against an individual for 4 years and if a case on an individual has been closed.</p> <p>In addition, the conference report includes a Sense of Congress that calls for an end to confidentiality agreements between LEAs and child predators, a prohibition on the transferring predators to other schools, and reporting allegations of sexual misconduct to law enforcement.</p>

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
STAAR Performance Results - TAPR Student Groups
 (all students in the accountability subset)

State

		State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above												
Grade 3												
Reading	2015	75%	65%	71%	86%	76%	91%	77%	82%	45%	68%	68%
	2014	76%	65%	71%	88%	78%	92%	78%	83%	64%	69%	68%
Mathematics	2015	76%	61%	73%	85%	77%	93%	79%	81%	48%	69%	72%
	2014	71%	55%	67%	80%	71%	92%	73%	75%	57%	63%	67%
STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above												
Grade 4												
Reading	2015	72%	59%	66%	84%	70%	90%	74%	80%	39%	63%	58%
	2014	74%	64%	69%	85%	73%	91%	74%	82%	61%	66%	60%
Mathematics	2015	72%	56%	68%	82%	73%	93%	78%	77%	39%	64%	64%
	2014	71%	55%	67%	81%	69%	93%	72%	76%	58%	63%	62%
Writing	2015	68%	57%	64%	77%	66%	90%	75%	74%	31%	60%	59%
	2014	73%	64%	69%	82%	72%	91%	77%	80%	52%	66%	62%
STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above												
Grade 5 **												
Reading	2015	84%	77%	81%	92%	83%	95%	84%	90%	48%	78%	71%
	2014	86%	80%	83%	94%	88%	96%	87%	93%	79%	81%	72%
Mathematics	2015	77%	62%	74%	85%	77%	95%	81%	81%	42%	69%	67%
	2014	88%	80%	86%	94%	89%	98%	95%	92%	78%	84%	81%
Science	2015	70%	55%	64%	83%	71%	90%	68%	79%	38%	60%	50%
	2014	74%	60%	68%	86%	74%	92%	80%	83%	56%	65%	54%
STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above												
Grade 6												
Reading	2015	74%	64%	68%	86%	73%	93%	79%	83%	32%	65%	46%
	2014	78%	69%	72%	88%	80%	93%	83%	85%	58%	70%	52%
Mathematics	2015	73%	60%	68%	84%	75%	94%	81%	81%	39%	65%	56%
	2014	79%	67%	75%	88%	81%	95%	84%	84%	59%	72%	62%
STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above												
Grade 7												
Reading	2015	73%	65%	67%	85%	74%	91%	78%	83%	29%	64%	37%
	2014	76%	67%	69%	87%	76%	92%	79%	85%	55%	67%	39%
Mathematics	2015	70%	56%	65%	82%	71%	92%	77%	78%	31%	61%	45%
	2014	68%	55%	62%	81%	68%	92%	75%	77%	51%	59%	43%
Writing	2015	70%	61%	65%	81%	71%	91%	79%	79%	26%	61%	36%
	2014	72%	64%	65%	82%	71%	91%	74%	80%	52%	63%	36%
STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above												
Grade 8 **												
Reading	2015	85%	79%	82%	93%	87%	95%	88%	92%	45%	79%	56%
	2014	90%	86%	86%	96%	90%	96%	91%	95%	73%	85%	60%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
STAAR Performance Results - TAPR Student Groups
 (all students in the accountability subset)

State

		State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Mathematics	2015	72%	62%	69%	82%	72%	92%	79%	79%	33%	66%	53%
	2014	86%	78%	83%	93%	85%	97%	87%	91%	74%	82%	70%
Science	2015	69%	56%	63%	81%	69%	92%	74%	79%	31%	59%	36%
	2014	72%	61%	65%	85%	72%	93%	75%	80%	52%	62%	37%
Social Studies	2015	63%	51%	55%	77%	63%	89%	64%	74%	28%	51%	28%
	2014	63%	53%	54%	77%	64%	89%	67%	73%	47%	51%	28%

STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above

End of Course

English I	2015	69%	60%	64%	80%	68%	87%	72%	78%	32%	61%	38%
	2014	67%	58%	61%	80%	70%	86%	72%	78%	43%	58%	30%
English II	2015	70%	60%	65%	82%	71%	86%	72%	80%	32%	62%	37%
	2014	69%	60%	63%	83%	72%	87%	66%	81%	48%	60%	28%
Algebra I	2015	79%	68%	76%	87%	78%	95%	82%	85%	40%	73%	58%
	2014	80%	71%	77%	89%	80%	95%	83%	87%	52%	74%	56%
Biology	2015	89%	84%	87%	95%	88%	97%	92%	94%	57%	85%	69%
	2014	89%	85%	86%	95%	92%	95%	90%	94%	66%	85%	66%
U.S. History	2015	89%	84%	86%	94%	89%	95%	93%	94%	55%	84%	64%
	2014	92%	89%	90%	96%	93%	97%	92%	95%	72%	88%	69%

STAAR Percent at Phase-in Satisfactory Standard or Above

All Grades

All Subjects	2015	74%	64%	70%	85%	75%	92%	78%	82%	38%	66%	56%
	2014	77%	67%	72%	87%	78%	93%	79%	84%	59%	69%	57%
Reading	2015	75%	65%	70%	86%	75%	91%	78%	83%	37%	67%	54%
	2014	76%	68%	71%	87%	78%	91%	78%	85%	59%	69%	55%
Mathematics	2015	74%	61%	70%	84%	75%	94%	80%	80%	39%	67%	62%
	2014	78%	66%	74%	87%	78%	94%	81%	83%	61%	71%	65%
Writing	2015	69%	59%	64%	79%	68%	91%	77%	76%	28%	60%	52%
	2014	72%	64%	67%	82%	71%	91%	75%	80%	52%	64%	53%
Science	2015	76%	66%	71%	87%	77%	93%	79%	84%	42%	68%	51%
	2014	78%	69%	73%	89%	80%	93%	83%	86%	58%	71%	53%
Social Studies	2015	76%	67%	70%	86%	77%	92%	79%	84%	41%	66%	42%
	2014	76%	70%	70%	86%	79%	93%	80%	83%	56%	67%	42%

STAAR Percent at Postsecondary Readiness Standard

All Grades

Two or More Subjects	2015	41%	26%	32%	55%	41%	78%	45%	51%	8%	28%	12%
	2014	41%	26%	32%	55%	41%	76%	44%	50%	20%	28%	13%
Reading	2015	44%	30%	35%	59%	44%	76%	47%	55%	9%	30%	14%
	2014	45%	32%	36%	61%	46%	77%	47%	56%	26%	33%	17%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
STAAR Performance Results - TAPR Student Groups
 (all students in the accountability subset)

State

		State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Mathematics	2015	38%	22%	31%	51%	37%	79%	43%	46%	9%	27%	17%
	2014	39%	24%	32%	51%	37%	78%	43%	46%	25%	28%	19%
Writing	2015	33%	21%	26%	43%	30%	73%	39%	40%	5%	22%	14%
	2014	35%	24%	28%	46%	32%	71%	38%	44%	23%	24%	16%
Science	2015	42%	28%	34%	57%	42%	76%	45%	53%	9%	30%	12%
	2014	43%	29%	35%	59%	46%	76%	48%	54%	21%	31%	14%
Social Studies	2015	43%	31%	34%	56%	45%	73%	46%	53%	11%	30%	8%
	2014	39%	28%	30%	53%	42%	71%	44%	49%	17%	27%	8%
STAAR Percent at Advanced Standard												
All Grades												
All Subjects	2015	15%	8%	10%	24%	14%	45%	17%	22%	5%	9%	7%
	2014	15%	7%	10%	22%	14%	43%	15%	21%	6%	9%	10%
Reading	2015	16%	9%	11%	26%	15%	42%	17%	25%	4%	9%	7%
	2014	15%	8%	10%	24%	14%	40%	14%	22%	6%	9%	9%
Mathematics	2015	16%	7%	11%	22%	14%	51%	18%	21%	5%	9%	11%
	2014	17%	7%	13%	23%	15%	53%	17%	22%	6%	11%	14%
Writing	2015	9%	4%	5%	13%	7%	33%	10%	13%	3%	4%	4%
	2014	8%	3%	6%	11%	7%	28%	7%	10%	5%	4%	9%
Science	2015	15%	7%	9%	24%	14%	44%	17%	22%	5%	8%	3%
	2014	14%	6%	9%	22%	14%	41%	14%	20%	5%	7%	3%
Social Studies	2015	19%	10%	12%	29%	20%	44%	20%	27%	6%	10%	2%
	2014	15%	8%	9%	24%	15%	40%	17%	22%	5%	8%	2%
STAAR Percent Met or Exceeded Progress ***												
All Grades												
All Subjects	2015	57%	53%	55%	61%	56%	73%	59%	61%	46%	54%	55%
	2014	61%	57%	59%	63%	59%	72%	59%	63%	60%	58%	n/a
Reading	2015	59%	56%	57%	62%	57%	71%	60%	63%	52%	56%	55%
	2014	61%	57%	59%	63%	59%	72%	59%	63%	60%	58%	n/a
Mathematics	2015	51%	34%	49%	58%	48%	80%	51%	54%	19%	47%	56%
	2014	60%	56%	58%	64%	59%	79%	65%	64%	56%	57%	n/a
Writing	2015	56%	53%	53%	60%	59%	75%	60%	62%	48%	52%	52%
STAAR Percent Exceeded Progress ***												
All Grades												
All Subjects	2015	16%	13%	14%	18%	14%	28%	15%	18%	12%	14%	17%
	2014	17%	15%	17%	17%	16%	25%	15%	17%	14%	16%	n/a
Reading	2015	16%	14%	14%	18%	15%	24%	15%	19%	14%	14%	16%
	2014	17%	15%	17%	17%	16%	25%	15%	17%	14%	16%	n/a
Mathematics	2015	21%	10%	19%	26%	16%	52%	20%	25%	6%	18%	24%
	2014	18%	14%	17%	19%	16%	40%	19%	20%	12%	16%	n/a

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
STAAR Performance Results - TAPR Student Groups
(all students in the accountability subset)

State

		State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Writing	2015	7%	5%	5%	9%	6%	20%	9%	10%	4%	5%	5%
Progress of Prior Year STAAR Failers (Percent of Failers Passing STAAR)												
Sum of Grades 4-8												
Reading	2015	39%	36%	38%	49%	42%	49%	43%	46%	22%	37%	32%
	2014	45%	41%	43%	54%	47%	53%	47%	51%	48%	42%	38%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
STAAR Performance Results - TAPR Student Groups
 (all students in the accountability subset)

State

Student Success Initiative	State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL	
Grade 5 Reading												
Students Meeting Phase-in 1 Level II Standard on First STAAR Administration												
2015	75%	64%	70%	86%	73%	91%	74%	84%	31%	67%	57%	
2014	77%	66%	71%	88%	75%	91%	78%	85%	50%	68%	54%	
Students Requiring Accelerated Instruction												
2015	25%	36%	30%	14%	27%	9%	26%	16%	69%	33%	43%	
2014	23%	34%	29%	12%	25%	9%	22%	15%	50%	32%	46%	
STAAR Cumulative Met Standard												
2015	84%	76%	80%	92%	83%	94%	83%	90%	44%	78%	71%	
2014	86%	79%	82%	94%	88%	94%	86%	92%	65%	80%	70%	
STAAR Failers Promoted by Grade Placement Committee												
2014	92%	93%	92%	91%	88%	94%	96%	93%	97%	92%	92%	
2013	89%	91%	89%	88%	89%	93%	91%	92%	96%	89%	90%	
STAAR Met Standard (Failed in Previous Year) Promoted to Grade 6												
2015	14%	15%	13%	18%	16%	24%	22%	18%	8%	13%	12%	
2014	19%	18%	18%	24%	37%	26%	13%	22%	11%	18%	18%	
Retained in Grade 5												
2015	59%	59%	58%	69%	38%	45%	50%	57%	53%	58%	53%	
2014	58%	57%	56%	69%	100%	60%	0%	72%	52%	57%	53%	
Grade 8 Reading												
Students Meeting Phase-in 1 Level II Standard on First STAAR Administration												
2015	76%	67%	71%	88%	77%	91%	79%	86%	27%	68%	38%	
2014	83%	77%	78%	92%	83%	93%	85%	91%	48%	76%	44%	
Students Requiring Accelerated Instruction												
2015	24%	33%	29%	12%	23%	9%	21%	14%	73%	32%	62%	
2014	17%	23%	22%	8%	17%	7%	15%	9%	52%	24%	56%	
STAAR Cumulative Met Standard												

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
STAAR Performance Results - TAPR Student Groups
 (all students in the accountability subset)

State

	State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
2015	85%	78%	81%	93%	86%	94%	88%	92%	39%	78%	52%
2014	89%	86%	86%	96%	89%	95%	91%	95%	60%	84%	56%
STAAR Failers Promoted by Grade Placement Committee											
2014	95%	96%	96%	95%	94%	93%	100%	98%	98%	95%	96%
2013	95%	96%	95%	92%	91%	97%	83%	95%	98%	95%	96%
STAAR Met Standard (Failed in Previous Year) Promoted to Grade 9											
2015	8%	7%	8%	11%	8%	17%	4%	12%	3%	8%	6%
2014	10%	12%	9%	16%	16%	15%	29%	15%	6%	9%	6%
Retained in Grade 8											
2015	46%	39%	47%	57%	40%	25%	-	100%	33%	44%	37%
2014	54%	59%	49%	68%	0%	67%	50%	80%	52%	52%	40%

*** Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.

**** Indicates that the 2014 and 2015 rates for reading and the 2014 rate for mathematics are based on the cumulative results from the first and second administrations of STAAR. No retests were administered for mathematics, grades 5 and 8, in 2015.

***** Indicates that 2015 ELL rates include current and monitored students. 2014 ELL rates include current students only.

'?' Indicates that the data for this item were statistically improbable, or were reported outside a reasonable range.

'-' Indicates zero observations reported for this group.

'n/a' Indicates data reporting is not applicable for this group.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Postsecondary Readiness Indicators

State

	State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Attendance Rate											
2013-14	95.9%	95.6%	95.7%	96.0%	95.4%	97.8%	95.7%	96.0%	94.6%	95.5%	96.6%
2012-13	95.8%	95.6%	95.6%	95.9%	95.3%	97.7%	95.7%	95.9%	94.5%	95.4%	96.6%
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 7-8)											
2013-14	0.5%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	1.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.7%	2.2%
2012-13	0.4%	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.6%	2.0%
Annual Dropout Rate (Gr 9-12)											
2013-14	2.2%	3.1%	2.7%	1.1%	2.3%	0.7%	3.0%	1.5%	3.0%	2.6%	4.8%
2012-13	2.2%	3.3%	2.8%	1.1%	2.5%	0.8%	2.2%	1.5%	3.2%	2.6%	4.9%
4-Year Longitudinal Rate (Gr 9-12)											
Class of 2014											
Graduated	88.3%	84.2%	85.5%	93.0%	87.1%	94.8%	88.9%	91.2%	77.5%	85.2%	60.3%
Received GED	0.8%	0.6%	0.8%	0.9%	1.1%	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.9%	0.4%
Continued HS	4.3%	5.3%	5.6%	2.5%	4.0%	2.7%	3.7%	3.2%	10.8%	5.0%	13.6%
Dropped Out	6.6%	9.8%	8.2%	3.6%	7.9%	2.4%	7.0%	4.8%	11.2%	9.0%	25.7%
Graduates and GED	89.1%	84.9%	86.3%	94.0%	88.1%	94.9%	89.3%	92.0%	78.0%	86.0%	60.8%
Grads, GED, & Cont	93.4%	90.2%	91.8%	96.4%	92.1%	97.6%	93.0%	95.2%	88.8%	91.0%	74.3%
Class of 2013											
Graduated	88.0%	84.1%	85.1%	93.0%	85.8%	93.8%	89.5%	91.7%	77.8%	85.2%	61.7%
Received GED	0.8%	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	1.3%	0.2%	0.5%	0.9%	0.5%	0.9%	0.6%
Continued HS	4.6%	5.3%	5.9%	2.6%	4.4%	3.0%	4.7%	3.1%	10.7%	5.4%	14.1%
Dropped Out	6.6%	9.9%	8.2%	3.5%	8.5%	3.0%	5.3%	4.4%	11.1%	8.5%	23.7%
Graduates and GED	88.9%	84.8%	85.9%	93.9%	87.2%	94.0%	90.0%	92.6%	78.2%	86.1%	62.2%
Grads, GED, & Cont	93.4%	90.1%	91.8%	96.5%	91.5%	97.0%	94.7%	95.6%	88.9%	91.5%	76.3%
5-Year Extended Longitudinal Rate (Gr 9-12)											
Class of 2013											
Graduated	90.4%	86.7%	88.2%	94.4%	87.6%	95.3%	91.4%	93.4%	82.1%	88.2%	67.9%
Received GED	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	1.1%	0.8%	1.3%	0.8%
Continued HS	1.3%	1.3%	1.6%	0.8%	1.3%	1.0%	1.2%	0.8%	5.6%	1.4%	3.8%
Dropped Out	7.2%	10.9%	9.0%	3.6%	9.0%	3.5%	7.0%	4.7%	11.5%	9.1%	27.6%
Graduates and GED	91.5%	87.7%	89.3%	95.6%	89.7%	95.5%	91.8%	94.6%	82.9%	89.5%	68.6%
Grads, GED, & Cont	92.8%	89.1%	91.0%	96.4%	91.0%	96.5%	93.0%	95.3%	88.5%	90.9%	72.4%
Class of 2012											
Graduated	90.4%	86.5%	88.0%	94.5%	88.6%	96.2%	92.0%	94.0%	81.6%	88.7%	66.9%
Received GED	1.2%	1.0%	1.2%	1.3%	2.3%	0.2%	0.5%	1.2%	0.8%	1.2%	0.7%
Continued HS	1.3%	1.4%	1.7%	0.8%	1.2%	1.0%	1.7%	0.7%	5.8%	1.5%	3.8%
Dropped Out	7.1%	11.1%	9.1%	3.4%	7.8%	2.5%	5.8%	4.1%	11.8%	8.6%	28.7%
Graduates and GED	91.6%	87.5%	89.2%	95.8%	90.9%	96.5%	92.5%	95.2%	82.4%	89.9%	67.5%
Grads, GED, & Cont	92.9%	88.9%	90.9%	96.6%	92.2%	97.5%	94.2%	95.9%	88.2%	91.4%	71.3%
6-Year Extended Longitudinal Rate (Gr 9-12)											
Class of 2012											
Graduated	90.9%	86.9%	88.6%	94.8%	89.2%	96.6%	93.2%	94.2%	83.6%	89.4%	68.6%
Received GED	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	2.6%	0.3%	0.5%	1.7%	1.0%	1.6%	0.9%
Continued HS	0.6%	0.6%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	3.6%	0.6%	1.3%
Dropped Out	7.0%	11.0%	9.0%	3.2%	7.7%	2.5%	6.1%	3.9%	11.7%	8.4%	29.3%
Graduates and GED	92.4%	88.4%	90.2%	96.4%	91.8%	97.0%	93.7%	95.9%	84.6%	90.9%	69.4%
Grads, GED, & Cont	93.0%	89.0%	91.0%	96.8%	92.3%	97.5%	93.9%	96.1%	88.3%	91.6%	70.7%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Postsecondary Readiness Indicators

State

	State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Class of 2011											
Graduated	89.8%	85.0%	87.0%	94.3%	90.0%	97.0%	92.5%	94.4%	83.7%	88.7%	67.9%
Received GED	1.5%	1.3%	1.6%	1.6%	2.2%	0.3%	1.1%	1.3%	0.9%	1.4%	0.9%
Continued HS	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	3.2%	0.7%	1.4%
Dropped Out	8.1%	13.0%	10.6%	3.6%	7.5%	2.1%	5.9%	3.8%	12.1%	9.1%	29.8%
Graduates and GED	91.3%	86.3%	88.6%	96.0%	92.1%	97.3%	93.7%	95.7%	84.7%	90.2%	68.8%
Grads, GED, & Cont	91.9%	87.0%	89.4%	96.4%	92.5%	97.9%	94.1%	96.2%	87.9%	90.9%	70.2%
RHSP/DAP Graduates (Longitudinal Rate)											
Class of 2014	85.5%	79.3%	85.7%	86.1%	81.5%	95.4%	86.2%	85.9%	27.4%	82.0%	73.3%
Class of 2013	83.5%	76.7%	83.7%	84.6%	79.8%	94.0%	85.7%	84.6%	27.8%	79.6%	70.0%
RHSP/DAP Graduates (Annual Rate)											
2013-14	83.8%	77.4%	83.9%	84.8%	79.8%	94.6%	83.6%	84.8%	25.1%	80.6%	72.3%
2012-13	81.6%	74.6%	81.5%	83.1%	78.3%	92.9%	83.8%	83.0%	25.1%	77.9%	68.3%
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion (Grades 11-12)											
Any Subject											
2013-14	53.2%	42.7%	49.0%	59.5%	48.3%	80.5%	52.7%	58.3%	13.3%	45.5%	26.8%
English Language Arts											
2013-14	28.9%	20.8%	24.9%	34.1%	24.8%	54.7%	27.5%	33.3%	4.6%	22.0%	8.9%
Mathematics											
2013-14	42.4%	33.1%	36.9%	49.5%	39.4%	71.1%	43.8%	48.4%	8.3%	34.4%	15.5%
Science											
2013-14	13.4%	7.6%	10.0%	16.4%	10.8%	42.8%	17.3%	17.1%	1.2%	8.7%	2.1%
Social Studies											
2013-14	27.8%	19.1%	23.0%	33.8%	24.4%	59.2%	26.5%	32.4%	2.3%	20.2%	5.0%
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion (Grades 9-12)											
Any Subject											
2013-14	33.1%	25.4%	30.4%	37.1%	29.6%	59.8%	31.5%	36.4%	8.2%	27.5%	16.6%
2012-13	31.4%	24.2%	28.5%	35.6%	28.9%	57.0%	30.0%	35.0%	7.1%	25.6%	14.2%
English Language Arts											
2013-14	15.4%	11.5%	13.8%	17.7%	13.5%	29.4%	14.3%	17.0%	3.5%	12.2%	7.5%
2012-13	14.3%	10.7%	12.4%	17.0%	12.4%	27.6%	12.3%	17.0%	2.6%	10.8%	5.4%
Mathematics											
2013-14	18.8%	14.3%	16.0%	22.7%	17.7%	36.6%	20.1%	21.6%	3.2%	14.5%	5.6%
2012-13	18.4%	14.0%	15.4%	22.4%	17.1%	35.2%	17.9%	21.0%	3.1%	13.9%	5.2%
Science											
2013-14	5.6%	3.2%	4.1%	6.9%	4.5%	20.2%	7.4%	7.2%	0.4%	3.5%	0.7%
2012-13	5.2%	2.9%	3.7%	6.7%	4.1%	19.2%	5.2%	7.0%	0.3%	3.1%	0.5%
Social Studies											
2013-14	18.3%	12.5%	14.5%	22.8%	15.9%	45.8%	17.5%	22.3%	1.4%	12.4%	2.6%
2012-13	17.0%	11.7%	13.3%	21.4%	15.5%	42.5%	17.7%	21.4%	1.4%	11.4%	2.1%
College-Ready Graduates											
English Language Arts											
Class of 2014	68%	56%	62%	77%	68%	82%	74%	76%	19%	58%	13%
Class of 2013	65%	53%	58%	75%	65%	80%	60%	74%	16%	55%	12%
Mathematics											
Class of 2014	67%	51%	62%	78%	68%	88%	69%	74%	18%	58%	33%
Class of 2013	74%	60%	69%	83%	78%	90%	70%	80%	22%	66%	40%
Both Subjects											

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Postsecondary Readiness Indicators

State

	State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Class of 2014	54%	38%	47%	67%	54%	78%	58%	63%	8%	42%	8%
Class of 2013	56%	41%	48%	69%	57%	77%	54%	67%	9%	45%	8%
Either Subject											
Class of 2014	81%	70%	77%	88%	82%	92%	85%	86%	28%	74%	37%
Class of 2013	83%	72%	79%	89%	85%	93%	76%	87%	28%	76%	43%
College and Career Ready Graduates											
Class of 2014	78.4%	66.5%	76.0%	84.5%	76.4%	90.4%	72.1%	80.9%	50.2%	73.4%	48.6%
CTE Coherent Sequence Graduates											
Class of 2014	46.4%	5.0%	23.4%	15.6%	0.2%	1.5%	0.0%	0.7%	3.5%	23.5%	1.0%
AP/IB Results (Participation)											
All Subjects											
2014	23.5%	15.2%	20.9%	26.3%	19.5%	55.9%	24.5%	27.5%	n/a	17.7%	n/a
2013	22.1%	13.7%	19.5%	24.9%	16.4%	53.6%	21.8%	26.6%	n/a	16.7%	n/a
English Language Arts											
2014	15.0%	10.3%	12.5%	17.3%	12.4%	38.2%	17.6%	18.5%	n/a	10.7%	n/a
2013	14.0%	9.4%	11.5%	16.4%	10.3%	36.0%	13.4%	18.2%	n/a	9.9%	n/a
Mathematics											
2014	6.5%	2.9%	4.4%	8.2%	5.0%	26.2%	7.4%	8.6%	n/a	3.6%	n/a
2013	5.7%	2.6%	3.9%	7.2%	4.4%	23.4%	7.0%	8.1%	n/a	3.2%	n/a
Science											
2014	6.9%	3.4%	5.1%	8.1%	4.9%	27.8%	8.6%	9.2%	n/a	4.3%	n/a
2013	6.2%	2.8%	4.5%	7.4%	4.2%	26.0%	7.1%	8.9%	n/a	3.8%	n/a
Social Studies											
2014	13.8%	8.9%	11.3%	15.7%	11.7%	40.1%	14.7%	17.2%	n/a	9.7%	n/a
2013	12.7%	7.6%	10.4%	14.8%	9.1%	38.5%	13.0%	16.5%	n/a	8.9%	n/a
AP/IB Results (Examinees >= Criterion)											
All Subjects											
2014	51.3%	27.8%	38.3%	64.6%	52.8%	73.9%	47.6%	61.6%	n/a	35.1%	n/a
2013	50.9%	27.3%	37.5%	64.3%	48.9%	72.5%	50.0%	60.3%	n/a	34.3%	n/a
English Language Arts											
2014	44.7%	25.1%	24.4%	62.4%	46.5%	69.5%	40.9%	59.8%	n/a	21.2%	n/a
2013	45.2%	24.1%	24.7%	62.9%	40.6%	68.8%	46.9%	57.9%	n/a	21.2%	n/a
Mathematics											
2014	53.6%	34.6%	33.3%	63.6%	53.3%	72.9%	49.3%	62.6%	n/a	32.1%	n/a
2013	52.3%	32.6%	33.0%	61.8%	42.9%	71.3%	47.5%	60.4%	n/a	31.4%	n/a
Science											
2014	45.7%	23.2%	24.5%	59.3%	36.3%	65.5%	38.8%	58.3%	n/a	22.6%	n/a
2013	47.6%	25.6%	26.4%	60.1%	40.9%	67.7%	46.7%	56.4%	n/a	24.5%	n/a
Social Studies											
2014	41.6%	21.8%	22.2%	57.4%	40.1%	65.8%	35.0%	52.7%	n/a	19.6%	n/a
2013	42.0%	23.9%	22.3%	57.2%	39.9%	63.9%	33.6%	52.7%	n/a	19.6%	n/a
SAT/ACT Results											
Tested											
Class of 2014	66.3%	69.7%	60.9%	69.1%	61.6%	91.7%	70.6%	71.0%	n/a	59.1%	n/a
Class of 2013	63.8%	66.7%	57.2%	68.2%	58.9%	90.2%	61.7%	70.2%	n/a	55.6%	n/a
At/Above Criterion											
Class of 2014	25.1%	8.4%	11.9%	41.9%	24.0%	54.1%	24.0%	35.8%	n/a	9.8%	n/a
Class of 2013	25.4%	8.2%	12.3%	41.5%	25.2%	53.6%	23.5%	36.3%	n/a	9.9%	n/a

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Postsecondary Readiness Indicators

State

	State	African American	Hispanic	White	American Indian	Asian	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	Special Ed	Econ Disadv	ELL
Average SAT Score											
All Subjects											
Class of 2014	1417	1255	1306	1557	1417	1650	1404	1524	n/a	1273	n/a
Class of 2013	1422	1254	1317	1558	1425	1633	1378	1516	n/a	1281	n/a
English Language Arts and Writing											
Class of 2014	925	824	851	1020	929	1062	914	1000	n/a	829	n/a
Class of 2013	927	821	855	1019	932	1047	891	992	n/a	831	n/a
Mathematics											
Class of 2014	491	430	455	536	488	588	490	524	n/a	444	n/a
Class of 2013	496	432	462	539	494	585	487	523	n/a	450	n/a
Average ACT Score											
All Subjects											
Class of 2014	20.6	17.5	18.5	23.1	20.8	25.0	20.6	22.3	n/a	18.0	n/a
Class of 2013	20.6	17.5	18.5	23.0	20.7	25.0	20.9	22.3	n/a	18.0	n/a
English Language Arts											
Class of 2014	20.0	16.8	17.6	22.9	20.4	24.3	20.1	22.0	n/a	17.2	n/a
Class of 2013	20.0	16.7	17.6	22.7	20.0	24.2	20.0	21.9	n/a	17.1	n/a
Mathematics											
Class of 2014	21.2	18.2	19.3	23.3	21.2	26.4	21.3	22.5	n/a	18.9	n/a
Class of 2013	21.3	18.2	19.5	23.3	21.2	26.5	21.9	22.6	n/a	19.0	n/a
Science											
Class of 2014	20.7	17.8	18.8	23.0	20.9	24.6	20.5	22.3	n/a	18.4	n/a
Class of 2013	20.7	17.8	18.9	22.8	20.9	24.5	21.4	22.2	n/a	18.5	n/a
Graduates Enrolled in TX Institution of Higher Education (IHE)											
2012-13	56.9%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011-12	57.3%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Graduates in TX IHE Completing One Year Without Remediation											
2012-13	70.8%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011-12	69.0%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

'?' Indicates that the data for this item were statistically improbable, or were reported outside a reasonable range.

'*' Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.

'-' Indicates zero observations reported for this group.

'n/a' Indicates data reporting is not applicable for this group.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile

State

Student Information	----- State ----- Count	Percent
Total Students:	5,215,282	100.0%
Students by Grade:		
Early Childhood Education	12,201	0.2%
Pre-Kindergarten	219,225	4.2%
Kindergarten	390,276	7.5%
Grade 1	412,144	7.9%
Grade 2	407,896	7.8%
Grade 3	396,108	7.6%
Grade 4	390,351	7.5%
Grade 5	388,101	7.4%
Grade 6	383,487	7.4%
Grade 7	382,838	7.3%
Grade 8	388,190	7.4%
Grade 9	419,715	8.0%
Grade 10	372,988	7.2%
Grade 11	341,724	6.6%
Grade 12	310,038	5.9%
Ethnic Distribution:		
African American	659,074	12.6%
Hispanic	2,714,266	52.0%
White	1,509,555	28.9%
American Indian	21,411	0.4%
Asian	201,738	3.9%
Pacific Islander	7,085	0.1%
Two or More Races	102,153	2.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	3,068,820	58.8%
Non-Educationally Disadvantaged	2,146,462	41.2%
English Language Learners (ELL)	948,391	18.2%
Students w/ Disciplinary Placements (2013-2014)	78,821	1.5%
At-Risk	2,668,590	51.2%
Graduates (Class of 2014):		
Total Graduates	303,109	100.0%
By Ethnicity (incl. Special Ed.):		
African American	38,046	12.6%
Hispanic	141,907	46.8%
White	103,764	34.2%
American Indian	1,278	0.4%
Asian	12,420	4.1%
Pacific Islander	401	0.1%
Two or More Races	5,293	1.7%
By Graduation Type (incl. Special Ed.):		
Minimum H.S. Program	48,435	16.0%
Recommended H.S. Program/DAP	251,154	82.9%
Foundation H.S. Plan	3,520	1.2%
Special Education Graduates	23,654	7.8%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile

State

<u>Student Information</u>	<u>Non-Special Education Rates</u>	<u>Special Education Rates</u>
Retention Rates by Grade:		
Kindergarten	2.0%	8.6%
Grade 1	4.3%	8.1%
Grade 2	2.9%	3.9%
Grade 3	2.2%	1.6%
Grade 4	1.2%	0.9%
Grade 5	1.3%	0.9%
Grade 6	0.7%	0.8%
Grade 7	1.0%	1.1%
Grade 8	1.0%	1.4%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile

State

	----- State -----	
	Count	Percent
Data Quality:		
PID Errors (students)	4,688	0.1%
Underreported Students	8,429	0.4%

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile
State

Class Size Information **State**

Class Size Averages by Grade and Subject (Derived from teacher responsibility records):

Elementary:	
Kindergarten	19.2
Grade 1	19.3
Grade 2	19.3
Grade 3	19.1
Grade 4	19.1
Grade 5	20.8
Grade 6	20.3
Secondary:	
English/Language Arts	17.2
Foreign Languages	18.9
Mathematics	18.1
Science	19.1
Social Studies	19.6

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile

State

Staff Information	----- State ----- Count	Percent
Total Staff	673,140.3	100.0%
Professional Staff:	433,985.7	64.5%
Teachers	342,191.8	50.8%
Professional Support	65,119.0	9.7%
Campus Administration (School Leadership)	19,679.9	2.9%
Central Administration	6,995.1	1.0%
Educational Aides:	64,640.8	9.6%
Auxiliary Staff:	174,513.8	25.9%
Total Minority Staff:	311,862.3	46.3%
Teachers by Ethnicity and Sex:		
African American	33,863.7	9.9%
Hispanic	87,714.8	25.6%
White	210,044.8	61.4%
American Indian	1,244.6	0.4%
Asian	4,890.6	1.4%
Pacific Islander	758.8	0.2%
Two or More Races	3,674.5	1.1%
Males	79,947.9	23.4%
Females	262,243.9	76.6%
Teachers by Highest Degree Held:		
No Degree	2,980.2	0.9%
Bachelors	257,146.2	75.1%
Masters	79,997.8	23.4%
Doctorate	2,067.7	0.6%
Teachers by Years of Experience:		
Beginning Teachers	29,256.4	8.5%
1-5 Years Experience	89,247.1	26.1%
6-10 Years Experience	77,168.2	22.6%
11-20 Years Experience	91,890.7	26.9%
Over 20 Years Experience	54,629.4	16.0%
Number of Students per Teacher	15.2	n/a

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile
State

<u>Staff Information</u>	<u>State</u>
Average Years Experience of Teachers:	11.0
Average Years Experience of Teachers with District:	7.5
Average Teacher Salary by Years of Experience (regular duties only):	
Beginning Teachers	\$44,540
1-5 Years Experience	\$46,575
6-10 Years Experience	\$49,127
11-20 Years Experience	\$52,640
Over 20 Years Experience	\$59,787
Average Actual Salaries (regular duties only):	
Teachers	\$50,715
Professional Support	\$59,791
Campus Administration (School Leadership)	\$74,292
Central Administration	\$96,907
Instructional Staff Percent:	64.6
Turnover Rate for Teachers:	16.6
Staff Exclusions:	
Shared Services Arrangement Staff:	
Professional Staff	1,148.2
Educational Aides	228.9
Auxiliary Staff	508.3
Contracted Instructional Staff:	2,090.1

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
2014-15 Texas Performance Reporting System
Profile
 State

Program Information	----- State ----- Count	Percent
Student Enrollment by Program:		
Bilingual/ESL Education	930,737	17.8%
Career & Technical Education	1,209,784	23.2%
Gifted & Talented Education	397,159	7.6%
Special Education	442,476	8.5%
Teachers by Program (population served):		
Bilingual/ESL Education	20,082.5	5.9%
Career & Technical Education	14,616.2	4.3%
Compensatory Education	10,485.6	3.1%
Gifted & Talented Education	6,478.6	1.9%
Regular Education	248,541.9	72.6%
Special Education	30,683.6	9.0%
Other	11,303.5	3.3%

[Link to:
 PEIMS Financial Standard Reports/
 2013-2014 Financial Actual Report](#)

'?' Indicates that the data for this item were statistically improbable, or were reported outside a reasonable range.

*** Indicates results are masked due to small numbers to protect student confidentiality.

'-' Indicates zero observations reported for this group.

'n/a' Indicates data reporting is not applicable for this group.