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**Our Mission**

The **American Federation of Teachers** is a union of professionals that champions fairness; democracy; economic opportunity; and high-quality public education, healthcare and public services for our students, their families and our communities. We are committed to advancing these principles through community engagement, organizing, collective bargaining and political activism, and especially through the work our members do.
INTRODUCTION

Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, each state education agency (SEA) must submit a consolidated state plan. This document reflects the revised template, which was released by the U.S. Department of Education on March 13. The revised template, along with a fact sheet, a letter from DeVos and additional information is available at http://bit.ly/revisedESSAtemplate.

Although the revised template under the new administration no longer requires states to describe their stakeholder engagement, the SEA is required by law to engage in timely and meaningful consultation with stakeholders in developing its consolidated state plan.

Each SEA can choose to submit its plan by the April 3, 2017 or Sept. 18, 2017 deadline. Any state submitting a plan for the spring deadline can submit it by May 3 to give its governor the required 30-day review period. For a list of when states have told the Department of Education they will submit, go to http://bit.ly/ESSAdeadline.

What follows is not a comprehensive document for all ESSA decision-making; rather it highlights some of the major decision points that SEAs, in consultation with stakeholders, must make. This document can be used to help guide your state in the development of its plan, or to help understand your state’s already-drafted plan. There are many aspects of ESSA implementation that, while important, do not have to be included in the state consolidated plan.

LONG-TERM GOALS

Academic Achievement

☑ Interim and long-term goals for academic achievement (performance on state tests for reading/language arts and mathematics) for the “all students” group and separately for each subgroup of students

Guiding questions

• What should the measure of achievement be?

STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders consulted must include the governor, the state legislature, the state board of education, local education agencies, teachers and paraprofessionals, parents, representatives of Indian tribes located in the state, community and civil rights organizations.

AFT’S TAKE

Deadlines: States should take the time to ensure meaningful stakeholder engagement and a strong consolidated plan that takes into account important equity and accountability decisions in an innovative way. The decision of when to submit should be based on the progress the state has already made in crafting its plan with stakeholder input, as well as external factors like the direction of federal initiatives.

ACHIEVEMENT

While elementary schools must offer the same assessments to all public school students statewide, states may choose to offer a nationally recognized local assessment at the high school level (SAT or ACT, for example), as long as assessments are reliable, valid and comparable.

AFT’S TAKE

Academic Achievement: Assessments should align to high-quality standards and curriculum; be developed through collaborative efforts; be focused on measuring growth and continuous development; and rely on diverse, authentic and multiple indicators of student performance that can inform teaching and learning.
• Should the types of tests administered by the state be reconsidered? Should common performance assessments be considered?
• Taking into account longitudinal or trend data, what targets for achievement and growth would be ambitious but achievable?
• Should subjects other than English language arts, math and English language proficiency be incorporated?
• How should the weight be determined for academic achievement?
• How should growth be accounted for?

**Graduation Rate**

Interim and long-term goals for graduation rates for the “all students” group and separately for each subgroup of students

**Guiding questions**

• Should there be other persistence measures?
• Should an extended-year cohort graduation rate be used?
• Should dropout rates be measured? What about the rate at which schools re-engage dropouts?
• What about the percentage of students meeting a certain target beyond minimum graduation requirements (an additional certification, graduation from a particular program, another sort of distinguished achievement)?

**English Language Proficiency**

Interim and long-term goals for English proficiency rates of English language learners

**ACCOUNTABILITY, SUPPORT AND IMPROVEMENT**

**Accountability System**

**Indicators**

Types of measure(s) included in each of the following indicators: academic achievement, academic progress, graduation rate, progress in achieving English language proficiency, and school quality or student success indicators

**Guiding questions**

• What are the most important things to know about a school’s performance?
• Do the current school, district and state report cards accurately reflect what is happening in our schools? What is misleading or missing?
• Is there a process for revising the accountability system based on iterative feedback and examination of data?
• Will the indicators be piloted locally and/or reported on before incorporating them into the statewide system? If so, how will these be incorporated into the accountability determinations?

Subgroups

Consider modeling an indicator of school quality or student success on California’s CORE Districts. Their accountability system includes a high school readiness rate, which is the percent of students who meet the below criteria: eighth-grade GPA of 2.5 or better, eighth-grade attendance of 96 percent or better, no Ds or Fs in eighth-grade English language arts or math, and no suspensions in eighth grade.

Subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group in the state, and any additional subgroups of students used in the accountability system

Minimum Number of Students

Minimum number of students for purposes of accountability that the state determines is necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students

Guiding questions

• Looking at longitudinal and trend data, what n-size is small enough to effectively include as many traditionally underserved students as possible in the accountability system while still protecting student privacy? Is that a large enough n-size that any single student cannot have an outsized effect on the school’s overall rating?

Annual Meaningful Differentiation

Distinct and discrete levels of school performance, and how they are calculated on each indicator in the statewide system

Weighting of each indicator

Summative determinations, including how they are calculated

Participation Rate

How the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments is incorporated into the system of annual meaningful differentiation.

INDICATORS

State-developed accountability systems must include each of these indicators:
1. Proficiency in reading and math
2. High school graduation rates
3. Another academic indicator for elementary and middle schools (growth or another indicator that is valid, reliable and statewide)
4. English language proficiency
5. At least one other indicator of school quality or success

Indicators 1-4 must each have substantial weight and in aggregate must weigh more than indicator 5.

AFT’S TAKE

Participation: Schools that do not meet the 95 percent threshold should receive support, not punishment.

Identification: Three years is a reasonable time period.
IDENTIFICATION OF SCHOOLS

Comprehensive Support and Improvement
✓ Will the state identify schools for improvement every year or every three years?
✓ Methodology to identify the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools
✓ Methodology to identify schools with a graduation rate below 67 percent
✓ Methodology to identify schools with chronically low-performing subgroups
✓ Criteria to exit the comprehensive support and improvement status

Targeted Support and Improvement Schools
✓ Methodology to identify “consistently underperforming” schools, including the length of time a school can be consistently underperforming before more rigorous interventions must be taken (maximum allowed is four years)
✓ Timeline for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups that must receive additional support
✓ Criteria to exit the targeted support and improvement status

State Support and Improvement for Low-Performing Schools
✓ Process to award school improvement funds to local education agencies (LEAs) and monitor and evaluate the use of funds by LEAs
✓ Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the state serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how the SEA will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions

Guiding questions
• What kinds of interventions are based in evidence? (For an overview of four evidence-based interventions go to: http://bit.ly/ESSAevidence.)
• Are there any school sites or districts to hold up as models?
• What is the theory of action? What will leading indicators be? Lagging indicators? Will midcourse corrections be possible?
✓ Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools
identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the state’s exit criteria within a state-determined number of years (the law allows for a maximum of four years)

☑ How will the SEA periodically review, identify and address inequities in resources?

SUPPORTING EXCELLENT EDUCATORS

Educator Development, Retention and Advancement
☑ Will the SEA use Title II, Part A funds or funds from other included programs for any of the activities below (and if so, how)?

• Certifying and licensing teachers and principals or other school leaders;
• Improving educator preparation programs; and
• Providing professional growth and improvement opportunities for educators.

Educator Equity
☑ Describe your strategy to address the most significant differences in access to effective, in-field, experienced teachers

Guiding questions
• What school teaching conditions would help recruit and retain teachers?
• How can professional development be part of an equity strategy?

SUPPORTING ALL STUDENTS
☑ Will the SEA use funds from Title IV, Part A or other included programs to support LEAs in their strategies to do any of the following (and if so, how)?

• Improve school conditions for student learning, including activities that create safe, healthy and affirming school environments inclusive of all students to reduce bullying and harassment, discipline practices that remove students from the classroom, and aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety;
• Use technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students; and
• Engage parents, families and communities.
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
on Accountability Plans Under the Every Student Succeeds Act
ADAPTED FROM A CONVERSATION WITH LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND, PRESIDENT OF THE LEARNING POLICY INSTITUTE

Q: ESSA requires that all indicators used for federal accountability purposes be disaggregated by student subgroup. If results from a particular survey cannot be disaggregated in this manner, is there still a role for them in state accountability and improvement systems?

A: Although indicators in the accountability and improvement system that states utilize under ESSA are required to be disaggregated by student subgroup, a school may use additional surveys for diagnostic purposes to help improve learning and the school environment. For example, in addition to the possible student surveys used in state accountability systems, the state, district and school could utilize teacher and/or parent survey results on an aggregated basis to assess aspects of school climate or functioning.

Q: How is the different weight distribution of indicators within the state accountability and improvement system determined?

A: ESSA allows states to establish their own weightings among the indicators that are required to be part of each state’s accountability and improvement system. However, there are some parameters. ESSA requires that student performance on assessments, graduation rates and English language proficiency each carry “substantial weight” and collectively carry “much greater weight” than the indicator(s) of school quality or student success. States also have the flexibility to use growth on assessments as part of their accountability system and determine how growth is weighted in their system. With any weighting, states should take into account how the indicators of school quality or student success will have enough influence so that districts and schools are incentivized to, and acknowledged for, improved performance on them. For example, the CORE districts in California, which secured a federal flexibility waiver from the U.S. Department of Education (DOE), weight the combined set of academic indicators at 60 percent and the combined set of school climate/culture indicators at 40 percent.

Although it is not yet known how DOE will evaluate this aspect of state plans, it is worth noting that states have a number of options: They may use a single weighted score for school identification purposes, or they may propose a means to categorize schools that weigh indicators in a different way. For example, if a school is found to be low-performing and non-improving on some number of individual indicators, with academic indicators counting most heavily, it would be identified as eligible for comprehensive or targeted improvement and support. It is also important to note that states must seek public input on how they construct their accountability systems under the new ESSA. This includes public input and hopefully discussion with key stakeholders such as parents and teachers on how different indicators will be weighted.

Q: What does Title II afford in terms of opportunities to meet the needs of low-performing schools?

A: Funding under Title II can be used to increase student access to effective, in-field and experienced teachers, and to address the root causes of inequities in access for students of color and those from low-income families. States and districts can extend these efforts to include access for English learners and students with disabilities. Title II funding can be used for states and school districts to provide professional development activities that support improving teacher and school leader effectiveness in helping students meet state standards; utilizing teacher surveys to help with identifying professional development needs in low-performing schools; reforming teacher/leader certification requirements; providing induction, residency and mentoring programs; implementing strategies to increase recruitment and retention; using data and assessments to improve classroom practice; and developing and implementing instructional practices that support dual or concurrent enrollment programs. Title II remains a flexible program and allows states to reserve 3 percent of funding for professional development for school leaders.
Q: What are some examples of promising state accountability and improvement systems?

A: According to a report [https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/redesigning-school-accountability-and-support-progress-pioneering-states] from the Learning Policy Institute on accountability systems, California, Colorado, Iowa, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia and West Virginia are developing promising models. Here are some examples from the report on what these states are doing:

**California** combines a more equitable system of funding with locally designed accountability plans that hold all schools and systems responsible for improving the learning opportunities and outcomes of all students. The state’s newly adopted local control accountability plans meet the requirements of ESSA and are designed to provide a more comprehensive picture of school performance and progress than the previous system.

**Colorado** has developed a plan to ensure students are college and career ready upon graduation by gathering input from a variety of stakeholders through several different initiatives, councils and working groups. The state has also endorsed the use of performance assessments by providing support to schools as they develop assessments for use in determining educator effectiveness. This includes helping teachers integrate performance assessments into sample curriculum units spanning all grade levels and subjects.

**Iowa** is redesigning the state system of accountability and focusing largely on adopting ambitious expectations for college and career readiness, supporting innovation through the adoption of competency-based models for learning and assessment, and growing the capacity of educators by creating opportunities for teachers to lead professional learning in schools. The state also has taken steps toward developing a multiple-measures data dashboard system that can serve as a tool to inform and differentiate support for school improvement efforts.

**Kentucky** is redesigning its system to include a definition of college and career readiness, as well as multiple initiatives and opportunities for developing innovative learning models to support students in meeting these expectations. Kentucky is also using a multiple-measures data dashboard to highlight school success, identify areas for improvement and deploy focused support based on local needs.

**New Hampshire** is focused on an “improvement-to-innovation continuum” that reflects a move toward a collaborative, support-based approach aimed at ensuring that students are able to demonstrate learning and mastery of skills on the path to college and career readiness. Central to this approach are the state’s efforts to integrate performance assessments as part of its competency-based model.

**Oregon** has defined college and career readiness by the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind required for postsecondary success. The state raised graduation requirements and is encouraging the use of performance assessments to measure and support student progress in meeting these comprehensive expectations. Oregon’s efforts to support innovation and school improvement have focused on proficiency-based learning models and early steps toward creating multiple-measures data dashboards.

**South Carolina** has a redesign that focuses on adopting a comprehensive vision for high school graduates and creating opportunities for innovative approaches to learning that will support students in meeting these expectations, including career-based learning experiences, personalized learning, proficiency-based learning models, and other novel programs and courses. In addition, the state has redesigned its educator evaluation system to draw on multiple forms of evidence of student learning and is taking steps to develop a multiple-measures accountability system for schools and districts.

**Vermont** is taking a proficiency-based approach to system redesign that emphasizes personalized learning. The state provides educators with flexibility to design learning experiences and assessments that require students to demonstrate what they know and can do. A key mechanism for determining the effectiveness of this proficiency-based system is the use of education quality reviews that incorporate quantitative and qualitative data in five dimensions of school quality: academic achievement, personalization, safety and school climate, high-quality staffing and financial efficiencies.

**Virginia** has reduced high-stakes testing and shifted toward a system of assessments, including
performance-based assessments, aimed at informing instruction. School divisions (districts) have the freedom to design and administer assessments that are aligned to state-determined levels of quality and standards of learning. In addition, the state has multiple initiatives in place to support students in meeting expectations for college and career readiness, including early college programs and career and technical education programs.

**West Virginia** has adopted college- and career-readiness standards and assessments. The state employs a diagnostic review process to improve the capacity of schools to meet these expectations. In addition, the state has taken comprehensive steps toward growing professional capacity by redesigning its approach to professional learning and teacher evaluation.

**Q: What are some of the specifics of the California model?**

**A:** California does not contain a single summative rating. Instead, its proposed accountability system offers a varied set of data on school performance to support educators and allow educators and other stakeholders to integrate their own values in determining school performance. The model establishes a set of "state indicators" and provides information both on the status of and change in performance.

California also will report data that are aligned with its local control funding formula on some aspects, such as implementation of state standards and parent engagement. For each of the local measures, the state has proposed a common standard and suggested evidence for assessing progress in meeting that standard. Each district determines whether the standard has been met, and that information will be displayed on the school report card. To identify low-performing schools, the state may use a process that analyzes a number of measures, using low- and non-improving performance on one or more of the indicators as the basis for identification and a flag for the kind of assistance that may be needed to improve in the area(s) noted.
ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Guidance on stakeholder engagement and developing state plans

A Handbook for Meaningful Stakeholder Engagement

Let's Get This Conversation Started

Let's Keep This Conversation Going

State Template for the Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act

Accountability

A Framework of Indicators for School Success

Pathways to New Accountability Through the Every Student Succeeds Act

Interventions

Evidence-Based Interventions: A Guide for States

What Works Clearinghouse

More information on ESSA

Council of Chief State School Officers

Equity and ESSA: Leveraging Educational Opportunity Through the Every Student Succeeds Act
http://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/equity-essa-report

Partners for Each and Every Child
https://partnersforachandeverychild.org/StateEngagement.html
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