

# Every Student Succeeds Act Overview

NGALC Meeting 1  
June 29, 2016

Ryan Reyna

# From Waivers to ESSA

- States must maintain challenging academic standards
- Testing schedule remains
  - More flexibility in the assessments given
  - Continue disaggregation of data and 95% participation threshold
- Requirements for accountability rating systems
  - Statewide long-term and interim progress goals
  - Specific inclusion of measures and subgroups
- Districts in driver seat for turnaround
  - Only required to support bottom 5% of performers
  - No federally mandated models
- Teacher evaluation tied to student achievement no longer required
- Consolidation of programs

# Accountability - Testing

- Annual statewide assessment in:
  - ELA and Math: grades 3-8 and once in HS
  - Science: once per grade span
- Districts may petition state to use “nationally-recognized” high school assessment (i.e., SAT or ACT)
  - State must validate assessment is aligned to state standards
  - State “shall” approve any district that selects to use the assessment
- No more limits on out of grade items for computer adaptive tests
- Alternative assessments capped at 1% at state level
  - States may not force a local cap, it is determined by “need”
  - States can apply for a waiver if the rate goes above 1%

# Accountability – School/LEA Designations

- Must differentiate all schools
- ES and MS required metrics:
  - Proficiency in ELA and Math, English-language proficiency, one other academic factor (such as growth) and one school quality or student success measure
- HS required metrics:
  - Proficiency in ELA and Math, English-language proficiency, cohort graduation rate and one school quality or student success measure
- Examples of opportunity to learn:
  - Student engagement, educator engagement, access to and completion of advanced coursework, postsecondary readiness, school climate and safety
- Academic factors have to count “much more” than quality/success
- All metrics must be broken out by each subgroup and available statewide

# Discussion

For additional questions or comments, email  
[ryan@ryanreynaconsulting.com](mailto:ryan@ryanreynaconsulting.com)

# Accountability – Test Participation

- Federal requirement for 95% participation
- States may create their own opt out laws, but still must meet 95%
  - Nothing in law “shall be construed as preempting a State or local law regarding the decision of a parent to not have the parent’s child participate in the academic assessments”
- States and LEAs decide consequence of missing 95%
  - Proficiency calculations out of the higher of
    - Total # tested students, or
    - 95% of eligible students
  - Must be taken into account in accountability system, but left up to states to decide how to implement

# Accountability – Test Participation

- States must use one of four methods to respond to participation rates that fall below the 95 percent threshold (all students or subgroup):
  - Lower summative performance rating
  - Lowest performance level on academic proficiency indicator
  - Identification for targeted support and improvement
  - State-determined action that is rigorous and approved by ED
- Schools not meeting the 95 percent participation requirement must develop an improvement plan that is approved and monitored by the local educational agency
- LEAs with significant number of schools must implement improvement plans reviewed and approved by state

# Accountability - Interventions

- States only have to identify and intervene in the bottom 5% of schools and any high schools with below 67% graduation rate
  - At least once every 3 years
  - District works with educators and community to develop an evidence-based plan
  - State monitors plan and if school struggles for four years, then state steps in with its own turnaround plan, but there is no required model
- Districts identify schools that struggle with subgroups
  - Schools develop evidence-based plan to help that set of students
  - District monitors plan and if school continues to struggle (for an undefined amount of time), then district intervenes with its own plan
- State and districts have to take a more aggressive approach to “chronic underperformance” of subgroups, but limited details provided