

OFFICE OF CHIEF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
Summary of State Board of Education Agenda Items
February 18, 2016

OFFICE OF SCHOOL AND EDUCATOR ACCOUNTABILITY

03. Information: *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) planning team update regarding Reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 [Goals 1 and 2 – MBE Strategic Plan]

On December 10, 2015, the President signed into law the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), which reauthorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). The reauthorized law prioritizes excellence and equity for our students and supports great educators. The signing of the ESSA provides an opportunity for states to revisit the plans presented in the State's Consolidated State Plan under the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, as well as the revisions presented in the State's *ESEA Flexibility Request*.

The Mississippi Department of Education ESSA Planning Team continues to meet, studying the new law in order to provide. In light of some changes within the law, the U.S. Department of Education (USED), has provided guidance on a few changes during the transition.

The MDE ESSA Study Group is utilizing resources from the Council for Chief State School Officers to analyze Mississippi's current status and identify areas needed for next steps. Attached is the CCSSO's Roadmap tool that the Study Group is using during its work this spring.

This item references Goals 1 and 2 of the *Mississippi Board of Education 2016-2020 Strategic Plan*.

Information Only

Back-up material attached

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 1: CCR Alignment	Main Point	State Quick Takes	
	Align accountability system goals with the broader goal of helping all students master the knowledge and skills necessary for success in college and career	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish college and career ready state standards, and align accountability system goals with college and career ready performance, such as reflected in the state’s standards. Define college and career readiness to include the full range of deeper learning knowledge, skills, and dispositions – academic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal – that evidence shows are necessary for success in college, career, and life (from early learning through K12) Use this robust definition of college and career readiness to create a clear “line of sight” for all state policies and practices including accountability and supports. 		
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set challenging state academic standards aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the state’s system of public higher education and relevant career and technical education state standards. ESSA § 1111(b)(1)(D)(i). Use those standards to carry out systems of assessment, accountability, and school improvement (ESSA § 1111(b)(1)(A)), and base the state’s accountability system on those challenging standards. ESSA § 1111(c)(4). 		
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing a clear state definition and high standards for college and career readiness can set equitable, high expectations for all students. Including higher-order skills can ensure that the system focuses on developing a full range of college and career ready knowledge and skills for <i>all</i> students. 		
Resources/ Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCSSO, <i>Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions: The Innovation Lab Network State Framework for College, Career, and Citizenship Readiness, and Implications for State Policy</i>¹ State examples, such as ESEA waivers (e.g., OR, WA, NH); WV <i>College and Career Readiness</i> definition;² ME Learning Results³ and Guiding Principles⁴ 		
Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What do we know about the range of knowledge and skills necessary for success in college and career (and how do they align from early learning through K12 education)? 		
State Notes			

¹ http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/ILN_CCR_Framework.html

² <https://wvde.state.wv.us/apps/tree/static/doc/college-career-readiness.pdf>

³ <http://www.maine.gov/doe/proficiency/standards/maine-learning-results.html>

⁴ <http://www.maine.gov/doe/proficiency/standards/guiding-principles.html>

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 2: Annual Determinations	Main Point	Quick Takes	
	Make annual accountability determinations for all public schools/districts based on clear goals to advance continuous improvement.	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a clear, shared vision for the role of accountability and how it connects – as a process – to meaningful supports and continuous improvement for all public schools/districts. Make and report on annual accountability determinations for all public schools and districts that are valid, meaningful, and understandable, including through index systems and/or data dashboard (as described in Principle 3), and consider how you will address school classifications (including lowest-performing as well as highest-performing and/or the full range of schools, as appropriate). Ensure meaningful accountability goals for performance and improvement for all public schools and subgroups, such that all students are on track to college and career readiness. 		
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a system for meaningfully differentiating on an annual basis all public schools in the state (based on accountability indicators, as described in Principle 3), ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(C), and identify for support and improvement the lowest-performing schools and subgroups (as described in Principles 7 and 8). Establish ambitious, state-defined long-term goals, including measurements of interim progress, on all required indicators and for all students and subgroups. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(A) 		
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing reasonable but ambitious goals for all schools and subgroups, based on multiple measures (as described in Principle 3) provides an opportunity to focus on closing achievement gaps. Making/reporting determinations for all public schools provides an opportunity to empower stakeholders and promote continuous improvement in all schools. 		
Resources/ Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To come.</i> 		
Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What could it mean to “meaningfully differentiate” schools across the full range of performance? What does that mean for classifications, and/or for data dashboard and/or index models (as discussed below) given the state’s vision? What information is important for all purposes and stakeholders, and how do you distill that to be meaningful while not overwhelming? What are options/models for setting long-term and interim goals? How could state system best integrate early learning, K12, and higher education? 		
State Notes			

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 3: Focus on Outcomes	Main Point	Quick Takes	
	Base accountability determinations on multiple, high-quality measures that are aligned with advancing college and career ready goals.	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include multiple measures in the state’s accountability system to make initial accountability determinations (and as part of deeper data reporting and diagnostics, as described in Principle 6), including but not limited to high-quality assessments and accurate graduation rates, based on both status and growth in performance, as appropriate. ▪ Include all students as appropriate (and subgroups as described below). ▪ Ensure that all metrics are meaningful, measurable, and teachable and learnable with regard to the goal of improving CCR student outcomes and closing achievement gaps (connected by evidence and/or researched-based presumptions). ▪ Consider additional measures of the full range of CCR student outcomes, including the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that result in college, career, and civic readiness, such as additional CCR measures⁵ (e.g., advanced course taking, students “on track,” college credit, college entrance without remediation, workforce certificates); measures of engagement and/or higher-order/social-emotional skills; and those best measured through performance-based demonstrations of learning. ▪ Consider additional measures of school quality and equity, including for example, opportunity for student learning and access to critical resources (e.g., curriculum access, access to early learning, provision and distribution of high-quality teaching/leading, funding, staffing, facilities, and technology); and school climate/environment and conditions of learning (e.g. school discipline, attendance, etc.) ▪ Determine how to weigh measures and how to present measures for initial accountability determinations – whether as a data dashboard, index system, or both, across multiple measures. ▪ Consider the value of and mechanism for including a mix of state and local measures to spur innovation and authenticity, where there is sufficient validity, capacity, scale, etc. ▪ Consider efforts to improve quality and utility in the state’s system of assessments, including the number and mix of interim and summative assessments, the inclusion of performance-based assessments, and the number and mix of state and local assessments, so that essential diagnostic, instructional, and accountability purposes are met with the minimum number of assessments 		

⁵ Other possible measures include, for example, additional academic subjects beyond reading and math; successful completion of advanced coursework; college credit accumulation; college entry, remediation, and persistence rates; career preparedness as measured by industry certifications and other measures; performance on national or international assessments (e.g., NAEP or PISA); reading proficiency in the early grades; measures of students being “on track” at critical transition points (such as 9th grade); and measures of deeper learning/social-emotional skills (such as critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, and academic mindset).

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

	<p>needed, assessments are clearly being used for their intended purposes, and assessments meet criteria of high-quality, individually and as a system.⁶</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider how all accountability measures and their combination advance the <i>shifts in teaching and learning</i> necessary to advance CCR student outcomes (such as personalized, competency-based approaches) – for example by valuing student progress toward mastery of key knowledge and skills. ▪ Consider any <i>unintended negative consequences</i> of different indicators and/or accountability designs. 		
<p>ESSA Requirements</p> <p><i>Each state MUST...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each state’s accountability system must be based on multiple indicators and measure annual performance on those indicators (including status and/or growth as determined by the state). ▪ This includes (1) state assessments in math and reading/language arts (3-8 and once in high school), (2) one other indicator for elementary and middle schools, (3) graduation rates for high schools, (4) English proficiency for ELLs, and (5) at least one other indicator that is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (such as measures of student engagement, educator engagement, advanced coursework, postsecondary readiness, or school climate and safety). ESSA § 1111 (c)(4)(B). ▪ In making annual determinations, indicators 1-4 above must each be given “substantial weight” and “in the aggregate, much greater weight” than the other indicator(s) in 5. ESSA § 1111 (c)(4)(C). ▪ Systems must annually measure at least 95% of all students (and students in each subgroup), and states shall determine how this factors into accountability. ESSA § 1111 (c)(4)(E). ▪ ESSA requires state high-quality assessments in reading/language arts and math in grades 3-8 and once in high school (and grade-span tests in science) and establishes a range of assessment pilots and programs, including a pilot for innovative assessment models (up to 7 states in the first 3 years) (see ESSA § 1204); providing for locally-selected, nationally-recognized high school assessments (see ESSA § 1111(b)(2)(H); and a use of funds to audit assessment systems (for quality and burden) (see ESSA § 1202). 		
<p>Elevating Equity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Including a range of measures aligned to CCR student outcomes provides an opportunity to prioritize efforts that will help promote equal opportunity and close achievement gaps, as well as raise achievement overall. ▪ Meaningfully including English proficiency for English learners provides an opportunity to elevate the importance of English proficiency for closing achievement gaps. 		
<p>Resources/ Examples</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current state/district models, such as CA LCFF/LCAP; CORE; KY ▪ International models including Alberta, Canada, and the United Kingdom 		

⁶ <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2013/CCSSO%20Assessment%20Quality%20Principles%2010-1-13%20FINAL.pdf>

Attachment "Rubric"
CCSSO's Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What do we know about the array of metrics that are meaningful, measurable, and able to be impacted with regard to advancing CCR teaching, learning, and student outcomes? What do educators and other stakeholders believe is most valuable?▪ Within that, how are you specifically thinking about non-academic indicators related to school quality?▪ What might be most important for accountability versus deeper data analysis and diagnostic review (as described below)?▪ What are the implications and opportunities associated with incorporating English proficiency in school accountability systems?▪ What are the viable options (including under ESSA) for data dashboard and/or index models for initial accountability determinations? Is there a distinction in what you would want to use to identify lowest-performing schools versus and what's reported as part of your school/district report cards?▪ How can states leverage ESSA assessment provisions to best advance a system of high-quality assessments for accountability and broader, deeper purposes? How should the state address "opt-out" issues in that regard?
State Notes	

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 4: Disaggregation	Main Point	Quick Takes	
	Continue commitment to disaggregation of data – for reporting and accountability – and to closing achievement gaps in education opportunity and outcomes.	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD ...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to disaggregate data for each measure in the state’s accountability system (discussed above) and for additional data for improvement (discussed below) – by at least the subgroups including race, ethnicity, poverty, disability, and limited English proficiency. Use disaggregated data in school accountability determinations/ classifications and in targeting supports and interventions, as appropriate (including schools with lowest-performing subgroups and/or greatest gaps). Ensure that any “super” subgroups promote inclusion rather than masking certain subgroups. Establish a minimum number for subgroup reporting and accountability that is as inclusive as possible and appropriate given context, validity, need to protect student privacy, etc. Publicly report disaggregated data for all subgroups (as discussed below). 		
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESSA requires that each state set long-term and interim accountability goals disaggregated by subgroup. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(A). ESSA requires that states annually measure and make accountability determinations for each school overall and for each subgroup. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(B), (C). ESSA requires that each state/district annually report accountability data for each school overall and for each subgroup, as well as other data points. ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(C). ESSA requires that states set a statistically-sound “minimum number” for subgroup data reporting and accountability, in consultation with key stakeholders. ESSA § 1111(c)(3)(A). 		
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This focus on disaggregated data and subgroup accountability and public reporting is one of the strongest commitments to equity maintained from NCLB. The focus on consultation with stakeholders can also be a mechanism for elevating equity in the process. 		
Resources/ Examples	▪ <i>To come.</i>		
Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can states best incorporate subgroup performance into school accountability determinations? What do we know about “super” subgroups and how they can promote inclusion versus exclusion? What factors do stakeholders feel are important with regard to determining a “minimum number” for subgroup size and with regard to “super” subgroups? How will you disaggregate data by subgroup for your non-academic indicators? 		
State Notes			

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 5: Data Reporting	Main Point	Quick Takes	
	Report data in a manner that is rich, timely, accessible, and actionable to a range of critical stakeholders.	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce (at least) annual state and local report cards that present key accountability data and determinations, including disaggregated data as appropriate (as in the “data dashboard” discussed in Principle 3). Include as appropriate additional data beyond those used in initial accountability determinations to further inform data analysis and continuous school improvement, including other data related to, for example, social-emotional skills; school climate; and access to resources. Design report cards to be most useful to key stakeholders (including teachers, principals, parents, policymakers, etc) in terms of format, design, substance, and distribution. Consider aligning report cards with processes for continuous improvement by incorporating data gathered through diagnostic/school quality review processes (see Principle 6). 		
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESSA requires that each state and district produce annual report cards and report data – overall and by subgroup, as appropriate – with regard to accountability determinations, measures used in accountability systems, and other key variables (including at a minimum, for example, preschool enrollment, access to high-quality teachers and leaders, etc.). See, e.g., ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(C). ESSA requires that these report cards be clear, concise, understandable, accessible, and developed with input from stakeholders. See e.g., ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(B) 		
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robust, timely data reporting is crucial for empowering stakeholders, focusing on equity, understanding and closing gaps in opportunity and achievement, etc. This is particularly true with regard to disaggregated data. States and stakeholders have an opportunity to work together on the design of state and district report cards to make them most meaningful, user-friendly, and useful to their purposes. 		
Resources/ Examples	▪ <i>To come.</i>		
Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What accountability and other data are most important to advance excellence, equity, and continuous improvement? What models of data reporting are most effective for the array of key stakeholders and purposes? What impact do your decisions about data inclusion have on your data collection and reporting infrastructure? 		
State Notes			

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 6: Diagnostic Review	Main Point	Quick Takes	
	Include deeper diagnostic review to better connect accountability determinations and data analysis to a range of supports and interventions.	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Include state <i>systems of deeper data analyses and school diagnostic, quality reviews</i> to help determine root causes, identify resource and capacity issues, develop strong plans for continuous improvement, and connect initial accountability determinations to the most appropriate supports and interventions. ▪ Consider a system that supports diagnostic reviews <i>periodically for all schools</i>, in addition to <i>more regularly for low-performing schools</i>/districts. ▪ Consider how to <i>leverage accreditation</i> to support evidence-based school quality reviews. ▪ Consider how results from deeper data analyses and diagnostic reviews might affect <i>accountability determinations/classifications</i> for supports and interventions. 		
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESSA requires for lowest-performing schools that there be a school-level needs assessment to inform plans for comprehensive support and improvement. ESSA § 1111(d)(1)(B)(iii). 		
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These deeper data analyses and diagnostic reviews can focus particularly on opportunity and achievement gaps, and enable greater analysis of access to key resources, school climate, and other variables that should be addressed to improve student outcomes, particularly in high-poverty, low-performing schools. ▪ These diagnostic reviews can include key stakeholders in this regard. 		
Resources/ Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State models of diagnostic review (e.g., KY, VT Education Quality Review⁷) ▪ UK inspectorate model 		
Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What models exist for implementing deeper analyses and diagnostic reviews that connect to accountability determinations/classifications and related supports and interventions? ▪ What are models for engaging stakeholders meaningfully and productively in a school-level needs assessment and other periodic reviews? ▪ What role will the state, district, and school play in developing and implementing these processes? 		
State Notes			

⁷ <http://education.vermont.gov/education-quality-review>

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 7: Systems for General Improvement	Main Point		Quick Takes	
	Build statewide systems of supports and capacity to promote continuous improvement across <i>all</i> schools and districts.		Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build statewide systems of supports available to all schools and districts to enable evidence-based plans for continuous improvement. ▪ Consider requiring annual plans for continuous improvement for all public schools/districts. ▪ Build a clear delivery system and strengthen capacity (state, district, external) to help the full range of schools and districts, as appropriate. Consider networks in this regard. ▪ Consider how these systems can promote the kinds of shifts in teaching, learning, and supports necessary to help all students master CCR knowledge and skills – including shifts toward personalization, competency-based pathways, focus on “cognitive” and “noncognitive” skills, etc. and shifts to further build professional capacity and growth (e.g., high-quality professional development, teacher-leader career tracks and lattices, educator development plans). 			
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESSA provides states with wide latitude in how they will set accountability classifications and systems of improvement beyond lowest performing schools (discussed below). ▪ ESSA allows states to use up to 3% of Title I funds for "Direct Student Services" - with a priority on services in districts with high concentrations of schools identified for improvement. These direct student services could indirectly benefit all schools and students in these districts by building systems of supports. 			
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing a full system of supports can help connect accountability more fully to resources for evidence-based improvements, and can help address achievement gaps statewide, including within school, across schools, and across districts. 			
Resources/ Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>To come.</i> 			
Sample Deep- Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the most effective state roles in building these statewide systems of support? What do districts, schools, and stakeholders most need from statewide systems of support? ▪ What do we know about and how can states best promote or facilitate evidence-based, comprehensive activities as part of these statewide systems of support (including through delivery systems, use of intermediaries, strengthening the market, etc.)? 			
State Notes				

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 8: Lowest-Performing Schools	Main Point	Quick Takes	
	Ensure significant, sustained, evidence-based interventions in lowest-performing schools.	Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the state’s accountability system (above), identify and ensure <i>significant, sustained, evidence-based interventions</i> to dramatically improve school quality and outcomes in <i>lowest-performing schools</i> and <i>schools with lowest-performing subgroups</i>, and to do so on an ambitious though reasonable time frame. Consider how these school improvement plans/strategies will be <i>informed</i> by data analysis and deeper diagnostic review, stakeholder engagement, etc.; will <i>address essential elements</i> that research and evidence indicate are important; and will be subject to <i>periodic review and continuous improvement</i> (as described in Principle 9). 		
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESSA requires that states beginning in 2017-18 (and at least once every three years thereafter) identify for comprehensive support and improvement a group of lowest-performing schools based on the state’s accountability system (described in Principle 2), including at least the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools receiving Title I funds and all high schools graduating less than 67% of their students. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(D). ESSA requires that, for these schools, districts develop, with stakeholders, a comprehensive support and improvement plan (based on all accountability indicators and a school-level needs assessment, identifying resource inequities, including evidence-based interventions, and approved by the state) for all lowest-performing schools, with the option of a one-year planning period. These districts may also provide public school choice to students in those schools. ESSA § 1111(d)(1). ESSA also requires that states beginning in 2017-18 identify for targeted support and improvement schools in which subgroups are “consistently underperforming” based on the state’s accountability system. ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(A). ESSA requires that such schools develop a targeted support and improvement plan, including evidence-based interventions, along with district approval. ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(B). 		
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both the focus on lowest-performing schools and lowest-performing subgroups can directly affect equity in closing gaps in opportunity and achievement. Focusing on evidence-based interventions can further support equity, such as efforts to address the effects of poverty and adversity, to equalize resources and access to great teaching, etc. 		
Resources/Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>To come.</i> 		

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ What do we know about the range of research/evidence-based strategies that should be included in systems of supports for lowest-performing schools and/or subgroups?▪ What approval process will the state establish for comprehensive support and improvement schools? What will the monitoring process for these schools include?▪ How will a school exit from the comprehensive support and improvement status? How long will a school have to work to improve before more rigorous interventions will be required?▪ For purposes of targeted intervention schools, how will you define “consistently” and “underperforming?”▪ How will the state determine that a targeted intervention school is not making sufficient progress such that it is identified as needing comprehensive support and improvement?
State Notes	

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Principle 9: Continuous Improvement	Main Point		Quick Takes	
	Establish systems of periodic review and continuous improvement in the state’s system of accountability and supports itself, to best advance CCR teaching and learning.		Status	Priority
Opportunities for State Leadership <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how the state’s system of accountability and supports might best evolve and improve through this period of transition and over time (e.g., with regard to measures, data reporting, supports, etc.). Establish systems of periodic review and continuous improvement for the state’s system of accountability and supports (e.g., annually) based on information such as rapid-cycle feedback loops, data and evaluation, broader research, etc. In particular, ensure that systems of periodic review and continuous improvement are in place for supports to lowest-performing schools/ subgroups to best promote success and reinforce the need for learning systems. Promote systems of stakeholder engagement as part of initial plans (above) and cycles of continuous improvement. This could include diverse stakeholders such as other state leaders, local leaders, educators, parents, civil rights, business, etc. Consider how this can promote broader shifts toward learning systems and a culture of innovation, implementation, evaluation, and continuous improvement. 			
ESSA Requirements <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESSA requires that states and districts periodically review and revise as appropriate their state and local plans under Title I. ESSA §§ 1111(a)(6)(A)(ii), 1112(a)(5). ESSA requires, for example, that plans for comprehensive supports and improvement for lowest-performing schools be periodically reviewed, that the state periodically review resource allocations for school improvement in schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports, and that that more rigorous actions be taken if there is not sufficient improvement over time. See ESSA §(d)(1), (3). ESSA requires that state and local plans, as well as specific components of those plans related to assessment, accountability, and supports, be developed in consultation with an array of stakeholders. See, e.g., ESSA § 1111(a)(1)(A). 			
Elevating Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing systems of periodic review and continuous improvement can help ensure that accountability and support strategies have greater impact over time, including on equity. More broadly, this can help promote the kinds of learning systems that are likely necessary for the system to achieve success for all kids. Establishing systems of stakeholder engagement can help elevate diverse voices and advance equity in both process and substance. 			

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Resources/ Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ TBA
Sample Deep-Dive Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ How can states establish systems of periodic review and continuous improvement that can help shift culture toward learning systems that can best advance CCR outcomes over time?▪ What forms of evidence should those systems consider and on what cycles?▪ How can states establish structures for productive, ongoing stakeholder engagement? What are the core strategies and models?
State Notes	

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Appendix A: ESSA Implementation Timeline and Process

The following timeline includes the estimated sequence and estimated timing of activities at the federal and state/local levels in implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Activities that are certain under the law or within the process are presented in bold. **All non-bolded activities are only estimated and are subject to shifting over time**, depending on numerous factors, including but not limited to implementation by the U.S. Department of Education (USED) and to the appropriations process. Underlying these estimations is the assumption that USED will attempt to accomplish as much as possible, within existing capacity and subject to certain external restraints, in the final year of this Administration. More clarity and detail on the points within the timeline will become available as USED releases more information about transition and implementation of ESSA.

Quarter/ School Year	Federal	State/Local
Q1: January – March 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> January 11th and 19th – USED hosts two in-person Regional Meetings for input from stakeholders January 21st – Comments due to USED on recommendations for regulations and guidance. USED internal efforts moving toward launch of formal Rulemaking and Negotiated Rulemaking (Neg. Reg.) (participants in Neg. Reg. will be chosen from those that submitted comments by Jan. 21st). NOTE: Neg. Reg. is required on issues related to state standards, state assessments, and supplement not supplant provisions. January 29, 2016 – Deadline for each state implementing ESEA flexibility to notify USED of which of the two available options it has selected related to priority and focus schools March 1, 2016 – Deadline for states choosing to update priority and focus school lists for 2016-17 school year to submit lists to USED. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States begin planning the development of their Title I state plans, including standards aligned to entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the system of public higher education in the state and career and technical state standards; high quality systems of assessment; and next generation accountability systems States begin planning for stakeholder engagement in state and local plans under the main ESSA programs and funding streams January 29, 2016 – Deadline for each state implementing ESEA flexibility to notify USED of whether it will (1) “freeze” priority and focus school lists for improvement as of December 10, 2015 and continue to implement interventions at least through 2016-17, OR (2) exit schools that met the exit criteria and identify new schools that will implement interventions through the 2016-17 school year March 1, 2016 – Deadline for states that selected second option above to submit updated lists of priority and focus schools to USED

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Quarter/ School Year	Federal	State/Local
Q2: April-June 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USED possibly publishes in Federal Register proposed regulations on all topics not subject to Neg. Reg. USED reviews public comments and commences revisions to proposed ESSA regulations on all topics not subject to Neg. Reg. Title I assessment peer review commences (April and June 2016) Neg. Reg. process possibly convenes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States continue process of developing their plans and conducting stakeholder engagement States and districts continue to administer assessments under ESEA and report on performance on statewide assessments, including by subgroup, for the 2015-16 school year (without required reporting on AMOs) States continue to publish annual report cards under ESEA (but are not required to report on performance against AMO's for 2014-15 or 2015-16)
Q3: July-Sept 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 1, 2016 - USED transitions to award funding for formula grants authorized under ESSA USED reviews public comments and revises proposed ESSA regulations in areas not subject to Neg. Reg. 8/1 – ESEA Flexibility Waivers expire (educator evaluation no longer required;) Neg. Reg. process likely continues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States continue process of developing their state plans and conducting stakeholder engagement States continue to publish annual report cards under ESEA (but are not required to report on performance against AMO's for 2014-15 or 2015-16) 8/1 – ESEA Flexibility Waivers expire (note educator evaluation no longer required)
Q4: Oct-Dec 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 1, 2016 - USED transitions to award funding for competitive grants authorized under ESSA USED possibly finalizes ESSA regulations in areas not subject to Neg. Reg. and publishes in Federal Register USED potentially publishes in Federal Register proposed regulations subject to Neg. Reg. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States are in transition year from ESEA Waivers to ESSA States possibly release their state plans for 30-day comment period Districts begin developing their local Title I plans for submission to States
Prior to the end of the Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USED potentially finalizes and publishes regulations on all topics not subject to Neg. Reg. USED potentially publishes proposed regulations subject to Neg. Reg. 	

Attachment “Rubric”
CCSSO’s Roadmap Analysis Document Working Draft/2-2-16

Quarter/ School Year	Federal	State/Local
Q1-Q2 2017: Remainder of 2016-2017 School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USED possibly finalizes regulations subject to Neg. Reg Jan. 2017 – Incoming Administration commences States submit state plans (whether consolidated or specific to ESSA titles), and USED conducts peer review process of the plans. USED continues process of awarding funding to states for assessment audits for the 2017-18 school year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States are in transition year from ESEA Waivers to ESSA Priority and focus schools continue to implement interventions through the end of 2016-17 (and potentially 2017-18, pending clarification from USED) before transition to ESSA school improvement process States submit state plans (whether consolidated or specific to ESSA titles) to USED for review and approval, including participating in peer review process Districts continue to develop local plans consistent with State plans States will possibly begin to conduct assessment audits
2017-18 School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USED provides ongoing technical assistance, guidance, and monitoring of ESSA implementation, including developing new monitoring questions and FAQs based on the statute, possibly new regulations, and addressing other issues needing clarity USED continues processes for grant competitions and pilot/demonstration programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States fully implement new state plans, including new accountability systems with new determinations to be made potentially at end of school year. Under new state accountability system, states identify new cohort of low-performing schools in need of support (timing of supports and interventions TBA) States commence process of awarding funds to LEAs for support and improvement activities in identified schools (timing and process – competitive or formula – will be state-determined; awards for up to four years, which may include a planning year) States likely conduct assessment audits
2018-19 School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USED provides ongoing technical assistance, guidance, and monitoring of ESSA implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEAs develop and submit applications to SEAs for funding to implement support and improvement activities for identified schools (process and timing of application TBD by each state) Schools identified in need of improvement potentially begin planning year Potentially Y1 of funding for school improvement activities in first cohort of identified schools (may be a planning year for LEAs, as determined by states)
2019-20 School Year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USED provides ongoing technical assistance, guidance, and monitoring of ESSA implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially Y2 of funding for first cohort of school improvement activities (may be first year of implementation in states that allowed for planning year)