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All states have submitted their ESSA Plans; 16 of 17 plans submitted in April have been approved.
Key Takeaways

The Good

• **Summative ratings:** In 44 states and DC, schools will earn a summative rating; in 14 of those states, schools will earn an A-F letter grade.

• **Minimum N:** All states plan to use a minimum N-size of 30 or less; 39 states and DC plan to use 20 or less.

• **Focus on student outcomes:** In 32 states, student outcomes account for 80 percent or more of an elementary school’s rating; in 22 states, it’s 90 percent or above.

The Not-so-good

• **Measuring achievement:** Fewer than half the states will measure academic achievement based on the percent of students reaching proficiency.

• **Measuring growth:** Although 48 states plus DC will measure student-level growth, just 15 states will incorporate criterion-based growth models.

• **Interventions:** Most states lack a rigorous approach to school turnaround; just 19 states will use competitive grants to leverage federal funds.

• **Innovation:** State plans generally fail to discuss innovation; only 2 states plan to take advantage of the new Direct Student Services set aside.
Summative Ratings
In 44 states and DC, schools will earn a summative rating.
Summative Ratings

In 44 states and DC, schools will earn a summative rating. In 14 states schools will earn an A-F school grades.
Summative Ratings

Some summative ratings fail to clearly articulate school performance
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- Needs Improvement
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Minimum N-size for Accountability
All states plan to use a minimum N-size of 30 or less; 39 states and DC plan to use 20 or less.
40 states have a minimum N-size of 20 or less.
Weighting the Indicators
In 32 states, student outcomes account for 80 percent or more of a school’s summative rating for K-8 schools*.

*Seven states are excluded because they did not have a summative rating or weighting of indicators was unclear.
Balancing Proficiency and Growth: K-8

Most states are balancing the weights of proficiency and growth at the K-8 level*

*Ten states are excluded because they did not have a summative rating or weighting of indicators was unclear.
In 30 states, student outcomes account for 80 percent or more of a high schools’ summative rating*.

*Seven states are excluded because they did not have a summative rating or weighting of indicators was unclear.
States tend to prioritize proficiency at the high school level*

*Ten states are excluded because they did not have a summative rating or weighting of indicators was unclear.
Indicators Used for Accountability
Fewer than half of the states plan to measure academic achievement based on percent proficient.
Measuring Student Growth

Just 15 states will incorporate growth models focused on measuring whether students are on track for college and career readiness.

- Normative, 30
- Criterion, 10
- Both, 5
- Unclear, 4
- None, 2
Participation Rates

States generally will not impose significant consequences on schools that fail to assess 95 percent of students.

- Improve Plan, 18
  - Drop in overall rating, 8
  - Other, 23
  - Identify schools for targeted or comprehensive support, 2*

* Illinois and South Dakota are the only states to identify schools for either Targeted Support (TS) or Comprehensive Support (CS) for schools failing to test 95% of their students.
Indicators of School Quality and Student Success
While absenteeism measures are the most popular, most states are incorporating at least one measure of college/career readiness.
## Some states plan to innovate with other SQ/SS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Other measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Reading by grade 3; freshman on-track; Alaska Performance Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Decreasing 3rd grade minimally proficient; special education inclusion in general classroom; military enlistment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Grade-level reading proficiency (3-10 grade); computer science credits earned; community service credits earned; on-time credits earned; ACE concurrent credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>Alternate grad metric; Early childhood classroom program quality; Re-enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>K-12 literacy; beyond the core; university entry without remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>9th grade on-track; P-2 quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Decreasing the percent of students scoring in API Levels 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Grade 9 course passing; extended engagement rate; annual dropout rate, MassCore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Seal of Biliteracy; diploma with advanced designation; high School equivalency diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Honors diplomas awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>All grades career exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Performance on ASVAB; participation in youth apprenticeship programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interventions in Low-performing Schools
Five states will leverage competitive grants to push districts toward more rigorous school turnaround strategies; an additional 14 will distribute through a combination of competitive/formula...
Very few states are planning to leverage ESSA’s new Direct Student Services set aside.

- Yes, 2
- No, 49