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ESEA Reauthorization: 8 years of attempts


- Law due for reauthorization.
- Chairman Miller’s 2007 draft.
- Chairman Kline’s piecemeal 2011 attempt.
- Chairman Harkin’s 2011 Draft reauthorization.
- Administration announces ESEA Waivers
- Attempted 2013 Reauthorization
- Conference committee emerges with compromise which passes with large margin.

ESEA TIMING
Why did this effort pass when so many others failed?
For eight years, Congress tried – and failed – to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Despite broad agreement on the need to overhaul key provisions of the law, there was little consensus on the exact solutions. A central element of the debate was defining a federal role that balanced state authority with protections for struggling students. By 2015, however, NCLB and the conditions the Administration placed on waivers from the law had grown incredibly unpopular on the left and the right. Much to the surprise of the education world, Congressional Democrats and Republicans were able to craft a compromise that significantly reduced the federal role in education while preserving key elements of accountability like annual assessments. That compromise passed the House and Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support.
The Five Big Themes of ESSA

1. Shifts authority over most education policy decisions from federal to state, but the shift is not absolute.

2. New state flexibility for school rating systems, goals and a system of school supports and interventions, but with limited federal guard rails.

3. Preserves annual assessment, but gives states an opportunity to audit, streamline and innovate.

4. Gives states greater flexibility to direct federal funds to state-determined priorities, but districts often have final say.

5. Eliminates the teacher evaluation system required under waivers, but states can choose to continue/refine their systems.

The nuance around the themes + Questions around how states will use new authority + 2016 Presidential Election = Significant Uncertainty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliminated</th>
<th>Survived</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability of Secretary to incent states to adopt a particular set of standards</td>
<td>Requirement to adopt “challenging” state academic content standards</td>
<td>Standards must be aligned with credit-bearing courses in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial discretion to reject state plans that comply with the law</td>
<td>Annual testing in reading and math in grade 3-8 and high school</td>
<td>Innovative assessment pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)</td>
<td>Grade-span testing in science</td>
<td>New assessment delivery options (adaptive, roll up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate to achieve universal proficiency by a certain date</td>
<td>State participation in NAEP</td>
<td>Funding for assessment audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic identification of schools that don’t meet 95% participation requirement</td>
<td>Disaggregated data</td>
<td>Mandate for state-developed accountability systems with limited federal rules around goals, indicators, and school ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally defined cascade of sanctions (including tutoring and school choice)</td>
<td>95% participation requirement <em>(states determine consequences)</em></td>
<td>Locally- and school-designed interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement Grants (SIG) program</td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement on state Title I plans (expanded to include charter leaders)</td>
<td>Optional set aside for “Direct Student Services”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race to the Top <em>(authorized under ARRA, not reauthorized by ESSA)</em></td>
<td>Existing Title I formula</td>
<td>Weighted student funding pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly qualified teachers requirement</td>
<td>“Supplement not supplant” and “maintenance of effort” requirements <em>(with new flexibilities)</em></td>
<td>Student Support and Academic Enrichment block grants of $1.6 billion <em>(if fully funded)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher evaluations based on student achievement <em>(required by waivers)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline

2015-16 School Year: Bill Passage and Initial Rulemaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSA passes.</td>
<td>Negotiated rulemaking panel (NPRM) meets.</td>
<td>USED Rulemaking</td>
<td>USED develops drafts regulations.</td>
<td>NPRM sent to Congress for review.</td>
<td>NPRM is open for public comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Dates are estimates.)

2016-17 School Year: Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESEA Waivers null and void.</td>
<td>Final regulations released (ongoing)</td>
<td>States Develop and Submit Plans</td>
<td>States must continue interventions in identified schools (i.e., focus and priority schools).</td>
<td>Competitive grant programs take effect in new fiscal year based on new program structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New President & Secretary*

2017-18 School Year: New Systems in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Accountability Systems Take Effect*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is not clear from the legislation when states will first be required to identify a new set of schools based on their accountability systems under ESSA (i.e., will the identification be based on 2016-17 data or 2017-18 data). We hope to have more clarity on the timeline from the U.S. Department of Education in the coming months.*
### Shifts in Accountability Policy: Who is Responsible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCLB</th>
<th>ESSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td>State but, under waivers, Feds required Common Core or sign off by higher ed.</td>
<td>State must demonstrate alignment to college coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessments</strong></td>
<td>State with Federal review and approval</td>
<td>State with Federal review and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions</strong></td>
<td>Federal Cascading set of Federal consequences, states choose amongst SIG options</td>
<td>States and Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AYP/School Rating</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State must incorporate certain indicators for each subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations on the Secretary’s Authority

**Standards:** The Secretary may not require states to submit any academic standards for review or approval or “mandate, direct, control, coerce or exercise any . . . supervision over” standards.

**Rulemaking:** The Secretary may not “promulgate any rule . . . that would add new requirements [or new criteria] that are inconsistent with or outside the scope” of the law.

**Approval of state plans:** The Secretary must approve a State Plan that is compliant with the law within 120 days.

**Secretary may not prescribe:**
- Goals or lengths of terms for goals;
- Specific academic assessments or items;
- Accountability indicators;
- Specific school support/improvement strategies;
- Minimum N.

How reduced is the Secretary’s power?

Even with these limitations, there are many ambiguities in the law that the U.S. Department of Education has a responsibility to explain, and the Secretary still has the power to withhold funds from a state that fails to comply with the requirements of the law.
Waivers

States and districts may request waivers of many provisions of the law if the state/district shows the waiver will advance student achievement.

Like NCLB, waivers are not available for civil rights provisions, maintenance of effort, comparability, supplement not supplant, and charter school requirements.

**New Limitations:**

- The Secretary has **120 days** to approve a waiver.

- The Secretary **may not** disapprove a waiver “based on conditions outside the scope of the waiver request” or require that a state, as a condition of granting the waiver request, include or delete specific standards, use a specific academic assessment, or adopt a teacher evaluation system.

**How Can States Use These Waivers:**

- States with rigorous, proven accountability systems in place may seek waivers of new accountability requirements that are inconsistent with their current approach to accountability.
## Accountability: Standards and Assessments

### Summary: Standards

States must adopt challenging academic standards in reading, math and science.

- Standards must apply to all students with the exception of alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.
- States must demonstrate that their standards are aligned with college entrance requirements and relevant career and technical education standards.

### Limits on Secretarial review.

- As under NCLB, the Secretary may not require states to submit their standards for review or mandate, direct or exercise any control over states’ standards.

### Summary: Assessments

**Annual assessments.**

- Reading and math in grades 3-8 and once in high school, as well as in science at least once in each grade span.
- With state permission, districts can use a nationally recognized high school assessment in place of the statewide assessment.
- Must measure higher order thinking skills.

**New delivery options.**

- Assessments may be administered as a single test or as a set of interim tests rolled up into a single annual result.
- Computer adaptive assessments are explicitly allowed.

**Assessment audits.** The Secretary can make grants to states to audit their assessment systems.
Accountability: Standards and Assessment

Recommendations

Plan to streamline assessment systems.
• States should establish a process to identify and eliminate repetitive, unnecessary or low-quality assessments. States may apply for a federal grant to fund the audit.

Consider new assessment delivery options.
• New testing options give states greater flexibility to experiment with innovative assessment models that support competency-based learning.

Resources

• ExcelinEd: Proficiency Matters
• Achieve: Student Assessment Inventory for School Districts
• ExcelinEd: Four ways to reduce testing and maintain accountability
Accountability: Goals and Identification

Goals
States must establish “ambitious, state-designed long-term goals” and interim progress targets for all students and for each subgroup for:

- Proficiency
- High school graduation
- English language proficiency

Identification
The accountability system must identify at least three categories of schools:

- Comprehensive support & improvement schools
- Targeted support and intervention schools
- Additional schools

School Rating Systems
States must establish a system of meaningfully differentiating schools on an annual basis, based on the following indicators. The system must give each “substantial” weight to each indicator.

1. Academic achievement
2. Another academic indicator (growth, grad rate)
3. English proficiency
4. Additional indicator of school quality or student success

Note on Accountability Provision, 95% Requirement:
States must annually test no less than 95% of students overall and within each subgroup, and states must provide a clear explanation of how the state will factor this requirement into its accountability system.
### Accountability: New Flexibility Around Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States <strong>Must</strong></th>
<th>States <strong>May</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Notify districts of identified schools.</td>
<td>• Distribute school improvement dollars through competitive grants and direct student services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor district improvement plans.</td>
<td>• Take additional action in districts serving significant number of identified schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set exit criteria.</td>
<td>• Establish alternative evidenced-based strategies that can be used by districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If criteria is not met, take more rigorous action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review resource allocation to support school improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide technical assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flexible funding to support innovative intervention strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set aside for school improvement (7% of Title I, mandatory)</th>
<th>Direct Student Services (3% of Title I, optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Distributed through formula or competitive grants to districts to serve identified schools.</td>
<td>• States may make awards to districts serving identified schools to provide supplemental courses, tutoring, and public school choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Or, with district approval, states may distribute to entities such as school support teams or external providers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accountability: New Flexibility Around Interventions

### NCLB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>In need of improvement (year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Transfer Options</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Services</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring (planning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructuring (implementation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ESSA

**What should be in your toolbox?**
- Achievement School District
- Tutoring
- School Choice
- CMOs
- Integrated Student Supports (e.g. CIS)

**For which identified school?**
- Comprehensive support & improvement schools
- Targeted support and intervention schools
- Additional schools

**At what time?**
- How many years does a school need to be identified before triggering next set of escalating intervention?
Accountability: Reporting

Summary: State/District Report Cards

- Details of the state accountability system.
- Disaggregated results on all accountability indicators.
- Disaggregated assessment participation rates.
- Information on the acquisition of English language proficiency.
- The state’s minimum N.
- Disaggregated results on the indicators reported to the Civil Rights Data Collection.
- The professional qualifications of educators (including the number of inexperienced teachers) disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools.
- State, local and federal per-pupil expenditures, by funding source.
- Number of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate assessment.
- State National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results, as compared with national averages.
- Disaggregated rates of students who graduate from high school and enroll in higher education.
Accountability: Ratings, Identification, Intervention, Reporting

**Recommendations**

*Wait for final regulations and guidance* to be issued in the fall or winter of 2016 before making any major or permanent changes to state accountability systems.

*Plan a thoughtful transition:* Review data; consult with education reform groups; and build political will.

*Prepare for new accountability requirements and responsibilities:* For example, what tools should be in a turnaround toolbox (e.g., achievement school districts, reconstitution, high-performing charters, public school choice, equitable distribution of effective teachers, and/or new curricula based on digital learning).

*Understand new restrictions, and opportunities, around waivers:* New restrictions will allow states to seek unconditional waivers of burdensome provisions.

**Resources**

- *ExcelinEd: Resources on Common Core, A-F, school recognition, and accountability*
- *ExcelinEd: My School Information Design Challenge results*
Innovative Assessment and Accountability Demonstration Authority

Summary

• Up to 7 states (including those in consortia) to participate.

• States must demonstrate validity, reliability, comparability, and accessibility of new system and plan to scale statewide.

• States may choose to no longer continue the use of the statewide academic assessments otherwise required if not used in proposed accountability system.

• Examples: Competency-based assessments; interim assessments; cumulative year-end assessment; or performance-based assessments that combine into an annual summative determination for a student.

States to Watch

The ESEA waiver for NH’s Performance Assessment of Competency Education (PACE) system helped to inspire this pilot.

OH state law established Innovation Lab Network assessment waivers as well as a competency-based education pilot program.

CCSSO Innovation Lab Network: The Innovation Lab Network (ILN) is a group of states taking action to identify, test, and implement student-centered approaches to learning.

Current states in the ILN include CA, CO, IA, KY, ME, NH, OH, OR, VA, VT, WV and WI.

Recommendations

Understand the far-reaching commitment.
• Developing and validating new assessments will require substantial time and costs as well as input from key stakeholders.

Begin by authorizing an Innovation Schools program.
• Interested states should pilot new models or identify districts that have begun the transition to competency-based education.

Resources

• Competency-Based Education Policy Summary
• Competency-Based Education Model Legislation
• Council of Chief State School Officers: Innovation Lab Network Roadmap to Competency-Based Education
Key New Provision: Direct Student Services

This optional Title I set aside can help support state priorities such as course access and public school choice.

Optional Title I Set Aside
- Beginning with the 2017-18 school year, states may choose to set aside up to 3% of Title I Part A funds to make awards to districts to provide Direct Student Services (e.g., supplemental courses, tutoring, and public school choice). 99% of funds must be distributed to districts.

- Services can be offered through providers or the school district.

- Examples include credit recovery, AP/IB or dual credit courses, career and technical education courses not otherwise available, personalized learning, course access, tutoring, and transportation for transfer to higher-performing public schools

Required Prioritization
- Awards must go to districts serving the highest percent of schools targeted for comprehensive and then targeted support and improvement.

Process
- Districts apply to the state to receive funds and must explain how they will inform parents of available services.

- States monitor quality of providers and maintain list of state-approved providers.
Key New Provision: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

This block grant is authorized at **$1.6 billion**. However, the grant programs that were rolled into this block grant only received appropriations of **$400 million** in fiscal year 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Activities</th>
<th>May Include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Well-Rounded Educational Opportunities (at least 20%)** | • Increasing access to accelerated learning (AP and IB)  
 • Expanding access to STEM courses  
 • Strengthening the teaching of American history/civics  
 • Improving foreign language instruction  
 • Promoting volunteerism  
 • Working directly with districts to emphasize that literacy is the most critical component of providing a well-rounded education. |
| **Safe and Healthy Students (at least 20%)** | • School-based mental health services  
 • Anti-bullying campaigns  
 • School-wide positive behavioral interventions  
 • Drug and violence prevention programs |
| **Effective Use of Technology (infrastructure costs cannot exceed 15%)** | • Building capacity and infrastructure  
 • Providing professional development on using technology  
 • Expanding personalized/blended learning (resources, devices, or content)  
 • Delivering rigorous academic courses and curriculum through technology  
 • Providing students in rural/remote/underserved areas with digital resources |
Key New Provision: Title I Funding Flexibility

ESSA makes two key changes to Title I requirements that could increase state discretion over federal funds and give schools greater flexibility to determine how funds are spent.

Changes to the Supplement Not Supplant Rule

- ESSA makes changes to the “supplement not supplant” rule, which states that schools and districts cannot use federal funds for anything the state already requires them to spend money on.

- Previously, districts and schools had to itemize individual costs and services to show compliance. Now, districts and schools need only show in fiscal terms that the Title I dollars supplement state and local dollars.

Expanding the Definition of Schoolwide Programs

- Under ESSA, states can give schools waivers to operate “schoolwide Title I programs” as opposed to targeted assistance programs in which Title I funds must be directed toward programs for certain at-risk students.

- Schools that receive a waiver to operate a schoolwide program will have significant more freedom to direct federal funds toward the programs that will maximize the benefit for all students.
## Summary

ESSA contains two potential sources of support for state course access programs:

1. **Direct Student Services**
   - Set aside amounts would likely range from approximately $1.1 million (Wyoming) to $54.5 million (California).
   - States could set aside 1% of that total for administration.

2. **Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants**
   - If fully funded at $1.6 billion, allotments would range from $3.7 million (Wyoming) to $188 million (California)
   - If funded closer to $400 million, allotments would range from approximately $1 million (Wyoming) to $47.2 million (California).

## Recommendations

- **Use the Direct Student Services to create or expand a statewide Course Access program.**
  - Encourage or limit uses of Direct Student Services funds for course access costs.
  - Use the 1% administrative set-aside of this program to develop course access infrastructure (costs related to the review of provider applications, establishment of a course catalog, and monitoring of providers).

- **Encourage districts to use Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant funds in support of statewide Course Access programs.**
  - Districts will have to submit plans for how to use these funds to the state, which could create an opportunity to encourage or limit the use of funds to provide access to Advanced Placement, well-rounded, and other online distance learning courses.
Course Access and Online Learning

States to Watch

States where a Chief is interested in the topic but authorizing legislation for Course Access does not yet exist or states with Course Access programs where this could fund some of the state administrative costs and also increase enrollments without requiring additional state funds or use of district funds.

Resources

- Course Access 2015 White Paper
- Course Access Policy Summary
- Course Access Model Legislation
- Course Access Video Series
Digital Learning & Technology

Summary

States can advance digital learning and technology initiatives through the following provisions:

1. **Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants**

2. **Education Innovation and Research** (continuing the framework of Investing in Innovation grants (i3))
   - Competitive grants for districts, states or consortia to fund innovative programs designed to improve student achievement.
   - More and better evidence of effectiveness qualifies applicants for larger awards.
   - Each grant must include a plan for independent evaluation of effectiveness.
   - Authorized for $72 million in FY 2017 and 2018; and for $92 million in FY 2019 and 2020.

Recommendations

Encourage districts to use Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant funds to promote digital learning.
- For example, states could push districts to use funds to help launch new personalized learning models or provide students with access to well-rounded educational opportunities through distance learning.

Use Education Innovation and Research grants to promote promising state programs.
- Identify promising programs within the state where rigorous evidence of effectiveness exists but funding has not been available to expand statewide.
- Facilitate partnerships between entities such as institutes of higher education, nonprofits, or companies with consortia of districts to implement or replicate and evaluate programs across the state.
Digital Learning & Technology

States to Watch

States where there is already momentum related to blended and personalized learning initiatives:

- ID
- RI
- CO
- OH
- FL
- GA

Resources

- Digital Learning Now: Leading an Era of Change - On the Ground
- Digital Learning Now: Blended Learning Implementation Guide 3.0
Charter School Program (CSP)

The Charter School Program is authorized at $270M in FY17 and $300M in years 2018-20.

State Competitive Grants: **65%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Quality authorizing activities</th>
<th>State subgrants to CMO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Activities: **22.5%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMO replication and expansion</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Grants to Charter Schools</th>
<th>Facilities financing assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities: **12.5%**

Summary: State Competitive Grants

ESSA expands eligibility to include governors, charter boards and charter support organizations.

The Secretary must prioritize states that:

- Offer a high degree of flexibility;
- Have an ambitious plan for their charter sector;
- Allow for at least one other authorizer beside districts;
- Provide equitable funding and facilities support; and
- Have taken steps to ensure best practices in charter authorizing.

Recommendations

Strengthen charter school laws and policies to improve the chances of winning a CSP grant.

- States can increase the likelihood that they will win a CSP grant by providing facility support, moving towards per-pupil funding equity, and strengthening state charter authorizers.

Employ high-quality charter schools as a turnaround strategy.

- States can use up to 7% of Title I funds for school turnaround and have tremendous freedom to determine their own “turnaround toolboxes,” including restarting an identified school as a charter school.

Resources

- National Alliance for Public Charter Schools: Model Law
- ExcelinEd: High Quality Charter School Policy Toolkit
Weighted Student Funding Pilot

Summary

• The Secretary is authorized to enter into three-year agreements with up to 50 districts to create a weighted student funding formula for disadvantaged students.

• In 2019-20, the Secretary may expand to an unlimited number of districts.

Recommendations

Encourage districts to apply for the pilot.

• Helping districts use weighted funding effectively, paves the way for full state portability (i.e., where all funds follow the student from district to district).

Understand the intensive requirements.

• Districts will need technical support.
• The formula must cover a “significant” portion of federal, state and local funds and provide “substantially” more funding to disadvantaged students.
• Districts must demonstrate that no high-poverty school received less funding per disadvantaged student when compared with the previous year.

States to Watch

Hawaii Department of Education, Informational Briefing Department of Education Weighted Student Funding

Resources

• Digital Learning Now: Funding, Students, Options, and Achievement
• Reason Foundation: Weighted Student Formula Yearbook 2013
• Education Resource Strategies: Weighted Student Funding
Pay for Success

ESSA authorizes Pay for Success for dropout prevention (Title I, Part D) and community-based health and safety services (Title IV, Part A, Sec. 4108).

Summary

- Districts can use federal funds under these two programs for a performance-based grant, contract, or cooperative agreement in which a public entity commits to pay for improved outcomes that result in social benefit and direct cost savings or cost avoidance for government.
- This new provision recognizes Pay for Success as an important vehicle for bringing private investment to pay for expanding educational services at no risk to taxpayers.

Recommendations

In addition to taking advantage of Pay for Success under ESSA, states can also vigorously explore Pay for Success in a variety of contexts, including to pay for K-3 reading interventions, with repayment of investors coming from savings from reduced special education placement and reduced retention.

Resources

- ExcelinEd: K-3 Reading Policy Toolkit
- ExcelinEd: EdPolicy Leaders Online K-3 Reading MOOC
## College & Career Readiness

### Summary

ESSA provides states and districts with several opportunities to promote college and career readiness initiatives.

**Academic Accountability**

- School rating systems must include one additional indicator of school quality or student success.

**Direct Student Services**

- States can encourage districts the use Direct Student Services funds to support participation in AP course, IB courses and career and technical education courses.

**Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants**

- States can encourage districts to use grant funds to increase access to accelerated learning programs such as AP/IB.

### Recommendations

**Incorporate measures of college and career readiness into state accountability systems.** States should consider incorporating student success in AP, IB, dual enrollment, and industry-recognized certifications.

**Use this time as a planning period.** Determine state priorities that support the needs of students and the workforce that will employ them. Then, identify ways that Direct Student Services grants or Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants can help the state or districts meet those needs.
College & Career Readiness

States to Watch

States with the opportunity to strengthen college and career readiness indicators within their accountability systems.

Resources

- ExcelinEd: College and Career Readiness Policy Toolkit
K-3 Reading

Summary

ESSA can support the implementation of K-3 reading programs through two targeted grant programs, the block grant, and new funding flexibility.

Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation

• Targeted sub-grants for districts that serve “high needs” schools to implement evidenced-based literacy programs.

Family Engagement in Education Programs

• Competitive grants to statewide organizations to establish Family Engagement Centers that provide parent education and family engagement programs.

Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

• States can encourage districts to use grant funds toward literacy programs.

Funding flexibility

• Increased flexibility around supplement not supplant likely makes it easier to use Title I to fund a statewide K-3 reading policy.

Recommendations

Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation (Apply)

• Use funds to carry out best practices.
• Ensure evidence-based programs are being utilized in high-needs schools.
• Use a 5% state set aside to work with colleges and universities to ensure all teachers have the knowledge and skill to teach all students to read.
• Emphasize the importance of the school library.

Family Engagement in Education Programs (Apply)

• Provide centers to give parents the training needed to support literacy at school and in the home.

Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

• Work directly with districts to emphasize that literacy is the most critical component of providing a well-rounded education.

Funding flexibility

• Look for opportunities to use Title I funds to support and strengthen statewide K-3 reading policies, including the interventions for struggling students.
K-3 Reading

States to Watch

Examples of States that have implemented a Comprehensive K-3 Reading Policy.

Resources

- ExcelinEd: K-3 Reading Policy Toolkit
- ExcelinEd: EdPolicy Leaders Online K-3 Reading MOOC
### Timeline

#### 2015-16 School Year: Bill Passage and Initial Rulemaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USED Rulemaking**
- ESSA passes.
- USED develops drafts regulations.
- Negotiated rulemaking panel (NPRM) meets.
- NPRM sent to Congress for review.
- NPRM is open for public comment.

_Dates are estimates._

#### 2016-17 School Year: Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USED Rulemaking**
- ESEA Waivers null and void.

**States Develop and Submit Plans**
- Final regulations released (ongoing)
- States must continue interventions in identified schools (i.e., focus and priority schools).

**New President & Secretary**
- Competitive grant programs take effect in new fiscal year based on new program structure.
- Formula grant programs take effect for upcoming school year.

#### 2017-18 School Year: New Systems in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Accountability Systems Take Effect***

*It is not clear from the legislation when states will first be required to identify a new set of schools based on their accountability systems under ESSA (i.e., will the identification be based on 2016-17 data or 2017-18 data). We hope to have more clarity on the timeline from the U.S. Department of Education in the coming months.*
How ExcelinEd Can Help

ExcelinEd is available to help state policymakers deepen their understanding of ESSA, set the stage for new opportunities and prepare to tackle new challenges.

- **Provide technical assistance** related to accountability system design.
- **Identify ways new federal funds can support state reforms** in areas including K-3 reading, college and career readiness and digital learning.
- **Support state efforts to participate in the U.S. Department of Education’s rulemaking**
- **Provide advocacy support for states** to preserve rigorous standards and assessments and strong accountability systems during the transition to the new law.

**Contact Us:**

- (850) 391-4090
- (786) 664-1794
- info@excelined.org