CSAI Report

Scan of State Accountability Systems

A summary of ESEA-era state accountability systems, and initial examination of ESSA state accountability plans.

November 2016

The work reported herein was supported by grant number #S283B050022A between the U.S. Department of Education and WestEd with a subcontract to the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST). The findings and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of CRESST, WestEd, or the U.S. Department of Education.

WestEd is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research, development, and service agency that works with education and other communities throughout the United States and abroad to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults. WestEd has more than a dozen offices nationwide, from Massachusetts, Vermont and Georgia, to Illinois, Arizona and California, with headquarters in San Francisco. For more information about WestEd, visit WestEd.org; call 415.565.3000 or, toll-free, (877) 4-WestEd; or write: WestEd / 730 Harrison Street / San Francisco, CA 94107-1242.

State Accountability Systems

How have states constructed their accountability systems, particularly in terms of accounting for growth and progress of all students and student subgroups?

As the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA) is implemented, states are evaluating their accountability systems to gauge these systems' alignment with ESSA stipulations. The implementation of ESSA provides states with opportunities to change the compositions of their accountability systems and to select indicators that are aligned with their visions for systems that support learners. As states undertake this work, a scan of state accountability system decisions might provide some supportive contextual information.

The information presented in this report is gathered from state Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waivers and accountability workbooks, presenting findings related to accountability decisions made to meet ESEA requirements. A summary of state accountability systems is presented in Table 2, with a focus on states' approaches to developing annual measurable objectives (AMOs) and creating measures for subgroup accountability. CSAI also conducted a review of states' available draft ESSA plans, focusing on states that have released comprehensive state plans for public review.

In reviewing state ESEA flexibility waivers and accountability workbooks, CSAI found that use of assessments and graduation rates as indicators of student learning in state accountability systems was common across all states.[1] Nearly half (n = 23) of the states included attendance rates as an accountability measure. Additionally, present across at least 30 states was an emphasis on college and career readiness, as measured by some or all of the following indicators: participation and performance on college entrance (e.g., ACT, SAT, WorkKeys, college placement) and advanced secondary course (e.g., Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate) assessments; dropout rate; postsecondary enrollment; concurrent-enrollment/dual-credit rate; attainment of industry credits; and/or percentage of students requiring remediation in college.

[1] For the purposes of this report, "states" refers to all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

While student-related indicators were the primary focus of state accountability systems, other measures that were incorporated into a few states' accountability systems include:

- School climate/culture (Georgia, Illinois, and New Mexico)
- Community/student/parent engagement (Illinois, New Mexico, and Texas)
- Program reviews (Alabama and Kentucky)
- Principal/teacher evaluations (Alabama, Kentucky, and Michigan)

State accountability systems also included measures for identifying and reducing gaps in achievement among student groups. To close these achievement gaps, states set ambitious but achievable AMOs in English language arts and mathematics for the overall state and for districts, schools, and subgroups. Of the 43 states that were granted an ESEA flexibility waiver, slightly less than half (*n* = 20) proposed to develop AMOs in annual increments, toward the goal of reducing the percentages of non-proficient students in the overall state ("all students") group and in each subgroup by half within six years. The other states (*n* = 22) proposed to use their own method of calculating AMOs to close proficiency gaps. Texas was the only state that set AMOs that increased in annual equal increments with the goal of having 100 percent of its students meet proficiency no later than the end of the 2019–20 school year.

Table 1. Methods for Establishing Annual Measurable Objectives Used by States with ESEA Flexibility Waivers (*n* = 43)

AMO Method	State
Reduce the percentage of students who are not proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by half within six years	Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah
Reach 100 percent proficient by 2019–20	Texas
Use another method to set AMOs	Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin

While the implementation of ESSA will bring flexibility and options for changes to states' accountability systems, states are still responsible for selecting indicators that are appropriate and encouraging of all students' learning. In preparation for implementation of ESSA, states have begun to release draft state plans for public review and feedback.

CSAI's review of currently available draft ESSA state plans found that potential indicators for accountability systems include:

- Proficiency and growth on state assessments
- English learner growth on state assessments
- Graduation rate
- Chronic absenteeism
- College and career readiness
- Student engagement
- Student grades
- Access to and completion of arts and enrichment coursework
- Access to advanced coursework and career and technical education
- Next-level/grade readiness (e.g., on-track indicator)
- Dropout rates
- Disciplinary data (suspensions and expulsions)
- College enrollment
- Teacher quality, engagement, and/or retention
- Parent/community involvement
- Diploma endorsements

Table 2 includes a summary of states' accountability systems under ESEA—to provide context for the indicators previously selected by states—as well as potential accountability system information based on currently available draft ESSA state plans.

Table 2. Summary of State Accountability Under ESEA and Released Draft ESSA State Plans

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Alabama	Alabama's accountability system assigned A–F grades to schools, and included the following indicators: achievement; gap; learning gains; program reviews (including program areas such as art and JROTC); effective teachers and leaders; local school indicator; attendance rate; graduation rate; and College and Career Readiness Standards (CCRS (the percentage of students who successfully met an indicator of readiness for college or career)). Achievement, gap, and learning gains measures were based on the ACT Aspire and Alabama Alternate Assessment (AAA). CCR indicators could include the following: • Benchmark scores on the English, mathematics, reading, or science section of the ACT • Qualifying scores on advanced placement or international baccalaureate exams • Approved transcripts of college or postsecondary credit while in high school • Benchmark level on the ACT WorkKeys • Approved industry credentials Annual measurable objectives (AMOs) were set for each indicator. Meeting AMOs determined points earned, which were combined to obtain an overall school performance index. The index determined a school's grade. Using 2013–14 baselines, Alabama set AMOs in equal increments toward the goal of halving the difference between the baseline year and a performance proficiency goal, which represents the 90th percentile of performance for the all students group in 2013–14. The methodology used to establish AMOs included the following steps: 1. Establish 90th percentile of performance by schools for the all students group. Add the average increase for the subject area over a period of six years. (This established the performance proficiency goal.) 2. Establish subgroups with n count greater than or equal to 20 (e.g., American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, black, Hispanic, limited English Proficiency, multi-race, poverty, SPED, white). 3. Establish actual percent proficiency of the identified subgroups. 4. Subtract actual percent proficiency from the goal established in step one. 5. Divide the answer from step four by two. 6. Divide the answer from step five by six. 7. The answer from step six equaled the annual proficiency improvement target. Note that each subgroup was compared to the all students group. The AMOs were used to identify schools for reward and support.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Alaska	In Alaska's accountability system, schools received a one- to five-star rating (one being the lowest performing, five being the highest performing) based on their Alaska School Performance Index (ASPI). For elementary and middle schools, ASPI was based on achievement on state assessments (35 percent of overall grade); school progress or growth for all students and each primary subgroup (40 percent); and attendance rate (25 percent). The high school ASPI was based on achievement (20 percent); school progress (40 percent); attendance rate (10 percent); graduation rate (20 percent); and CCR (performance on ACT, SAT, or WorkKeys; participation rate included for WorkKeys (10%)). The overall score was on a 100-point scale. In 2015–16, Alaska administered the Alaska Measures of Progress (AMP) in English language arts and mathematics, but ratings did not use these assessments for the 2015–16 year. In Alaska's 2015 flexibility request, the state asked for a pause in its accountability system for 2015–16, indicating that it would submit a request to amend Principle 2 by January 2016. Alaska Education and Early Development (EED) planned to add a rule that a school could not receive the highest rating (five stars) if it had significant persisting achievement or graduation rate gaps across subgroups. ASPI was also revised during this amendment process. ASPI scores and star ratings were based on 2014 assessments, and then recalculated with 2016 assessment data. To close gaps, Alaska set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of halving the percentage of students in the all students group and in each subgroup who were not proficient within six years. AMOs were set at the state level and for each individual school and district. Targets were set for the all students group and for black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, white, Hispanic, multiethnic, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learner students. School and district targets were compared with state targets. AMOs were used to identify schools for reward or support; AMOs were not a factor in the ASPI score.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Arizona	Arizona implemented an accountability system that assigned A–F grades to schools and districts. Half of letter grade determinations were based on academic progress: growth of all students (25 percent) and growth of lowest performing students (25 percent). The other half included other academic outcomes: English language learner (ELL) reclassification; graduation rate; attendance rate; and Falls Far Below reduction. Academic progress was based on state assessments (alternate assessments included) in English language arts, mathematics, and science. For elementary and middle schools, grades were based on: • Academic outcomes (percent passing state assessments)—100 points possible • Growth (of all students, and of lowest performing students)—100 points possible • English language learner reclassification, drop-out points, and graduation points (additional points) For high schools, grades were based on: • Academic outcomes—100 points possible • Growth (of all students, and of lowest performing students)—100 points possible • College and Career Readiness Index weighted at 25 percent of model—15 percent for graduation rate, 5 percent for participation in CCRS classes or examinations, and 5 percent for success in CCRS classes, examinations, and professional certification To close achievement gaps, Arizona chose to reduce the percentage of nonproficient students by half within six years. AMOs were set for all students and each subgroup (traditional ESEA subgroups: ELL, free and reduced lunch, Special Education, race/ethnicity) in each grade for mathematics and reading. To meet AMOs, schools must have had students in all subgroups and all students in the bottom quartile perform at or above the AMO targets for each grade and subject combination. AMOs were used to identify schools for reward and support.	Draft Arizona State Plan Draft accountability indicators: The ESSA state plan may reflect recommendations adopted by the State Board of Education for the A–F Letter Grade Accountability System. For English language learners, the Arizona Department of Education will use the flexibilities in sections 1111(b)(1) and 1111(b)(3).

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Arkansas	Arkansas implemented an A–F accountability system. Accountability determinations were based on achievement and growth on assessments. At the high school level, college and career ready indicators such as graduation rate and graduation gap (measured by AMOs) were included. To close gaps, Arkansas chose Option C. AMOs were created for the following groups for all schools: the all students group, targeted achievement gap group (TAGG), black students, Hispanic students, white students, economically disadvantaged students, English learners, and students with disabilities for ELA and mathematics (grades 3–8, algebra, and geometry). For 2015, AMOs were calculated based on the school performance at the 20th percentile rank of the state distribution. The AMO for each subject for each group was set at the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the grade level standard as determined through the standard-setting process. For 2016 and beyond, individualized school, district, and state performance AMOs will be determined after review and modeling based on 2015 results. AMOs were also set for graduation rates. AMOs were used to determine gaps between subgroups and identify schools for reward and support.	
California	California's accountability system calculated an Academic Performance Index (API) score for schools. API scores were based on statewide assessments, drop-out rate, and graduation rate. Note that state assessment results may have constituted only 60 percent of a high school's API score. Eight districts in California submitted a single waiver application as the California Office to Reform Education (CORE) and were granted a provisional waiver by the U.S. Department of Education. The CORE districts were Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, San Francisco, Sanger, and Santa Ana; collectively, these districts serve more than one million students in the state. Under their provisional waiver, the CORE districts operated under a School Quality Improvement Index which was calculated using a weighted system of academic outcomes (e.g., test scores, graduation rates), socioemotional measures (e.g., absenteeism), and school climate measures (e.g., student and parent survey results).	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Colorado	Colorado's School Performance Frameworks (Performance Plan, Improvement Plan, Priority Improvement Plan, Turnaround Plan) measured attainment on four key performance indicators: achievement and growth on state assessments (including alternate assessments), academic gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness (graduation rate, dropout rate), and performance on the college and career ready assessment. To close gaps, AMOs were created for districts, schools, and subgroups. AMOs did not vary by district, school, or disaggregated group, requiring schools and groups further behind to make greater gains. AMOs were reported for the all students, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, black, Hispanic, white, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, two or more races, minority status, English language status, and free and reduced lunch/economically disadvantaged status groups. The 2011–12 AMO cutoff points for earning a "meets" rating in the academic achievement section of the one-year School Performance Frameworks were set at the proficiency rate (percent proficient or above) of the 50th percentile school/district in 2010. For example, the school 2011–12 AMO was the percentage of students that scored proficient at the median (50th percentile) school. AMO cutoff points were set separately for reading, math, writing, and science, at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The long-term goal was for schools/districts to earn an "exceeds" rating by 2015–16. The "exceeds" cutoff points were set at the proficiency rate (proficient or above) of the 90th percentile school/district in 2010. In order to reach this goal, interim annual targets were set from 2011–12 until 2015–16. AMOs were used to help determine the type of improvement plan that schools must implement and to determine a district's accreditation designation.	

Connecticut	Connecticut's accountability system included measures of the following: • Student achievement, measured by performance on Connecticut's state tests in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, and science (all students and high needs subgroups) • Growth on state tests in ELA and mathematics (all students and high needs subgroups) • Preparation for college and career readiness, measured by coursework and exams • Graduation rates (four-year adjusted cohort for the all students subgroup, six-year adjusted cohort for the high needs subgroup) • School Improvement Grant (SIG) status • Attendance/chronic absence (all students and high needs subgroups) • Postsecondary entrance rate • Physical fitness—the percentage of students meeting/exceeding the health fitness standard in all four areas of the Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment (CTPFA) • Arts access—the percentage of students in grades 9–12 participating in at least one dance, theater, music, or visual arts course in the school year State assessment results were used to calculate the School Performance Index (SPI). The subject-specific SPIs were averaged to produce a single calculation for each district, school, and subgroup. The result was an index score ranging from 0 to 100, where 0 indicated that all students scored at the below basic level, and 100 indicated that all students scored at the goal or advanced level. SPIs and scores from the other indicators were used to calculate the accountability index. A district/school was identified as having an achievement gap if the size of its index score gap between the high needs subgroup/supergroup and the non-high needs group was 75 or lower, or was a significant outlier (i.e., at least one standard deviation greater than the statewide gap in any subject) and the AMO target for its high needs subgroup was not met. Achievement gap based on the difference in index scores between the "high needs" subgroup and the non-high needs group in ELA, math, or science was used as an indicator in identifying schools for reward and support. The high needs supergroup included economically disadvantaged students, English learners, and students with disabilities. At the time Connecticut submitted its ESEA flexibility waiver, the state was not able to establish AMOs for ELA and mathematics. Science index scores were being recalculated using a scale score approach, so AMOs for science will also need to be reestablished.	
Delaware	The Delaware School Success Framework included the following indicators:	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
	• Academic achievement and growth on state assessments in mathematics, ELA, social studies, and science • Attendance rates • Graduation rates • On track in ninth grade—the percentage of ninth-grade students who earned at least four credits by July 31 in four of the following areas: ELA, mathematics, science, social studies, and/or foreign language (for high schools) • Demonstration of success on one or more example(s) of college and career preparation in high school—options included meeting college and career benchmark/levels on both Smarter Balanced ELA and mathematics assessments, SAT, AP, and IB; earning a B or higher grade in a Department-approved, non-elective course in the state course transfer matrix; or technical skills attainment with a score of six or higher on the Smarter Balanced exams, or with completion of a job training opportunity Delaware requested a one-year pause in the implementation of accountability ratings and to reset AMOs (no later than January 31, 2016). Delaware proposed to address achievement gaps in proficiency in ELA and mathematics, and four-year cohort graduation rates. For each of the measures, schools and districts received points based on their ability to meet overall annual performance targets and reduce the gap between the student gap group and overall statewide average. Annual targets were set in fall 2015 after the release of the 2014–15 Smarter Balanced assessment. The student gap group was an aggregate, unduplicated count of students that were in groups that historically have had achievement gaps. Student groups combined into the student gap group included race/ethnicity (black, Hispanic, Native American), students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English learners. Achievement gaps were between the overall state (average) and the student gap group. This addressed the small n problem for subgroups and provided schools with a single achievement gap goal.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
District of Columbia	The District of Columbia's accountability system included student proficiency and growth on state assessments, graduation rates, and attendance. Student proficiency and growth were used to provide each school with a school index score, which was the weighted average of student index scores (all index scores divided by the number of scores for tested grades and subjects). Student index scores were determined by comparing a student's achievement level in year one and year two. Scores ranged from 0–110. Students who were proficient scored 100 points, while students who were advanced scored 110 points. The school index score was used to classify schools as "reward," "rising," "developing," and "priority." The District of Columbia aimed to reduce the percentage of nonproficient students by half within six years. Proficiency AMOs in ELA and mathematics were created at the state, local education agency (LEA), school, and subgroup levels. Subgroups included Asian/Pacific Islander, black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native, white, Special Education, limited English proficient/non-English proficient, economically disadvantaged, and all students groups. Each subgroup received an index score. Subgroups' index scores were by subject; these were used to classify schools as focus schools based on achievement gaps (between highest and lowest performing subgroup index scores). Focus schools included: 1. Schools with a school subgroup index score in a subject area that was 20 points or more below the statewide subgroup score in that subject 2. Any school with a within-school achievement gap—the largest gap between the highest- and lowest-performing subgroup index scores within a subject 3. Any school with subgroup participation rate below 95 percent for two consecutive years in the same subgroup	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Florida	Florida's (A–F) School Grades System was a point system that assigned a letter grade to schools based on achievement on statewide reading, mathematics, writing, and science assessments (50 percent of total grade) and progress/learning gains of all students and the lowest-performing 25 percent of students in a school on statewide reading and mathematics assessments (50 percent of total grade). At the high school level, additional indicators included on-time graduation, participation and performance in advanced curricula, and postsecondary readiness in reading and mathematics based on SAT, ACT, or common placement test results. At the middle school level, the grading formula was modified to include points for students who participated in and passed high school end-of-course assessments while in middle school. Florida's School Grades System included the performance and learning gains of English language learners as well as students with disabilities. To close gaps, Florida set AMOs in reading and mathematics for each subgroup. All schools and subgroups within schools were evaluated to determine whether they met their individual annual targets for performance in reading and math. Subgroups categorized as improving had increased the percentage of students scoring level three or higher, while the subgroups categorized as maintained/declined had not increased the proportion of students scoring level three or higher. AMOs or targets for progress were also set for students in the lowest-performing 25 percent (in reading and mathematics). Schools must have showed that half of their students in the lowest-performing group (lowest 25 percent) had made learning gains. This group included Florida's most populous minority subgroups, students with disabilities, and its economically disadvantaged subgroup.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Georgia	Georgia's accountability system assigned performance flags—green, yellow, and red—to schools based on the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI). The CCRPI was based on: • Achievement and growth on statewide assessments in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies • Post-readiness indicators • Graduation rates • Extra points for subgroup performance • Extra points for "Exceeding the Bar" indicators (exceeding annual targets or AMOs in graduation rate and assessments) Georgia's accountability system also included a financial efficiency rating and school climate rating, both of which were reported but not included in calculations for the CCRPI. To close gaps, Georgia set AMOs toward a goal of halving the percentage of students in the all students group and in each subgroup who were not proficient within six years. Annual growth target was calculated using the following formula: ((100 percent – 2011 proficiency rate) * .5) / 6. AMOs were also created for subgroups, which included subgroups for economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English learners, and race/ethnicity (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, black, Hispanic, multi-racial, and white).	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Hawaii	Hawaii's accountability's system, the Strive HI Performance System (Strive HI), was approved in 2014 for use through the 2017–18 school year. Under Strive HI, schools received an index score ranging between zero and 400 points, with weighted points assigned to: • Student achievement in state assessments in ELA, mathematics, and science • Student growth in ELA and mathematics • Readiness—chronic absenteeism, CCRS assessment (ACT in grade 11), graduation rates, college enrollment) • Achievement gap (between high-needs and non-high-needs students) • Other (bonus points)—retention rate, chronic absenteeism, the percentage of students with advanced reading level (in third grade), Algebra 1 course-taking, and the percentage of students passing advanced placement, career/technical education, and international baccalaureate exams and dual-credit courses Based on this index score, schools were placed in one of five designations: recognition (for the top 5 percent of schools); continuous improvement (75th–85th percentile); focus (10th percentile); priority (bottom 5 percent of schools), and superintendent's zone (for schools designated as persistently unable to meet performance targets over time). Hawaii intended to set proficiency AMOs by school complex (a high school and its feeder middle and elementary schools) rather than a single statewide target, with every school and subgroup within the complex expected to meet or exceed the complex-wide AMO. AMOs were determined for the following subgroups: black, white, Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian/Pacific Islander. AMOs were used to classify schools for reward and support—that is, no school could be named a recognition school, for example, if it failed to meet AMO targets for any of its student subgroups. All schools with achievement gaps between different subgroups were expected to use the data in targeting supports and interventions toward the underperforming subgroups.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Idaho	In Idaho's old accountability system, indicators used to determine school ratings included achievement and growth in reading and mathematics; graduation rates; college entrance or placement exam scores; and student access to advanced opportunities including the percentage of eligible students taking at least one advanced course (e.g., AP, IB, dual credit, or tech prep courses). The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) received approval from the United States Department of Education (USED) to pause its current accountability system for 2015–16. ISDE submitted a waiver amendment on March 31, 2016 with specific details on its new accountability system, the Fair and Equitable Accountability System (FEAS), which would include a four-level accountability rating (below expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations, and exemplary). As of October 30, 2015, ISDE used achievement data from the 2014–15 Idaho achievement test (Smarter Balanced) to identify reward schools. ISDE started identifying priority and focus schools by January 31, 2016. However, ISDE did not assign schools new ratings (one to five stars in the current system) based on those assessment results. For 2014–15, Idaho used its state averages for the AMOs, which were determined for all required ESEA subgroups (e.g., all students, all ethnicity groups, students with limited English proficiency, economically disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities). AMOs were used to determine schools for reward and support.	Draft ESSA State Plan In Idaho's proposed statewide accountability framework, there are separate academic and school quality indicators for elementary and middle schools; high schools; and alternative high schools. Elementary and middle schools include the following: • Academic indicators—ISAT proficiency and growth, IRI, and English learner test growth • School quality indicators—next-level readiness index, chronic absenteeism, and teacher quality and engagement index High schools include the following: • Academic indicators—ISAT proficiency, English learner test growth, four-year cohort graduation rate • School quality indicators— college and career readiness index, chronic absenteeism, and teacher quality and engagement index Alternative high schools include the following: • Academic indicators—ISAT proficiency, English learner test growth, four-year cohort graduation rate, and extended year graduation rate • School quality indicators—credit recovery/accumulation, chronic absenteeism, teacher quality and engagement index, and student engagement index

Illinois	In July 2015, Illinois signed into law a new rating system, where a school or district's score would be based on academic achievement and progress (30 percent) and professional practices (e.g., family involvement, decision-making, school climate (70 percent)). Ratings were: unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and exemplary, based on a 100-point scale. In 2015–16, accountability was based completely on student performance using the Multiple Measures Index (MMI) and AMOs. The MMI consisted of two metrics—academic success and equity. Academic success measured CCRS for students by examining achievement and growth on state assessments and four- and five-year graduation rates. Equity focused on the same indicators but looked at subgroup performance on those indicators. Subgroups included race/ethnicity, low-income students, students with disabilities, and English learners. In 2016–17, Illinois will begin phasing in the professional practice component of the accountability system. AMOs will be established and first used in 2016–17. Schools and districts were expected to reduce the gap between their current percentage of college and career ready students and 100 percent by half in six years, with even steps each year as a target.	Draft Illinois State Plan Suggested academic indicators: grades; access to and completion of arts and enrichment coursework; portfolio indicator of student success (e.g., combined lexile reading level); kindergarten individual development survey readiness indicators and other K–2 academic indicators; Spanish literacy and science assessments to ensure validity and reliability for students classified as English learners and a growing number of students in dual language programs; longitudinal data on current and former English learners; study former English learners' access to AP/IB, graduation rates, etc.; high school drop-out/graduation rates; teacher retention/engagement; socioemotional learning; and consistency of test scores so student growth over time can be understood. Suggested school climate indicators: disciplinary data (suspensions and expulsions); safe environments; wrap-around support; "Ready to Learn"; access to physical activities; nutrition; extracurricular activities (participation outside school day); transportation; student-to-counselor ratio; student-to-nurse ratio; and components of the 5Essentials Survey. Engagement: parent-to-student-to-teacher; community; and teachers and administrators engaged beyond the classroom. Postsecondary readiness: Postsecondary plan; postsecondary credentialing; college enrollment; career pathways; GPA/transcripts; Career and Technical Education offerings; and college/career/workforce readiness.

		Access to advanced coursework: dual credit/AP/IB—equitable participation; course offerings; freshman reading/on track; and drop-out and attendance rates. Non-academic indicators: chronic absenteeism; attendance; expulsion and discipline policies (SB 100); state seal of biliteracy; mentorship programs; and early childhood education (K-transition, pre-literacy activities, gains (both academic and other) within pre-K–2). After further consideration, members of the accountability workgroup repeatedly identified the following school quality indicators: eighth/ninth grade on track (K–12 indicator); chronic absenteeism and/or attendance (K–12 indicator); high school curricular measure AP/IB/dual/CTE (9–12 indicator); and pre-K–2 indicator (two groups, which may not be ready by 2017–18). Illinois is considering using four indicators for the elementary/middle school levels and five indicators at the high school level. Schools eligible to receive comprehensive supports and services will include: 1. The lowest-performing 5 percent of schools as determined by the state accountability system 2. High schools with a four-year graduation rate of less than 67 percent 3. Schools with one or more student groups whose performance remains on par or is lower than the performance of the all students group in the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools after a school improvement plan has been implemented for a state-determined number of years

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Indiana	Indiana used an A–F grading system to evaluate schools. Elementary and middle schools were assessed based on student achievement and growth on the state's ELA and mathematics tests. High schools were measured on student performance and improvement on the mandatory end-of-course assessments, graduation rate, and college and career readiness (achievement and participation rate on advanced placement exams, IB exams, dual/concurrent enrollment college credits, and industry certifications). Each of the indicators was given a score ranging from zero to four, which was averaged to get an overall score and a final school grade based on a scale. Indiana created AMOs for the following groups: overall, bottom 25 percent ("super subgroup"), top 75 percent, and ESEA subgroups. Each school and LEA was expected to meet or exceed state targets for each subgroup for each metric and demonstrate closure of achievement gaps. The goal was to either earn an A rating or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline rating in eight years. A two-letter-grade improvement translated to twenty percentage points of improvement/increase in proficiency. AMOs were used to classify schools for reward and support.	
Iowa	Iowa's accountability system (Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)) included achievement on state assessments in reading, mathematics, and science; graduation rate; test participation rate; and average daily attendance.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Kansas	Kansas' accountability system calculated an API based on achievement and growth on state assessments, test participation rate, graduation rates, and attendance rate. Kansas set gap AMOs to hold schools accountable for closing their achievement gap between their lowest performing 30 percent of students and state benchmarks. To meet the gap AMO, a building must have decreased in annual equal increments by half the gap distance between the lowest performing 30 percent of students and the state benchmarks by 2016–17. State benchmarks were calculated for mathematics and reading. They were calculated by aggregating four years of assessment data. An API score was calculated for each building; buildings were then ranked by API score. The API score of the building at the 70th percentile became the state benchmark. The state API was compared with the API score from each building's lowest performing students (30 percent). Kansas also set proficiency AMOs to reduce the percentage of nonproficient students by half in six years. For each building, district, and the state, separate AMOs were reported for the all students group and all identifiable subgroups (free and reduced lunch, students with disabilities, English learners, Hispanic, black, white, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian, and multiethnic). Only subgroups with an n size of 30 or more were reported. Building-level percentage at or above proficient for the all students group and identifiable subgroups was aggregated across all tested grades within a building. Building AMOs were calculated by subtracting a building's rate of proficiency from one. This difference value was divided by half; the result was divided again by six (in increments of six). The final result was the percentage of additional students who must meet proficiency in order for a building to make its AMO. This methodology ensured that each building had an individual AMO for each subgroup. AMOs were used to classify schools for reward and support.	

Kentucky	In Kentucky's accountability model, each school and district received an annual overall score based on the three components of Next-Generation Learners, Next Generation Instructional Programs and Support, and Next-Generation Professionals. Measures of Next Generation Learners (70 percent of overall score) included achievement, gap scores, individual student growth, college and career readiness (percentage of students meeting ACT, college placement test, or career academic and technical benchmarks), and graduation rate. The Next Generation Instruction and Support component (20 percent) included program reviews while the Next Generation Professionals component (10 percent) included teacher and principal evaluations. The overall score placed each school and district into one of three categories: needs improvement, proficient, or distinguished. Kentucky used three metrics in its gap analysis: individual gap groups for AMO targets; non-duplicated gap group; and gap group novice reduction targets. 1. Individual gap group scores for all groups were created and targets were set for each individual group. Schools were held accountable for improving those scores. 2. For the non-duplicated gap group, the goal was to reach 100 percent proficiency. The gap category of Next Generation Learners focused specifically on student groups that performed traditionally below the achievement goal. The distance from that goal was measured by creating a student gap group—an aggregate count of student groups that have historically had achievement gaps, which include ethnicity/race, special education, poverty (free/reduced-price lunch status) and limited English proficiency. The percentage of students performing at proficient and distinguished in the non-duplicated gap group was reported annually for each content area. To calculate the combined student gap group, non-duplicated counts of students who scored proficient or higher and were in the student groups would be summed. No individual student was counted more than one time. 3. The gap group novice reduction focused on reducing the number of students in the novice performance level in individual student gap groups in reading and mathematics. An annual novice reduction target was set for each group in a school, district, and the state. Targets were set on reducing the percentage of novice students by half in equal annual increments in five years. The percentage of total targets obtained was used to determine the final score for a school. AMOs were calculated using the Next Generation Learners score to compute a mean and standard deviation for the all students group in each level: elementary, middle, and high school. The goal was for below-proficient schools to move one third of a standard deviation within five years. Schools scoring below the proficient level needed to achieve the full AMO score; proficient or higher-scoring schools needed to achieve one half the state AMO goal. The	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
	overall score and AMO status identified schools for recognition and support. In addition, AMO delivery targets were set for all students and subgroups (white, black, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, students with disabilities, free and reduced lunch, limited English proficiency). The state used the AMO delivery targets to determine the type of assistance a school received to improve gap group achievement under the focus school support. KRS 158.649 required the Kentucky Department of Education and each district to address achievement gaps between groups of students including male and female students, students with and without disabilities, students with and without limited English proficiency, and students who were eligible for free and reduced lunch and those who were not (ESEA Waiver, 150).	

Louisiana	Louisiana implemented an A–F school grading system. In elementary school, 100 percent of the grades were based on student achievement on annual assessments. In middle school, 95 percent of the grades were based on student achievement on annual assessments with the final 5 percent based on credits earned through the end of the students' ninth year. In high school, 50 percent of the school grade was based on student achievement (25 percent on ACT and 25 percent on end-of-course assessments), with the remaining 50 percent based on graduation (25 percent on the graduation index (achievements like AP and IB exam credit, graduation rate, career credentials, dual enrollment credit) and 25 percent on the cohort graduation rate). Louisiana is committed to closing the achievement gaps between students in subgroups and students who are not. Louisiana created a new super subgroup to focus on nonproficient students (one third of below-proficient students). If more than half of students in the super subgroups exceeded expected growth on state assessments in ELA and mathematics, the school achieved its super subgroup AMO. Points were awarded based on the higher percent or number of students exceeding expectations within the super subgroup. Points were added to a school's performance score to help determine its school letter grade. Additionally, Louisiana calculated and analyzed traditional ESEA subgroups to guide supports and interventions. The state, districts, and schools, including ESEA subgroups, were measured against the 100 percent proficiency goal. No schools could earn an "A" letter grade designation if there were significant achievement gaps across subgroups that were not closing. Examples of achievement gap comparisons included white versus black; FRL versus paid lunch, students with disabilities versus students without disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students versus non-economically disadvantaged students (ESEA Waiver, 78). AMOs were also created for overall school performance growth. The overall growth score AMO was: • For "A" schools: improve by five SPS points or reach 150 (for schools within five points of 150) • For all other schools: improve by 10 points on the SPS scale	Louisiana State ESSA Framework The draft state accountability plan rates schools and systems largely (25 percent) on the rate of annual progress all students make. The rating system for schools and school districts will include a calculation of individual student growth (all students) over the course of the year. Student subgroups within a given school will receive a performance score and rating to identify achievement gaps for addressing. Schools with low subgroup performance and those not making progress with subgroups will be identified as schools in need of "targeted support." These schools must develop improvement plans as part of school system applications for Title I funding. Schools and districts can also earn smaller amounts of credit (up to 5 percent) for demonstrated evidence of "leading indicators" of success. These indicators are drawn from research-based practices likely to produce positive long-term results as measured by nationally recognized instruments. For this indicator, schools and districts will analyze past results to identify a key area requiring significant improvement (from a list of four potential options). Schools and districts will establish quantitative and qualitative "leading indicators" that will be evaluated throughout the year by local officials, who will use nationally recognized instruments that are audited by the state and validated by independent boards of content experts. Independent boards of experts will also study statewide "leading indicator" results and propose refinements in the indicators allowed or required. Long-term indicators: • Mastery on grade 3–8 assessments

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
		• Five or more TOPS-aligned course credits for the Dropout Credit Accumulation Index (DCAI) • Mastery on five-level scale test (end-of-course assessments) • Score of at least 21 on the ACT • High school diploma plus basic Jump Start credential, or at least one TOPS core curriculum credit in AP, college credit, dual enrollment, or IB (current 110 level) • 90 percent cohort graduation rate in four years Leading indicators: • Mastery of fundamental skills • Serving historically disadvantaged students • Fair and equitable access to enriching experiences • Celebrating and strengthening the teaching profession
Maine	Maine assigned A–F grades to its schools using the Maine School Performance Grading System, which included indicators for student achievement on state assessments in math and reading, and growth/progress in achievement. For elementary schools, growth of the bottom 25 percent of students was included in this calculation; for high schools, graduation rate was included. Maine also included contextual information about schools, such as student poverty, teacher tenure and education levels, and school funding. In terms of growth, Maine measured student performance compared to a school's sixth-year proficiency goal, student proficiency compared to expected annual growth, and median student growth percentiles in math and reading. AMOs were created based on the target of halving the percentage of nonproficient students by 2017–18, with targets specific to each school, subject, and subgroup within a school.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Maryland	Maryland created the Maryland School Progress Index, with separate indices for elementary/middle schools and high schools. The elementary and middle school index consisted of the following indicators: student achievement (30 percent), growth (30 percent) on state assessments in English language arts, math, and science, and gap reduction (40 percent). The high school index consisted of the following indicators: student achievement (40 percent), gap reduction (40 percent), and college and career readiness (20 percent); the college and career readiness indicator was comprised of cohort graduation rate (60 percent) and college and career preparation (AP or IB exam performance and career concentrators—schools received credit for students enrolled in the third year of a CTE program, or college enrollment (40 percent)). Maryland also measured the percentage of students who make a year's worth of growth on state math and reading assessments. AMOs were set based on the goal of reducing the percentage of nonproficient students by half within six years. The gap reduction indicator was based on AMO performance, looking at gap closure between the lowest and highest subgroups within a school. Side note: a proportional index measured the location of a school relative to a target (O/T), where O was the observed value and T was the target. Proportions less than one indicated the observed performance was less than the target. Proportions greater than or equal to one indicated the observed performance was greater than or equal to the target. The measure was continuous in that the value conveyed how far above or below the target the observed result was. The index can be rescaled/converted to a 1–100 scale. AMOs were created for the all students and race/ethnicity groups (American Indian, Asian, black, Latino, Pacific Islander, white, two or more races, Special Education, limited English proficiency, free and reduced meals/free and reduced lunch status).	
Massachusetts	Massachusetts proposed the use of a Progress and Performance Index (PPI) that combined four years of data on state test participation, student achievement (on state assessments in English language arts, math, and science), student growth/improvement, cohort graduation rate, dropout rate, and dropout reengagement (reduction of the percentage of students scoring at warning/failing and/or increasing percentage of students scoring at advanced). The PPI used a five-level scale, ranking the highest performing schools at level one and the lowest performing schools at level five. AMOs were set with the target of increasing the percentage of students scoring in the advanced category on state ELA and math assessments. 0.25 points were awarded to schools for an increased percentage of students in the advanced category by 10 percent or more.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Michigan	Michigan created an Accountability Scorecard for its schools based on five components: student participation on state assessments; student proficiency on state assessments in math, reading, social studies, science, and writing; student graduation or attendance rates; educator effectiveness label reporting and teacher/student data link reporting rates; and School Improvement Plan reporting and school diagnostic reporting. For improvement, Michigan used error-adjusted mean student growth percentile (SGP) aggregated at the school level. Scorecards also reported assessment participation rates, proficiency rates, graduation rates, and attendance rates. Based on the Accountability Scorecard, a five-color scale was used to characterize schools. AMOs were developed with the target of 85 percent proficiency by 2023–24; for schools that have already reached 85 percent proficiency, the goal then becomes 100 percent proficiency.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Minnesota	Minnesota calculated a Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) and a Focus Rating (FR) for its districts and schools. The MMR was calculated with four achievement measures (worth 25 points each): proficiency (on state assessments in reading and math), individual student growth, growth gap reduction, and graduation rates. Growth gap was calculated by taking the growth of the state comparison group and subtracting the growth of the school student group. This growth measure used the "grade-to-growth" model. The FR measured proficiency and growth for minority students and students receiving special services. FR consisted of two domains (worth 25 points each): focused proficiency and achievement gap reduction. The weighting was based on the size of the student group; only groups with at least 20 students were included. For most elementary and middle schools, the maximum possible point total was 75. For most high schools, the maximum possible point total was 100. Points for graduation rate were based on the weighted percentage of student groups that met AYP graduation rate targets or demonstrated improvement from the prior year. The graduation rate target was 90 percent for all students and for each student group. Only Title I schools were then rated as priority schools (bottom 5 percent of MMR), focus schools (bottom 10 percent), continuous improvement (bottom 25 percent not already identified as priority or focus), celebration eligible (next 25 percent; 60th–85th percentile), and reward schools (top 15 percent). For the proficiency component, schools earned points based on a weighted percentage of student groups making AYP. AMOs were set based on the goal of halving the percentage of nonproficient students by 2017. Minnesota used the following formula to create AMO targets: ((1 – (starting index) x 0.5) + (starting index)). Growth gap reduction focused on the following student subgroups: Black, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian, Special Education, English learners, and students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Mississippi	Mississippi assigned A–F grades to its schools based on their Differentiated Accountability Model that assigned one of five designations to schools. This system accounted for: student performance on state assessments in reading/language arts, math, science (including biology) and U.S. history; graduation rate; college and career readiness (using math and English/reading, although this indicator was contingent on legislative funding); and acceleration (participation and performance combined). Mississippi also calculated the Quality of Distribution Index (QDI), which assigned a value from zero (students scoring at the lowest proficiency level) to 300 (students scoring at highest proficiency level) based on student proficiency levels. The Differentiated Accountability Model accounts for overall QDI, QDI-High (top 25 percent of students), QDI-Low (bottom 25 percent of students), achievement gap (or QDI gap), and a model for individual student growth percentiles. For growth, the state calculated the growth of all students and of the bottom 25 percent of students on state assessments. AMOs were calculated based on the goal of decreasing the percentage of nonproficient students by half.	
Missouri	Missouri used the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) to identify district accreditation status and to determine levels of differentiated support. MSIP accounted for student performance on state assessments in English language arts and math, graduation rate, test participation rate, attendance rate, high school readiness (points for completion of advanced math courses), and college and career readiness (points for the percentage of students earning a qualifying score in advanced courses). The most recent iteration was the MSIP 5, which determined status through three-year averages of the performance index, unless three years of data were not available. AMO targets were set based on overall academic achievement and the student gap group. For academic achievement, the goal was to improve total student proficiency on state assessments by 25 percent by 2020. Student gap group targets were based on the goal of cutting the achievement gap in half for students in historically underperforming subgroups (Black, Hispanic, Free and reduced lunch, Students with Disabilities, and English language learners). Student gap group AMOs were designed to reflect a linear trajectory of progress gains. Student growth outcomes were also calculated for student performance on state ELA and math assessments.	
Montana	Montana used AYP status for school accountability, looking at: student performance on state assessments in reading and math, attendance rate, and graduation rate.	
Nebraska	Nebraska classified its schools into one of five categories based on student performance on state assessments in reading, math, science, and writing, and graduation rates.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Nevada	Nevada used a five-star classification system based on student performance on state reading and math assessments, cohort graduation rate, college and career readiness (percentage of students in state colleges requiring remediation, percentage of students earning an advanced diploma, AP proficiency, and ACT/SAT participation), average daily attendance, and percentage of grade 9 students who were credit deficient. Student growth, proficiency, and gaps were also included in these calculations. If a school was missing one or more performance measures due to small student populations, adjusted index scores were applied. Adequate growth percentile goals were created for elementary and middle schools, awarding points for the percentages of students in subgroups that met these goals. Proficiency gap closure was used for high schools (only with groups that had at least 10 students), awarding points based on the difference between subgroup/supergroup proficiency rates and statewide percentage of proficient students in reading and math. For growth, student growth percentiles were calculated based on the Betebenner model. This growth calculation included an adequate growth percentile that assessed whether or not a student was on track towards proficiency within three years or by grade 8. Nevada monitored and reported on the academic performance (status and growth) of these student subgroups: Alaskan/Native American, Asian, African American, Hispanic, Caucasian, Pacific Islander, Two or More Races, Individualized Education Plan, English Language Proficiency, and Free and Reduced Lunch).	
New Hampshire	New Hampshire's accountability system was based on student achievement data from state assessments in reading and math from the most recent four years, with each content area worth 100 points. Index scores were added to produce annual combined scores; this cumulative achievement score determined a school's rating category. The system also accounted for graduation rate, drop-out rate, and attendance rate. Schools and districts also determined measures of performance that were deemed to provide opportunities for adequate education. AMOs were set based on the goal of reducing the percentage of nonproficient students by half within six years. AMOs used the approved n size of 11 for calculating each subgroup.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
New Jersey	New Jersey created performance reports that presented peer-school comparisons with approximately 30 similar schools. On these reports, the following indicators were included: student performance on state assessments (PARCC and end-of-course assessments), percentage of chronically absent students (students who were not present for 10 percent or more of the school year, for any reason), high school graduation rate, postsecondary outcomes (remediation rates in state postsecondary institutions, percentage of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions within six months of graduation, and percentage of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions within 18 months of graduation), and college and career readiness indicators (percentages of students taking the SAT or ACT, percentage of students taking the PSAT, percentage of students scoring above 1550 on the SAT, percentages of students taking AP and IB tests, and percentages of students scoring at or above three on AP tests and at or above four on IB tests). Performance targets were used as AMOs, which were based on the target of reducing the percentage of nonproficient students by half.	
New Mexico	New Mexico assigned A–F grades to its schools. The following weights were used to determine grades: 20 points for percent of proficient students, 10 points for value-added conditioning of proficiencies, 10 points for value-added conditioning of performance, 10 points for growth of the top 75 percent of students, 10 points for growth of the bottom 25 percent of students, three points for attendance of all students, five points for classroom survey, eight points for percentage of students graduating within four years, three points for percentage of students graduating within five years, two points for percentage of students graduating within six years, four points for value-added conditioning of school growth, five points for percentage of all students who participated in a college entrance exam or coursework leading to dual-credit and vocational certification, and 10 points for percentage of participants who met a success benchmark. Bonus points were available for student and parent engagement. Student growth targets were used as AMOs, which were set at the recommended 90th percentile of current performance. For growth, New Mexico calculated school growth and individual student growth over a three-year period, calculated for the highest- and lowest-performing students.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
New York	New York used the Differentiated Accountability system that incorporated student performance on state English language arts and math assessments (K–8 and Regents exams), student performance on state science assessments (grades 4 and 8), four- and five-year graduation rates, and state assessment participation rates. Student performance was determined using a performance index (PI) that assigned a score on a 200-point scale that communicated how a group performed on a required state assessment. PIs were used as AMOs, which were based on the goal of reducing the PI gap between all students and each subgroup. For growth, New York calculated median student growth percentiles and year-to-year gains in ELA and math assessment performance and graduation rates. The performance index was calculated for the following groups: all students, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, economically disadvantaged students, students with limited English proficiency, and students with disabilities.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
North Carolina	North Carolina assigned A–F grades based on student achievement (80 percent) and growth (20 percent) using the following indicators: student performance on state assessments in reading and math for grades 3–8; student performance on state science assessments in grades 5 and 8; student performance in math I, biology, and English II; percentage of students who scored 17 or higher on the ACT; percentage of students who achieved silver certificate or better on ACT WorkKeys; four-year graduation rate; Future-Ready Core completer rate (students who completed and passed algebra II/integrated mathematics III/mathematics III); and implementation of the Graduation Project. AMOs were set based on the target of reducing the percentage of no-proficient students by half within six years.	Draft North Carolina State Plan North Carolina's draft plan does not have information on accountability system yet; however, it provides a list of indicators for School Quality or Student Success that emerged in initial discussions: • Chronic absenteeism • Attendance • Student engagement • Student participation in co-curricular activities • Physical activity • Student participation in the arts • Student suspensions • Teacher engagement • Parent involvement • End-of-grade and end-of-course science test scores • College and career readiness index (AP and IB scores, ACT, ACT WorkKeys, career and technical education credentials, college credit) • Diploma endorsements • Promotion from 8th grade to 9th grade
North Dakota	North Dakota used AYP status for school accountability based on state assessments in reading and math, graduation rate, test participation rate, and attendance rate.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Ohio	Ohio assigned A–F grades to its schools, based on six components: achievement (75 percent of this indicator was based on student achievement on each state assessment, while 25 percent was based on the number of students who showed "proficient" knowledge on state tests in each grade and subject); four- and five-year cohort graduation rates; K–3 literacy; gap closure; and preparedness for success (the percentage of students prepared for college and careers without having to take remedial courses). State-level AMO targets for reading and math (gap closure) were calculated by determining the percentage of students in the all students subgroup who were not proficient in 2010–11; dividing that percentage by two; determining the 2017–18 goal by adding the above percentage to the percentage proficient in 2010–11; and computing annual incremental increases in performance targets by dividing the percentage of half nonproficient by six to determine how large the increases must be. Subgroup performance was then compared against the all students AMO. AMOs were applied to all subgroups with at least 30 students. AMOs were set based on reducing the percentage of nonproficient students by half. If a school's percent proficient for the current year was greater than or equal to the current year AMO, 100 points were awarded. If a subgroup failed to meet the current year AMO but was closing the gap and the number of percentage points of improvement between the prior year and the current year was larger than the gap in the current year, 100 points were awarded. If a subgroup failed to meet its current year AMO but the gap was closing and the number of percentage points of improvement between the prior year and the current year for the subgroup on the assessment was smaller than the gap in the current year, then points were awarded as follows: (amount of improvement divided by the current year gap) x 100. For growth, the SAS at Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) model was used to measure the effect of schools on student growth. For progress, value-added measures were calculated.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Oklahoma	Oklahoma assigned A–F grades to its schools. Half of the school grades were based on student performance (performance on all Oklahoma state exams) and the other half was based on student growth (overall student growth and growth of the bottom 25 percent of students), with bonus points available for achieving established criteria in attendance, advanced coursework, drop-out rate, graduation, college entrance exams, and/or overall end-of-instruction assessment performance. Schools had to test at least 95 percent of eligible students, or school scores would be reduced; if fewer than 90 percent of eligible students were tested, a school's grade was automatically reduced to an F. AMOs were set based on the goal of reducing the percentage of all students and subgroup students who were not proficient by half within six years, with targets for math and reading set at 70 or greater, or increasing scores by at least 15 percent of the difference between the previous year's score and 80. Student growth was measured by student learning gains on state reading and math assessments, and the level of improvement that the bottom 25 percent of students made on those assessments.	
Oregon	Oregon used Report Cards to rate its schools. The Report Cards included the following indicators: achievement (student performance on state assessments in math and reading); growth (of all students and of disadvantaged subgroups) in reading and math; and statewide test participation. High schools were also assessed on graduation and subgroup graduation rates. The Report Card also reported the achievement of all students and subgroups against AMOs for proficiency on state math and reading assessments, graduation, attendance, and test participation. AMOs were based on schools meeting the cutoff point for proficiency on state assessments, with a target set at the 90th percentile. The growth measure incorporated the Colorado growth model.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania's accountability system was delineated as follows: 40 percent academic achievement (PSSA/Keystone assessments, industry standards-based competency assessments, grade 3 reading proficiency, SAT/ACT college ready benchmarks); 5 percent academic improvement (closing achievement gap for all students); 5 percent academic improvement (closing achievement gap for historically underperforming students); 40 percent academic growth (progress of groups of students from year to year); and 10 percent other factors influencing or reflecting academic achievement (cohort graduation rate, AP or IB college credit offered, PSAT/Plan participation). Schools could also obtain up to seven extra credit points for students scoring at advanced level on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), students scoring at advanced level on industry standards-based competency assessments, and students scoring three or higher on AP exams. Pennsylvania also included Closing the Achievement Gap as a measure of how well schools were doing at closing the achievement gap by half over a six-year period. The indicator was measured cumulatively, with results reported for 30 or more students. If a school was on track or exceeding the cumulative rate needed to close the gap, a score of 100 was awarded. If a school had closed 80 percent of the gap, a score of 80 was awarded. If a school did not make progress or the achievement gap increased, a score of 0 was awarded. Closing the Achievement Gap was calculated for all students and historically underperforming students (nonduplicated count of students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and English language learners).	
Rhode Island	Rhode Island's accountability system was based on these indicators: student performance on state assessments in English language arts and math; graduation rate; postsecondary credentials; and test participation rate. Student performance on state assessments was calculated for all students who scored at least proficient (34 percent of rating), consolidated subgroup performance gaps against performance reference group (34 percent), students scoring at distinction level (6 percent), and either growth (for elementary and middle schools) or graduation rate (for high schools) (26 percent). AMO targets were set with the goal of reducing the percentage of nonproficient students by half within six years. The total score out of 100 determined the designation of commended, focus, or priority.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
South Carolina	South Carolina assigned A–F grades to schools based on the following indicators: student performance on state assessments in English language arts, math, science, and social studies; student performance on the High School Assessment Program; student performance on the End-of-Course Examination Program in Biology I; student performance on the ACT for ELA and math; and graduation rate. AMOs for elementary, middle, and high schools were set based on the scale score cutoff for "meeting grade level standard" and adding 5 percent for elementary schools and 4 percent for middle schools. In cases where schools and districts did not meet AMO, a tenth of a point was given for each scale point increase.	South Carolina Draft Plan A growth metric (for elementary/middle/district only) is currently under discussion by accountability workgroups and the Education Oversight Committee. The models being considered are: Decile Value Table, Value Added Model, LEXILE and QUANTILE model. Designations for growth will be applied as follows: • Exceeds Expectations: schools scoring more than one standard deviation above the mean • Meets Expectations: schools scoring above the mean, but below one standard deviation above the mean • Approaches Expectations: schools scoring between the mean and one standard deviation below the mean • Does Not Met Expectations: schools scoring more than one standard deviation below the mean Subgroups with n sizes of at least 20 will count in accountability ratings for each category. English learners will be excluded from the growth calculation in the first year of attendance in a U.S. school, but must be included in their second year.

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
South Dakota	South Dakota's School Performance Index (SPI) measured school performance on a 100-point index, with a separate index for elementary/middle schools and one for high schools. The SPI included indicators for: student performance on state assessments for ELA and math in grades 3–8 and 11; academic growth (elementary and middle schools) or high school completion (high schools); and attendance (elementary and middle schools) or college and career readiness (high schools). AMO targets were based on the goal of reducing the percentage of nonproficient students by half within six years. South Dakota used the following methods to set AMO goals and targets: 1. In the base year of every six-year cycle, calculating the percentage of students within a school who tested below proficient 2. Dividing this percentage by half (the school's goal for reducing the percentage of students who were not proficient within six years) 3. Subtracting the amount from step two from 100 percent (the school's goal for percentage of students testing at proficient expectations or above in six years) 4. Dividing the amount in step two by six (the school's annual target for increasing the percentage of students who were proficient) 5. Calculating the percentage of students in the base year who tested at or above proficiency 6. For year one AMO, adding the base year percentage of students testing at or above proficient expectations to the annual target for increasing the percentage of students who were proficient 7. For years two through six AMO, adding the annual target to the previous year's AMO The growth indicator examined the growth of the lowest quartile of students within a school or district (50 percent) and the growth of all students within a school or district (50 percent). Through 2013–14, the accountability system included the following student groups: Black, Native American, Hispanic, economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient. The state was set to reevaluate these groups after the 2014–15 assessment administration to see if other groups should be added.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Tennessee	Tennessee published A–F grades for its schools based on student performance on state assessments in math and reading/language; end-of-course exams in algebra I, algebra II, biology I, English I, English II, and chemistry; portfolio in math and reading/language; English Linguistically Simplified Assessment; grade 11 ACT performance; and graduation rate. In addition to information on student achievement, the grades also included information on students' trajectory of growth based on longitudinal data, based on value-added scores from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System. Growth was measured with value-added scores based on change in student proficiency percentages. Districts were accountable for ensuring schools met AMOs for achievement on gap closure. To address gaps, Tennessee set a goal of at least 6.25 percent annual reduction in the percentage of students who performed at or below basic on state assessments, with a larger goal of 50 percent reduction within eight years. The state also set a goal of at least 12.5 percent annual reduction in the percentage of students performing below basic, with a larger goal of 50 percent reduction within four years.	
Texas	Texas assigned A–F grades to schools based on: student performance on state assessments in reading, math, writing, science, and social studies in grades 3–8; end-of-course assessments in English I, English II, algebra I, biology, and U.S. history; STAAR Modified, Alternate, and L; graduation rate; community engagement; AP course enrollment; attendance; and drop-out rate. Four performance indices were used to determine state accountability ratings for each district and school. AMOs on student performance were set based on setting annual targets that increased in equal increments toward the goal of 100 percent student proficiency by 2022–23. System safeguards instituted by the Texas Education Agency required all schools and districts to also meet AMOs for graduation and assessment participation. Based on performance, the Texas Accountability Intervention System identified schools and districts for interventions, sanctions, and rewards based on accountability rating labels and system safeguards outcomes. AMOs were applied to all districts and campuses, for all subgroups that met minimum size criteria (if subgroup size was less than 10, data was aggregated across two or three years).	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Utah	Utah used the Utah Comprehensive Accountability System (UCAS) for school accountability. Included in UCAS was student performance on state English language arts, math, and science assessments, the percentage of students who graduated high school, and the percentage of students who were considered college ready based on performance on a college admissions test. UCAS also assigned points based on growth—150 each for student growth (of all students and of below-proficient students) and achievement (percent at or above proficient). Growth was calculated as student growth percentiles, comparing student progress with that of students with the same prior achievement pattern. This growth measure was calculated for all students and below proficient students. State AMOs were set based on a target of reducing the percentage of students who were not proficient by half. To address the issue of subgroups being too small for inclusion, Utah established a new subgroup of nonproficient students and applied a weight to those students in the state accountability system.	
Vermont	Vermont's school accountability system was based on schools meeting AYP status, based on these indicators: student performance on state assessments in math and reading; student performance on alternate assessments; graduation rate; and test participation rate.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
Virginia	Virginia assigned accreditation ratings to schools based on student performance on state assessments in English language arts, history/social science, math, and science, and meeting minimum benchmarks for graduation and completion (based on students within a cohort who have graduated on time). Virginia calculated AMOs with intermediate subgroup passing rates based on the goal of having all students at the same pass rate by 2017–18. Subgroups could meet these AMO targets if their current year pass rates met or exceeded the AMO target; their three-year average met or exceeded the target; or the subgroup reduced the failure rate by 10 percent compared to the prior year. These ratings were used to identify schools with high academic performance and graduation rates, as well as schools needing improvement plans, targeted support, and interventions. AMOs for the first year (2012–13) were created by ranking schools according to percentage proficiency on state assessments: 1. Determine pass rate of school at 20th percentile of enrollment 2. Determine pass rate of school at 90th percentile of enrollment 3. Calculate point difference between step one and step two 4. Divide point difference in half to calculate the gains in pass rates needed to cut the proficiency gap in half over the next six years 5. Divide the number calculated in step four by six 6. Set increasing pass rates at six equal intervals For the AMOs for years two through six, the AMOs included intermediate subgroup passing rates, with the target in 2017–18 to have all students (including subgroups) at the same pass rate. Virginia identified the following subgroups: economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English language learners, and racial/ethnic groups representing 5 percent or more of the student population (Asian, black, Hispanic, white).	
Washington	Washington's school accountability used the following measures: student performance on state reading, math, writing, and science assessments; student performance on the state High School Proficiency Exam in reading and writing; end-of-course assessments in biology and math; and the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.	

State	State Accountability Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Draft Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plans: Accountability Indicators
West Virginia	West Virginia based its school A–F ratings on the following measures: student performance on general and alternate assessments; attendance rate (for elementary and middle schools); graduation rate (for high schools); and test participation rate. West Virginia had a measure for student growth that compared students to state peers with similar prior academic scale scores. Growth was calculated with two measures: observed (median student growth percentile, based on state math and reading/language arts assessments for grades 4–11) and adequate (amount of growth required for proficiency, measured by state math and reading/language arts assessments in grades 4–10). AMO targets were set based on the expectation of all schools reaching the 90th percentile of state assessment performance by 2020. Starting in 2016, the subgroup n for AMO decisions was changed to 10.	
Wisconsin	Wisconsin's accountability system included multiple measures: student achievement and growth based on state assessment performance; closing gaps; and being on track to graduate (for elementary and middle schools) or postsecondary readiness (for schools that graduate students). AMOs were set expecting schools to make at least a one-percent increase on state assessment performance, toward a target of having all schools perform at the 90th percentile within six years. School performance was measured against AMOs by looking at the higher of proficiency rate in the current year or average proficiency rate in the current and prior years. A cell size of 20 students and a 95 percent confidence interval was applied to AMO determinations. Based on these measures of overall performance and gaps between subgroups, schools received a score on a 100-point scale to determine placement into one of five rating categories, which was used to identify high-performing and high-needs schools.	
Wyoming	Wyoming's school accountability system was based on meeting proficiency index targets (towards 100 percent proficiency) for: • Proficiency Assessment for Wyoming Students (PAWS) in reading, mathematics, and science • ACT for grade 11 in reading, mathematics, science, and combined English/writing The following readiness indicators were included for the evaluation of high schools: Hathaway scholarship eligibility; grade nine credit (all full-year academic students enrolled at a school at the end of grade nine); and tested readiness (composite scores on the ACT Explore in grade 9, ACT Plan in grade 10, or ACT in grade 11).	