EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES | KnowledgeWorks

POLICY BRIEF

JULY 2022

State Policies to Support Student-Centered Learning

Ben Erwin and Gerardo Silva-Padrón

Student-centered learning encompasses practices designed to meet each student's individual needs. This means creating learning environments that are personalized, competency-based, student-driven and connected to real world experiences. Student-centered learning approaches are intended to speak to students' diverse and distinct needs, interests and cultural backgrounds, and support the development of the skills and knowledge necessary for success in college, career and civic life. Although education leaders use a range of terms to describe student-centered learning practices, personalized, competency-based learning is a key strategy for creating student-centered learning environments, schools and education systems.

There is growing interest in student-centered learning as an approach to rethinking education systems and instructional design to better support individual learners. In recent years, state policymakers have studied the issue and pursued multiple approaches to support schools and districts seeking to shift instructional models in this direction. Although legislatures have played an important role, state boards of education, state education agencies (SEAs) and governors have also played critical roles in developing student-centered learning policies at the state level. Trends in recent years represent the continued expansion of student-centered learning policies in the states.

50-State Policy Scan

The 50-state scan at the end of this Policy Brief provides high-level information on state policies that empower districts to implement student-centered learning models in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The scan includes information on state graduate portraits and profiles, graduation requirements and course credit options, and policies permitting flexible school governance.

7 Elements for Personalized, Competency-Based Learning

According to the Aurora Institute, a personalized, competency-based learning environment involves the following:

1| Students are empowered daily to make important decisions about their learning experiences, how they will create and apply knowledge and how they will demonstrate their learning.

2| Assessment is a meaningful, positive and empowering learning experience for students that yields timely, relevant and actionable evidence.

3| Students receive timely, differentiated support based on their individual learning needs.

4| Students' progress is based on evidence of mastery instead of seat time.

5| Students learn actively using different pathways and varied pacing.

6| Strategies to ensure equity for all students are embedded in the culture, structure and pedagogy of schools and education systems.

7| Rigorous, common expectations for learning (knowledge, skills and dispositions) are explicit, transparent, measurable and transferable.

While research on the efficacy of student-centered learning strategies is in its early stages, there are indications that it can positively impact student experiences and potentially academic achievement. These findings may be explained by the benefits of high-quality, student-centered learning, including the opportunities it extends to students to guide their learning, demonstrate their knowledge based on mastery of standards and receive differentiated supports.

State policymakers in many states have laid a strong foundation for interested schools and districts to implement student-centered learning approaches, but some obstacles prove especially challenging. State leaders may consider the policy levers outlined in this brief to address the following policy barriers:

- Traditional instructional time requirements and definitions of course credit that rely on the Carnegie unit may limit the ability of schools and districts to implement innovative models because of noncompliance with state law or confusion about permissible forms of instruction and pacing.
- Where they exist, innovation zones or pilot programs may limit the number of participating schools or districts, which makes it difficult for wider adoption of student-centered learning policies.
- Defining student attendance for funding purposes in the context of seat time may impede the use of alternative instructional approaches, including blended learning; personalized, competency-based learning; and work-based learning.
- Building the capacity of local schools and districts to identify and effectively implement and communicate student-centered learning may prove difficult because of limited financial resources, time constraints or a lack of understanding of how to take advantage of flexibilities in state policy.
- State college and career readiness definitions and graduation requirements may be focused on traditional assessment approaches and not aligned with a vision for education built around skills and academic competencies.
- State and federal assessment and accountability requirements may conflict with student-centered instructional approaches.

Policymakers have a number of levers at their disposal to empower schools and districts eager to adopt student-centered learning approaches. In some cases, states have sought to provide a framework aligned to academic standards and statewide sets of skill-based competencies. States have also modified graduation requirements or developed an aspirational set of essential skills for all K-12 students — typically referred to as a profile of a graduate or portrait of a graduate. Other states have carved out local flexibilities that enable the implementation of innovative instructional models like personalized, competency-based learning. These approaches, especially when done in combination with one another, can create the policy environment necessary for high-quality, student-centered learning models at the local level.

Policy options for state education leaders fall into three related categories:

1| Assessment of Student Mastery.

2| Flexible Governance.

3| Student-Centered Learning Frameworks.

This Policy Brief offers an analysis of policy trends, state case studies and key considerations for those interested in a personalized, competency-based system. It also explores the existing foundation of student-centered learning policies by providing information on every state's policy in each category (see Appendix A for the full 50-state scan).

Assessment of Student Mastery

Federal accountability requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act require states to administer statewide assessments in specific grades and subject areas that must be used as the foundation for achievement metrics in state accountability systems. Although these requirements may limit innovation on assessments used for accountability, states have some opportunities to explore and build capacity for assessment innovation in other components of the state's assessment system.

Specifically, states can create flexibilities for local districts to allow for demonstration of knowledge and the awarding of credit based on a student's mastery of standards or competencies rather than a traditional Carnegie unit. They may also permit students to satisfy some graduation requirements through personalized models, such as performance assessments, portfolios or projects.

Based on a review of state policy, at least 25 states permit or require students to satisfy graduation requirements through student-centered assessment options, and 39 states and the District of Columbia allow students to receive course credit. These policies create space for districts to employ more personalized approaches to student assessment that, along with end-of-course assessments or standardized assessments, provide an additional way to measure student learning. These innovative assessment approaches can also be valuable tools for measuring student mastery of content both for the purposes of awarding credit as well as to meet graduation requirements. Some states have intentionally allowed districts to develop a menu of options

for students to demonstrate this mastery, which can enable schools to develop authentic assessments that are tailored to each student's skills, interests, and college and career goals.

Our scan of state policy identified 18 states that provide districts the flexibility to make competency determinations for graduation requirements. Others may require the local adoption of competency-based graduation requirements. Allowing these innovative assessment options also supports opportunities for students to apply their learning to real world experiences that relate to career goals or community needs.

Similarly, student-centered assessment for course credit allows students to meet course requirements while working at their own pace instead of through the fixed hours of instruction required by Carnegie units, or over the course of a single semester or academic year. Although implementing school-level practices that enable differentiated pacing requires time and effort on the part of schools, it can create opportunities to provide personalized supports based on specific student academic needs and allow students to progress more efficiently to advanced or college-level coursework. This flexibility also permits the application of learning in authentic and engaging ways, which gives students the opportunity to advance to deeper levels of mastery.

State Examples

In **Colorado**, the state board of education is tasked with developing graduation guidelines to support the development of local graduation requirements. As outlined in the most recent guidelines, districts can choose to offer students a variety of options to demonstrate competencies required for graduation, including a capstone project, portfolio of work or performance assessment. To support districts in implementing these personalized options, the SEA convened a work group of educators and administrators, in addition to representatives from postsecondary institutions and community organizations, that developed guidance on capstone projects and portfolio graduation requirements. The SEA elevated promising district examples, including districts using digital portfolios to track student progress and districts with capstone requirements.

In 2019, the state Legislature sought to support the development of student-centered learning options — including opportunities for competency-based learning and capstone graduation requirements — through the innovative learning opportunities pilot program. This program allows schools to apply for flexibility from attendance and seat-time requirements to create these learning opportunities. A review of district graduation requirements in Colorado found that 146 of the state's 178 local education agencies (LEAs) have adopted a "performance-based" graduation requirement.

Rhode Island requires LEAs to adopt proficiency-based graduation requirements for six core content areas — English language arts, math, science, social studies, arts and technology. The SEA explains that mastery can be demonstrated through formative assessment, summative assessments, locally designed assessments, performance assessments and state and national standardized assessments, in addition to capstone projects or portfolios of student work. While these graduation requirements are locally determined, the state developed extensive resources to guide local efforts.

In collaboration with the Great Schools Partnership, the Rhode Island Department of Education convened a group of teachers and administrators to develop a proficiency-based learning framework that includes graduation competencies for English language arts, math, science, social studies and cross-curricular skills, as well as performance indicators and scoring criteria to ensure consistency in student assessment. The group also developed model performance assessment tasks that gave participating teachers the opportunity to apply their understanding of student-centered learning and support other teachers in implementing personalized, competency-based learning.

In 2019, the **Washington** Legislature directed the state board of education to convene a group called the Mastery-Based Learning Collaborative to identify barriers to mastery-based learning and suggest policy changes to support the development of mastery-based courses and graduation pathways. Since the formation of the work group, the state board and legislature have continued to expand on this work, including the creation of a pilot program and the development of a profile of a graduate.

To accelerate local implementation of student-centered learning, the state board developed rules allowing schools to award mastery-based credit, including a locally created written or oral test, a written report by the student, a student-designed portfolio of work, a student presentation or oral defense of their learning in the course, or a hands-on demonstration of knowledge and skills. Schools are also permitted to award credit for learning experiences outside of a school setting that align to state standards. The state developed model policies and guidance for districts in creating mastery-based assessment options.

Flexible Governance

State policymakers have removed obstacles to student-centered learning by establishing flexibility in local governance to permit schools and districts to waive instructional time or attendance requirements or to pilot innovative education programs. State education leaders can approach this option through personalized, competency-based learning pilot programs, innovation schools or zones and alternative instructional time options. Some states have also allocated funding to support local capacity building and other investments necessary to implement student-centered learning models. In some cases, states have multiple options in policy.

Personalized, competency-based learning pilot programs are typically designed to grant a limited number of schools the flexibility to implement student-centered learning strategies. Some states have also opted to provide funding to support schools with planning, implementation and eventually scaling of programs. Innovation zones or schools similarly provide flexibility to schools

or districts to implement the student-centered learning model of their choosing, but they are not designed specifically for this end. These policies typically allow schools or districts to submit an innovation plan that outlines strategies to improve student outcomes and request waivers from state laws or regulations that would inhibit the implementation of the model. Finally, other states have outlined clear requirements for schools to receive waivers from state laws and regulations, including instructional time requirements and permission to implement an alternative instructional time model.

Based on a review of state policy, innovation schools or zones are allowed in at least 31 states, which makes it one of the most common student-centered learning policies. Oftentimes, these policies require the approval of an innovation plan by both the school community and SEA, and the opportunity to convert to innovation status is open to all schools or districts. Some states — like Colorado — have sought to encourage the establishment of innovation schools or zones as a school improvement strategy. However, it is important to note that while innovation schools or zones may allow for the implementation of student-centered learning practices, they may not always be leveraged to do so. State education agencies may need to provide schools with deliberate guidance and support.

While less prevalent, pilot programs specific to personalized, competency-based learning have supported the expansion of student-centered learning in a number of states. A scan of state policy found at least 18 states with pilot programs. Like innovation schools, pilot program schools are granted autonomy to implement student-centered learning models and may be provided with additional funding. State policymakers often limit the number of schools that may participate while annually increasing the total to allow for incremental scaling of the program. Pilot programs also allow for the development of a network of schools that can support one another in implementation and guide future expansion.

Additional funding also plays a significant role in the implementation of innovation school policies or pilot programs. At least 17 states provide grant funding that helps to build capacity for student-centered instruction, invest in technologies that monitor student progress or expand student-centered offerings to additional grade bands or subject areas.

Finally, at least 13 states have codified policies that allow schools to implement alternative instructional time models. Similar to innovation schools and pilot programs, these policies provide specific waivers from instructional time requirements, which opens the door to student-centered learning models, including virtual learning; personalized, competency-based learning; and blended learning models. **Arizona** recently enacted legislation that permits the development of locally determined instructional time models, following community approval, while still maintaining state per-pupil funding levels.

State Examples

Idaho began shifting toward student-centered learning following the recommendations of the Idaho Taskforce for Improving Education, created by the governor's office in 2012. The task force's primary recommendation was a shift to a mastery-based education system. In 2015, the Legislature passed H.B. 110 directing the Idaho Department of Education to develop an incubator process for mastery-based education by identifying a cohort of up to 20 districts to pilot a program. Following a few years of implementation, the Legislature passed S.B. 1059, which removed the cap on the number of schools allowed to participate in the pilot and established the Idaho Mastery-Based Education Network with support from the Idaho Department of Education.

The Idaho Mastery-Based Education Network has served as an important driver of the expansion of student-centered learning in the state by providing technical assistance and developing a wealth of resources for planning and implementation. This network developed a mastery-based education framework in addition to college and career readiness competencies and other resources, including model assessments and performance tasks. The work of the network is supplemented by the SEA through mastery-based education grants, which are awarded to support districts exploring the issue and to districts that develop goals aligned with the state's mastery framework. In 2020-21, 25 schools received grants averaging $25,000.

In 2016, the **Illinois** Legislature established a competency-based high school graduation requirements pilot program. Under the program, districts may substitute statewide graduation requirements with a competency-based system and receive waivers from specific statute or regulation that would limit the district's ability to implement personalized, competency-based learning. The state superintendent is charged with reviewing applications to participate, which must include waiver requests, professional development and community engagement efforts that would support the shift to a competency-based system and other information on the district's implementation plan. The superintendent may accept no more than 15 applicants annually after accepting no more than 12 during the first two years of the program. Nearly 50 districts have been approved to participate in the pilot program since its inception.

To support districts in transitioning to student-centered learning, the state board of education convened the Illinois Learner Competencies Working Group, which is made up of personnel from the original pilot sites and experts in the field of student-centered learning. The working group developed a guidance document to assist districts in developing their own competencies aligned with state standards. The guidance highlights sample competency statements, performance tasks and learning progressions. In addition to providing guidance and technical assistance, the state board of education is tasked with supporting stakeholder engagement, publishing implementation plans and evaluating the programs.

South Carolina has developed multiple approaches for school districts to pursue the flexibilities necessary to implement student-centered learning strategies. Most recently, the Legislature enacted H.B. 3589, which allows school boards to create one or more schools of innovation within a district that receive exemptions from specific statute or regulation, including instructional time requirements. This legislation is built on existing policies that permit districts to establish single innovation schools and receive waivers from

regulations that would impede the implementation of a school improvement plan. It also provides the option for high schools to apply to operate a proficiency-based system.

The office of personalized learning developed a comprehensive guide to educational flexibilities in the context of personalized learning. The guide highlights different options for districts that are aligned with the state's personalized learning framework, in addition to its profile of a graduate and connected competencies. The office also offers professional learning opportunities for educators in districts interested in implementing student-centered learning strategies. These flexibilities, coupled with funding opportunities provided by the SEA, create the policy conditions necessary for schools or districts to drive a local shift to a student-centered system.

Student-Centered Learning Frameworks

States can play an important role in driving systemic change and in supporting high-quality local implementation of student-centered learning by developing learning frameworks, competencies and graduation requirements that align with a student-centered vision for education. By creating a shared vision for student-centered learning with stakeholders throughout their state, education leaders can ensure that state statute, regulation and guidance are conducive to innovative, locally developed instructional delivery models.

A first step that some states have taken is the development of a profile of a graduate or portrait of a graduate, which serves as a guiding vision for what all K-12 students know and can do by the time they graduate. These profiles include both academic skills, and skills that community and postsecondary leaders have identified as critical for future success. Some states have built on profile of a graduate work or supported the implementation of student-centered learning by mapping state academic standards or cross-curricular skills onto competencies. Clear competencies communicate the knowledge and skills a student is expected to master in addition to progressions and learning targets for every student. Finally, some states have adopted competency-based graduation requirements that permit schools and districts to evaluate student readiness using multiple

demonstrations of mastery. Each of these policy approaches supports a coherent vision for student-centered learning that empowers schools and districts to pursue personalized, competency-based learning.

Graduate profiles are constructed through the input of stakeholders — including students, teachers, parents and administrators, as well as community, business, postsecondary and state leaders — to clearly define measures of student success that reflect state priorities. Profiles take into consideration key cognitive, personal and interpersonal competencies that students should be able to demonstrate before they graduate.

A thorough scan of state policy and resources identified at least 13 states that have developed graduate profiles or portraits; **Kentucky**, **North Carolina** and **Wyoming** are in the process of developing their own. Common cognitive competencies addressed in profiles include critical thinking, problem solving, creativity and innovation, in addition to academic proficiency. States most often include flexibility, perseverance and self-direction as core personal competencies, while empathy, effective communication and collaboration represent common interpersonal elements.

States often link graduate profiles to state standards; college and career readiness skills; and personalized, competency-based learning frameworks through the development of state competencies. Our review of state policy identified at least 12 states that established competencies. Of the states with competencies, five have developed academic competencies for core subject areas, two have developed specific college and career readiness competencies, and five have created competencies aligned directly with their profile or portrait of a graduate.

Competencies and graduate profiles provide a framework for students to build key academic, personal and interpersonal skills; and competency-based graduation requirements can help to put these into practice. Although at least 25 states permit competency demonstrations to satisfy graduation requirements, eight states have either developed competency-based components in statewide graduation requirements or directed local school boards to develop their own competency-based graduation requirements that allow for schools and districts to assess student readiness using multiple demonstrations of mastery.

State Examples

In an effort to redesign their education system around student-centered learning, **New Hampshire** eliminated the Carnegie unit as the basis for student credit and updated their minimum standards for school approval — criteria that every school in the state is evaluated on — to require the development of district academic competencies, graduation competencies and aligned competency-based assessments to award credit.

To support districts in the development of competencies and valid assessments aligned with state standards, the state board of education convened stakeholders, including school- and district-level leadership, teachers and other content area experts to develop model competencies in core subject areas and the arts. To ensure alignment with state standards and academic rigor, the board also convened a group of stakeholders to develop a validation rubric for local competencies. Through policy changes and state leadership, New Hampshire has created conditions conducive to the adoption of student-centered learning approaches, while building district capacity for implementation.

Following the enactment of ESSA, the state continued to build on their efforts to expand competency-based education through the federal Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority. Through IADA, the SEA received approval to implement Performance Assessment for Competency Education (PACE), which uses a combination of state- and locally developed and administered assessments that are aligned with identified competencies to evaluate student proficiency. Early research into PACE found small positive effects on student achievement. In March 2022, New Hampshire withdrew from IADA, but the state's experience with PACE and the accompanying research has the potential to inform other similar state-level efforts to align student-centered learning frameworks with assessment systems.

The **North Dakota** Legislature, department of public instruction and governor's office have worked collaboratively to empower districts seeking to adopt student-centered learning approaches through the development of multiple student-centered frameworks. The governor's office led the development of a state portrait of a graduate in partnership with a design team made up of state and local stakeholders to provide a foundation for the development of student-centered pathways to graduation. In 2021, the state Legislature built on previous efforts to support innovative education programs by directing the SEA to develop a learning continuum and by allowing districts to adopt a mastery framework policy for awarding course credit. This legislation permits districts that have adopted such a framework to waive high school instructional time policies to allow for progression based on mastery that is aligned with the state-developed continuum.

The department of public instruction had already started to lay the foundation for a shift to student-centered learning and the development of the learning continuum through the personalized, competency-based learning initiative — a network of five districts — that was launched in 2019 to support the implementation of personalized, competency-based learning. The learning continuum identifies key attributes and aligned competencies for student mastery for specific grade bands in core content areas, in addition to identifying competencies aligned to the state portrait of a graduate. These broad competencies create space for districts to adopt various student-centered learning strategies that best address the needs of their students and communities.

Utah paired statewide efforts to construct student-centered frameworks with the flexibility and funding support needed for interested districts. In 2021, the state board of education shifted away from traditional instructional time requirements to permit learner-validated enrollment for attendance calculations and funding purposes. Learner-validated enrollment provides districts with a significant degree of flexibility to provide online, blended, or personalized, competency-based learning opportunities to meet the needs of students. This rule change, in addition to the state board's assessment task force and accountability redesign process, represents a systemic approach to addressing barriers to personalized, competency-based learning and ensures alignment across statewide structures and local implementation efforts.

While developing student-centered frameworks, Utah has also prioritized alignment between the state's portrait of a graduate and state academic standards and competencies. The board emphasizes that its personalized, competency-based learning framework links the portrait of a graduate to the work of schools in achieving student learning outcomes. The state explicitly outlined learning outcomes as they relate to the portrait of a graduate through the Utah Talent MAP, which identifies competencies for each grade band across the P-20 spectrum.

While these state-level resources and local flexibilities, including flexibilities in graduation requirements, support implementation of personalized, competency-based learning, local strategic planning, capacity building and community engagement can prove difficult without additional resources. Utah's personalized, competency-based learning grant program provides funding at each stage of implementation — planning, implementation and expansion — for districts to invest in staff and leadership capacity, and connects them with technical assistance providers such as the Mastery Transcript Consortium and The New Teacher Project.

Policy Considerations

As state leaders consider their options to remove potential obstacles to local implementation, the following questions may support policy development that empowers student-centered learning approaches.

- Where possible, how do state assessment and accountability policies allow schools and districts to innovate in support of student-centered instructional models?
- Does the federal government offer waivers or flexibilities in assessment and accountability policies that would create space for student-centered learning approaches?
- How do state funding policies allow flexibility for schools and districts to pursue innovative education approaches?
- What types of flexibility do LEAs have to try new and innovative ways of meeting student needs?
- Does state policy provide multiple pathways for students to demonstrate content mastery and college and career readiness?
- Has the state established its vision for what K-12 students should know when they graduate?
- Which stakeholder groups and communities need to be represented to ensure student-centered frameworks reflect state and local priorities?

For additional insight into state policy conditions that foster student-centered learning, KnowledgeWorks' State Policy Framework for Personalized Learning offers 12 considerations to support a shift in this direction. This 50-state scan indicates that policymakers have taken steps to create space for local student-centered learning initiatives while opportunities for additional action remain.

About the Authors

Ben Erwin

As a policy analyst, Ben works on tracking legislation, answering information requests and contributing to other Policy Team projects. Prior to joining Education Commission of the States, he taught high school social studies in Kentucky and worked in education policy at the National Conference of State Legislatures. He earned a master's degree in education policy from the University of Colorado Boulder and a bachelor's degree in history and education from Transylvania University. Contact Ben at berwin@ecs.org.

Gerardo Silva-Padrón

As a policy researcher, Gerardo provides education policy leaders with quality and research-driven information on nationwide policies. He completed his bachelor's degree in international affairs and ethnic studies at the University of Colorado, Boulder. and plans to complete a master's of public health in health systems, management and policy at the Colorado School of Public Health. Gerardo is passionate about education policy because policies have an opportunity to promote better health outcomes in students and educators. Contact Gerardo at gsilvapadron@ecs.org.

Acknowledgments

This project has been made possible by a grant from KnowledgeWorks. KnowledgeWorks is a national nonprofit organization advancing a future of learning that ensures each student graduates ready for what's next. For 20 years, they've been partnering with states, communities and leaders across the country to imagine, build and sustain vibrant learning communities through evidence-based practices and a commitment to equitable outcomes.

Education Commission of the States would also like to thank the following experts, whose valuable insights informed this Policy Brief:

Jon Alfuth, director of state policy at KnowledgeWorks.
Emily Brixey, senior manager of policy, advocacy and research at KnowledgeWorks.

Appendix A: 50-State Scan

The following 50-state scan provides high-level information on state policies to enable student-centered learning.

State	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Alabama	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Ala. Code § 16-6D-6 Course Credit Resource A				
Alaska	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Alaska Stat. Ann. § 14.03.073				
Arizona	None identified.	Yes. The state offers a competency-based diploma option.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 15-792.03 Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 15-795 Graduation Requirements Resource A Course Credit Resource B				
Arkansas	Yes.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Ark. Code Ann. § 6-15-2801 Ark. Code Ann. § 6-15-216 Graduate Profile Resource A Innovation Schools Resource A Course Credit Resource C				
California	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Not specified in state policy.

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Colorado	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 22-32.5-101 et seq. Colo. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 22-7-1015 Graduation Requirements Resource B Pilot Program Resource A				
Connecticut	None identified.	Yes. The state has a competency-based component in its graduation requirements and districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 10-221a Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 10-4v Conn. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 10-74h Graduation Requirements Resource C and Course Credit Resource D				
Delaware	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Del. Code Ann. tit. 14, § 122 Code Del. Regs. 505				
District of Columbia	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Course Credit Resource E				
Florida	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Fla. Stat. Ann. § 1003.4996 Fla. Stat. Ann. § 1002.451				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Georgia	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Ga. Code Ann. § 20-2-14.1 Ga. Code Ann. § 20-2-159.4 Ga. Comp. R. & Regs. 160-5-1-.15 Pilot Program Resource B Pilot Program Resource C				
Hawaii	Yes.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Graduate Profile Resource B Graduate Profile Resource C				
Idaho	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Idaho Code Ann. § 33-5801 et seq. Idaho Admin. Code r. 08.02.03.105 S.B. 1267 (2016) S.B. 1059 (2019)				
Illinois	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery. Districts must receive approval to participate in the state pilot program.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: 110 Ill. Comp. Stat. Ann. 148/20- 148/35 Pilot Program Resource D Pilot Program Resource E				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Indiana	Yes.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Ind. Code Ann. § 20-32-4-1.5 Ind. Code Ann. § 20-25.7-4-9 Ind. Code Ann. § 20-26.5-2-1 Ind. Code Ann. § 20-31-9.5-9.5 Graduate Profile Resource D				
Iowa	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Iowa Admin. Code r. 281-12.5(256) Iowa Code Ann. § 256F.1 Iowa Code Ann. § 256.7 Graduation Requirements Resource D Course Credit Resource F Pilot Program Resource F				
Kansas	Yes.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Kan. Stat. Ann. § 72-4223 Graduate Profile Resource E Pilot Program Resource G				
Kentucky	Profile development in progress.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 160.107 704 Ky. Admin. Regs. 3:305 Pilot Program Resource H Innovation Schools Resource B Graduate Profile Resource F				
Louisiana	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Not specified in state policy.

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Maine	Yes.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Code Me. R. § 05-071 Ch. 132 Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 20-A, § 4722 Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 20-A, § 6212 Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 20-A, § 6213 ME LD 1845 (2022) Course Credit Resource G Graduate Profile Resource G				
Maryland	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Md. Code Regs. 13A.03.02.04				
Massachusetts	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. ch. 71, § 92				
Michigan	Yes.	None identified.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 380.1278b Graduate Profile Resource H Pilot Program Resource I				
Minnesota	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Minn. Stat. Ann. § 120B.018 H.F. 2 (2017) Pilot Program Resource J and Innovation Schools Resource C				
Mississippi	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Miss. Code. Ann. § 37-179-1				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Missouri	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Graduation Requirements Resource E and Course Credit Resource H Pilot Program Resource K				
Montana	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Mont. Code Ann. § 20-9-311 Mont. Admin. R. 10.55.906 Mont. Code Ann. § 20-7-1602 Mont. Code Ann. § 20-3-324 Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-101 Graduation Requirements Resource F and Course Credit Resource I				
Nebraska	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Neb. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 79-1054 92 Neb. Admin. Code Ch. 10, 004.04C3				
Nevada	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 389.210 Nev. Admin. Code 389.670 Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 389.171 Pilot Program Resource L				
New Hampshire	None identified.	Yes. Districts must adopt competency-based graduation requirements.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: N.H. Code Admin. R. § 04 N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 194-E N.H. Code Admin. R. § 27				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
New Jersey	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: N.J. Stat. Ann. § 18A:7C-2 N.J. Admin. Code § 6A:8-5.1				
New Mexico	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: N.M. Admin. Code 6.19.7.2 et seq. N.M. Stat. Ann. § 22-13-1.1				
New York	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.* *Limited to 6.5 credits.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Graduation Requirements Resource G Pilot Program Resource M				
North Carolina	Profile development in progress.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 115C-75.6 Course Credit Resource J Graduate Profile Resource S				
North Dakota	Yes.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: N.D. Cent. Code Ann. § 15.1-21-02 N.D. Cent. Code Ann. § 15.1-06-08.2 S.B. 2186 (2017) Graduate Profile Resource I				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Ohio	Yes.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3302.06 - 07 Course Credit Resource K Graduate Profile Resource J				
Oklahoma	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Okla. Stat. Ann. tit. 70, § 3-129.3 Okla. Admin. Code 210:35-25-2				
Oregon	None identified.	Yes. The state has a competency-based component in its graduation requirements.* *S.B. 744 (2021) suspended demonstration of essential skills and directed the SEA to review graduation requirements and demonstrations of proficiency.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Or. Admin. R. 581-022-2000 Or. Admin. R. 581-022-2025 Or. Admin. R. 581-022-2115				
Pennsylvania	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: 22 Pa. Code § 4.24 24 Pa. Stat. Ann. § 14-1401-B et seq.				
Puerto Rico	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Not specified in state policy.

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Rhode Island	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: 16 R.I. Gen. Laws Ann. § 16-3.2-1 et seq. 200 R.I. Code R. 20-10-2 et seq. Graduation Requirements Resource H and Course Credit Resource L				
South Carolina	Yes.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery. Districts must receive approval to operate a "proficiency-based system".	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: S.C. Code Ann. § 59-19-350 S.C. Code Ann. Regs. 43-234 H. 3589 (2021) Graduate Profile Resource K Graduate Profile Resource L Innovation Schools Resource D				
South Dakota	None identified.	Yes. The state has a competency-based component in its graduation requirements.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: S.D. Admin. R. 24:43:01:01 S.D. Admin. R. 24:43:01:09 Graduation Requirements Resource I				
Tennessee	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: Tenn. Code Ann. § 49-1-602 Pilot Program Resource N				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Texas	None identified.	Yes. The state has a competency-based component in its graduation requirements.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Tex. Educ. Code Ann. § 12A.001 et seq. 19 Tex. Admin. Code § 74.11 19 Tex. Admin. Code § 74.26 Innovation Schools Resource E				
Utah	Yes.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Utah Code Ann. § 53E-4-204 Utah Admin. Code r. R277-705 Utah Admin. Code r. R277-712-1 et seq. Utah Code Ann. § 53F-5-501 et seq. Utah Admin. Code r. R277-705-3 H.B. 386 (2022) Graduate Profile Resource M Graduation Requirements Resource J Pilot Program Resource O Graduate Profile Resource N Course Credit Resource M				
Vermont	Yes.	Yes. Districts must adopt competency-based graduation requirements.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: 7-1 Vt. Code R. § 2 Graduate Profile Resource O and Graduation Requirements Resource K Graduation Requirements Resource K and Course Credit Resource N				

State (continued)	Does the state have a profile of a graduate or a portrait of a graduate?	Does the state allow or require competency-based graduation requirements?	Does the state have a pilot program for personalized, competency-based learning?	Does the state allow innovation schools or zones?	Does the state allow competency-based assessment for course credit or progression?
Virginia	Yes.	Yes. The state has a competency-based component in its graduation requirements.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Va. Code Ann. § 22.1-253.13:4 8 Va. Admin. Code 20-131-51 Va. Code Ann. § 22.1-212.28 et seq. 8 Va. Admin. Code 20-760 8 Va. Admin. Code 20-131-110 Graduate Profile Resource P				
Washington	Yes.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28A.300.810 Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 28A.300.550 Wash. Admin. Code 180-51-050 Wash. Admin. Code 180-51-051 S.B. 5249 (2021) Graduate Profile Resource Q				
West Virginia	None identified.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.	Not specified in state policy.
	Citations: W. Va. Code Ann. § 18-5E-1 et seq.				
Wisconsin	None identified.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Yes.	Yes.
	Citations: Wis. Stat. Ann. § 118.33 Wis. Stat. Ann. § 118.38 Wis. Admin. Code PI § 8.01 Innovation Schools Resource F				
Wyoming	Profile development in progress.	Yes. Districts may allow students to satisfy graduation requirements through demonstrated mastery.	None identified.	Not specified in state policy.	Yes.
	Citations: Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 21-2-304 Graduate Profile Resource R				