

COMPARISON OF SELECT ELEMENTS OF ESEA PROPOSALS

Based on CCSSO's ESEA Priorities

July 16, 2015

CCSSO Priority (Released on January 8, 2015)	H.R. 5, Student Success Act House ESEA Bill (Passed House Floor on July 8, 2015)	S. 1177, Every Child Achieves Act Senate ESEA Bill (Passed Senate Floor on July 16, 2015)
Priority 1. Assessment Requirements		
Maintain annual grade-level assessments	Continues NCLB requirement for grade-level assessments in reading/language arts and math in grades 3-8, and once in high school, and grade-span assessments in science.	Continues NCLB requirement for grade-level assessments in reading/language arts and math in grades 3-8, and once in high school, and grade-span assessments in science.
State determination of one summative assessment or combination of multiple assessments	At the state's discretion, an assessment may be a single summative assessment or may be multiple statewide assessments administered during the course of the year if the results of the multiple assessments provide a summative score that provides valid, reliable and transparent information on individual student achievement.	At the state's discretion, an assessment may be a single summative assessment or may be multiple statewide assessments administered during the course of the year if the results of the multiple assessments provide a summative score that provides valid and reliable information on individual student achievement.
Authorize innovative assessment pilot	Would allow LEAs to develop and implement local assessment systems if such assessment systems are approved by the state and meet all of the technical quality requirements that apply to statewide assessments.	Includes an "Innovative Assessment and Accountability Demonstration Authority," initially available to up to 7 states, for the testing of competency-based and performance-based assessments. States meeting certain requirements may use the results from the innovative assessments as part of their Title I accountability systems.
Priority 2. Accountability Requirements		
State flexibility in making annual determinations to meaningfully differentiate schools and districts	Each state must annually evaluate and identify the academic performance of each public school in the state based on academic achievement, achievement gaps and other measures of school success. No other restrictions on how states make annual determinations.	Each state must annually evaluate and identify the academic performance of each public school in the state based on academic achievement, graduation rates (for high schools), an additional academic indicator (for other schools), the English proficiency of English learners, and at least one other indicator of school quality. No other significant restrictions.
Base accountability system on college-and-career readiness for all students	The statewide accountability system must ensure that all public school students graduate from high school prepared for postsecondary education or the workforce without the need for remediation.	The statewide accountability system must ensure that all public school students (including each of the disaggregated categories of students) graduate from high school prepared for postsecondary education or the workforce without the need for remediation.



CCSSO Priority (Released on January 8, 2015)	H.R. 5, Student Success Act House ESEA Bill (Passed House Floor on July 8, 2015)	S. 1177, Every Child Achieves Act Senate ESEA Bill (Passed Senate Floor on July 16, 2015)
Use assessment data and graduation rates in accountability systems and report cards	Achievement (as measured through state assessments) must be part of the state accountability system. Graduation rates are allowed but not required. Both measures must be on the report card.	Achievement (as measured through state assessments) and graduation rates are required elements of accountability systems and report cards.
Continued disaggregation of student data by subgroups in accountability systems and report cards	Assessment systems and report cards must provide disaggregated data, and accountability systems must consider achievement gaps.	Assessment systems and report cards must provide disaggregated data. Accountability systems must establish measurable state-defined goals for all students and for each of the categories of student.
State-determined accountability systems identify lowest-performing schools and target appropriate interventions	The state accountability system must include a state-designed system for school improvement for low-performing Title I schools that includes implementing interventions designed to address those schools' weaknesses.	State accountability system must identify the Title I schools that are in need of intervention and support. The state must provide technical assistance and support to LEAs with those schools.
Require district interventions in lowest-performing schools and include recognition for high-performing schools	The interventions in low-performing schools must be implemented by LEAs. No focus on recognition for high-performing.	LEAs must develop and implement appropriate intervention and support strategies for their schools that the state has identified as lowest-performing. The Secretary's national Title I report card may recognize states, LEAs, schools, programs and individuals for exemplary performance.
Priority 3. Teacher and Leader Evaluation Requirements		
State-determined effectiveness systems that include multiple measures of teacher and leader performance	Authorizes, but does not require, states to implement teacher and school leader evaluation systems. Does not specify that such systems, if implemented, use multiple measures.	Authorizes, but does not require, the design and implementation of teacher, principal and other school leader evaluation and support systems that are based in part on evidence of student academic achievement and include multiple measures.
Allow federal Title II funds to support state-determined teacher and leader evaluation systems	Authorizes the use of Title II SEA funds to support implementation of state-determined teacher and school leader evaluation systems, including for training and technical assistance provided by the state.	Authorizes the use of Title II SEA funds for the development or improvement of educator evaluation and support systems, or to assist LEAs in developing and implementing them.



Priority 4. Funding and Flexibility		
Include additional flexibility for states in allocating funds	Under the major formula grant programs (Title I, Title II, ELA, etc.), funds would still flow from SEAs to LEAs strictly on the basis of criteria specified in the statute. Under the new “Local Academic Flexible Grant” program (a block-grant-type authority), states would have flexibility in providing funds to LEAs and nongovernmental entities for evidence-based activities designed to raise student achievement.	Under the major formula grant programs (Title I, Title II, ELA, etc.), funds would still flow from SEAs to LEAs strictly on the basis of criteria specified in the statute. The Senate bill also includes several programs not in the House bill under which funds would flow to SEAs by formula (for STEM, Safe and Healthy Students, Technology) or competitively (for Literacy, Early Learning). Under the Literacy, STEM and Early Learning programs, states would have flexibility in allocating funds, but under the Safe and Healthy and Technology programs authorized, most funds would flow to LEAs by formula.
Expand allowable uses of funds for major titles	Allowable uses of funds under Title II and the new Local Academic Flexible Grant are very broad.	Revises “Supplement, not Supplant” requirement to deem compliant any school that receives its proper due allocation of state and local funds. Retains 40% poverty threshold for schoolwide programs, but allows limited exceptions. Allowable uses of funds under Title II and Safe and Healthy Students are very broad. The inclusion of more separately authorized programs makes the Senate bill more “categorical” than the House bill.
Funding for state assessment and reporting systems	Eliminates dedicated funding for state assessment systems, but states may use an amount equivalent to current state assessment funding of their set-aside of the Local Academic Flexible Grant to support test development and administration.	Authorizes “such sums as may be necessary” for dedicated state assessment program.
Provide additional support for early childhood education	No program is targeted on early childhood education.	Authorizes Early Learning Alignment and Improvement Grants (similar to the current Preschool Development Grants program) with a “such sums as may be necessary” authorization of appropriations.
Governance		
Continued SEA authority over all state-led ESEA programs	Preserves SEA authority over all state-led ESEA programs.	Preserves SEA authority over all state-led ESEA programs. Requires the SEA to consult, in a timely and meaningful manner, with the governor on the development of the state’s Title I and II plans and consolidated state applications. Permits the Governor 30 days prior to submission of the plan to sign the plan, but if the Governor does not sign within that time frame, the SEA submits the plan without the signature.

