



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Title:	Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Update	
As Related To:	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal One: Develop and support policies to close the achievement and opportunity gaps. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal Two: Develop comprehensive accountability, recognition, and supports for students, schools, and districts.	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal Three: Ensure that every student has the opportunity to meet career and college ready standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Goal Four: Provide effective oversight of the K-12 system. <input type="checkbox"/> Other
Relevant To Board Roles:	<input type="checkbox"/> Policy Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> System Oversight <input type="checkbox"/> Advocacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Communication <input type="checkbox"/> Convening and Facilitating
Policy Considerations / Key Questions:	<p>The memo provides answers and insights to the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the Board’s authority and role in the ESSA work? 2. What has happened so far with the ESSA State Plan work and what will happen in the near future? 3. What did the Consolidated State Plan (CSP) Team and the Accountability Systems Workgroup (ASW) recommend for use in school accountability as the School Quality and Student Success measures? 4. What are the major concerns expressed by stakeholders about the two measures of SQSS recommended by the ASW: chronic absence, and 9th grade on track? And where can I find more information on these two measures? 5. Under ESSA and per the recommendations from the ASW and the CSP Team, how will the next iteration of the Index differ from the current Index version? 6. What were the recommendations from the ASW and the CSP Team for the Superintendent on the topic of long-term goals? 	
Possible Board Action:	<input type="checkbox"/> Review <input type="checkbox"/> Approve	<input type="checkbox"/> Adopt <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
Materials Included in Packet:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Memo <input type="checkbox"/> Graphs / Graphics / Other <input type="checkbox"/> Third-Party Materials <input type="checkbox"/> PowerPoint	
Synopsis:	<p>The Every Student Succeeds Act Accountability System Workgroup recently finished their work and forwarded recommendations to the Consolidated State Plan Team for their discussion and moving those recommendations (or not) to the Superintendent for his consideration in the Plan submission to the United States Education Department. The memo provides information on the recommendations forwarded to the Superintendent.</p>	



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT - UPDATE

Policy Considerations

The Washington State Board of Education (SBE) has the authority to adopt school and district improvement goals under RCW 28A.305.130 (4)(a) and did so in WAC-180-105-020. In RCW 28A.657.110, the SBE was directed to develop a Washington Achievement Index and to coordinate with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to seek approval from the U.S. Department of Education (USED) to use the Achievement Index for federal accountability purposes.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires the OSPI to submit a Consolidated State Plan (CSP) to the USED that includes a description of long-term school improvement goals, and a description of the system of meaningful school differentiation, which is mostly derived from data in the Washington Achievement Index. To support this process, the OSPI established workgroups (including the Accountability System Workgroup) to provide recommendations on the above referenced topics to the Consolidated State Plan (CSP) Team and the Superintendent for his consideration in the State Plan submission to the USED. The Board will have questions about the recommendations provided to the Superintendent, and which of those recommendations moved forward into the State Plan.

Key Questions

1. What is the Board's authority and role in the ESSA work?
2. What has happened so far with the ESSA State Plan work and what will happen in the near future?
3. What measures of School Quality and Student Success (SQSS) did the Consolidated State Plan (CSP) Team and the ASW recommend for use in school accountability?
4. What are the major concerns expressed by stakeholders about the two measures of School Quality and Student Success (SQSS) recommended by the ASW: chronic absence, and 9th grade on track? And where can I find more information on these two measures?
5. Under ESSA and per the recommendations from the ASW and the Consolidated State Plan Team, how will the next iteration of the Index differ from the current Index version?
6. What were the recommendations from the ASW and the CSPT for the Superintendent on long-term goals?
7. When will the proposed rulemaking for the ESSA statewide accountability systems be finalized?

What is the Authority and Role of the Board?

The ASW formally met on seven separate occasions from April through October to discuss a wide range of topics on the statewide accountability system for the purpose of making recommendations to be considered by the CSPT for the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The ASW finished their work on Oct. 14 and on Oct. 20, the CSPT reviewed and discussed the 14 recommendations from the ASW. The CSPT forwarded and updated list to the Superintendent for his consideration in developing the State Plan.

The Board has important roles from two separate angles.

1. Broad oversight: ESSA Section 1111(a)(1)(A) states that the State Educational Agency (SEA) shall file with the Secretary of USED a State Plan that is developed by the SEA with timely and meaningful consultation with the Governor, members of the State legislature, the State Board of Education, and other agencies and stakeholders.

Section 1111(a)(8) directs the SEA to make the State Plan publicly available for public written comment for at least 30 days, by electronic means, and in an easily accessible format prior to submission to the Secretary for approval. The 30 day public comment period is expected to begin on November 9, or when the OSPI makes the State Plan publicly available.

2. Specified Authority:

RCW 28A.305.130 (4)(a) authorizes the SBE to adopt school and district improvement goals in ELA, math, and science that shall not conflict with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended. The SBE may establish school and district goals for high school graduation, and all of the goals shall be adopted by rule (currently in WAC-180-105-020).

RCW 28A.657.110 (2) directs the SBE to develop a Washington Achievement Index to identify schools and school districts for recognition, for continuous improvement, and for additional state support. Section (4) directs the SBE to coordinate with the OSPI to seek approval from the U.S. Department of Education (USED) to use the Achievement Index for federal accountability purposes.

Section 1111 (a)(8) of the ESSA expressly holds that the SBE have the opportunity to provide public written comment on the SEA's Draft State Plan prior to submission to the Secretary of the USED. Per Washington's designated authority and the state laws specified above, the SBE has the responsibility to:

- Ensure the goals described in the State Plan meet the Board's expectations
- Be sure the Achievement Index described in the State Plan is modified in a manner that fulfills the vision of the SBE and meets the requirements specified in state law.
- The SBE will need to update WAC-180-105-020 and may consider other rule writing regarding statewide accountability elements.

What has happened so far and what will happen in the near future?

The approximately 40-member ASW met for seven full-day meetings between May and October to discuss changes to the statewide accountability system required under the ESSA. The meeting agendas and summaries for the ASW and other ESSA workgroups can be found [here](#). The OSPI developed the State Plan after considering the recommendations and input from at least a dozen formal workgroups, at least seven public forums across the state, several focus groups and other solicited and unsolicited feedback from a long list of stakeholder organizations.

At the time of the writing of this memo, the OSPI was expecting to release the draft State Plan on November 9 at the SBE meeting if the Plan was ready. The public release triggers the start of a 30-day public review period that is described [here](#) on the OSPI website. The OSPI website includes information on three Review Tours to be held at Burien, Selah, and Spokane, for the public to hear about the plan and the manner in which the public may provide comments and feedback. The OSPI will also conduct a webinar for those to participate in who are unable to attend the presentations at the locations.

After reviewing comments and input coming from the 30-day public review, the OSPI has stated that it will develop a final draft of the Consolidated State Plan and deliver the document to the Secretary of the USED sometime in mid-to late-December. The USED officially published a Notice of proposed

Rulemaking covering accountability provisions on May 31, 2016, and identified March 6 and July 5, 2017 as ESSA State Plan submission deadline dates. As specified in the ESSA, the USED is establishing a peer review process (Appendix A) to support the 120-day approval of ESSA State Plans, and the 120-day approval timeline is expected to start on the submission date selected by Washington. As the Washington State Plan will likely contain to-be-determined (TBD) elements, the USED would be expected to grant “Conditional Approval.” Some of the key dates are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Shows the approximate timeline of some ESSA activities from the time of State Plan discussion at the November SBE meeting to the anticipated USED approval date.

Date	Activity
November 9, 2016	The OSPI may release the ESSA Consolidated State Plan at the regularly scheduled SBE meeting. The 30-day public review and comment period begins if the Plan is released at the meeting.
November 14-28, 2016	The OSPI conducts four meetings (three in-person across the state and one webinar) dubbed as the ESSA Review Tour to receive public input on the Consolidated State Plan.
December 9, 2016	The 30-day public review and comment period closes if the Plan is released as above. The OSPI reviews comments and develops the Final ESSA Consolidated State Plan.
Mid- to Late December, 2016 ⁺	Approximate date that the OSPI has stated it would deliver the Final ESSA Consolidated State Plan to the Secretary of the USED.
March 6, 2017	The USED opens the Peer Review Process for the 120-day approval of ESSA State Plans
July 5, 2017*	End of the 120-day approval period for Plans

⁺ Note: this date is approximate

*Note: this would be the latest possible approval date if no State Plan re-writing is required, if the 120-day review period begins on the March 6th submission date, and the date could be later if Washington is required to re-write part of the State Plan.

The ESSA identifies the 2016-17 as the school year transition year from the No Child Left Behind Adequate Yearly Progress (NCLB AYP) school accountability to ESSA accountability. Substantial feedback and input was provided by national stakeholder groups in favor of identifying the 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years as transitional years. Find the Washington ESSA Transition Plan [here](#), which explains what Title I requirements are included in the transition plan and click [here](#) to read about other aspects of the transition to the ESSA.

- The OSPI will not make AYP determinations based on 2015-16 assessments.
- Districts are not required to send AYP letters before the start of the 2016–17 school year.
- Most schools and districts do not need to update their school and district improvement plans for 2016-17. They will continue to implement their existing plans.
- The transition plan explains the manner in which districts and schools will provide Supplemental Educational Services (SES) and public school choice.

Once the Consolidated State Plan is submitted to the Secretary, the OSPI would hope that the State Plan be conditionally approved as written. There are expected to be aspects or elements of the plan that are unknown or unspecified at the time of the submission and the plan will be updated with the new

information as is allowed under the ESSA. In summary, the OSPI will follow the activities in the Washington ESSA Consolidated State Plan and would no longer need to follow the AYP Workbook.

What measures of School Quality and Student Success (SQSS) did the Consolidated State Plan (CSP) Team and the ASW recommend for use in school accountability?

The CSP Team discussed the measures for school accountability recommended by the ASW. The discussion was a brief review of the pros and cons of the ASW-recommended measures and other measures considered by the ASW but not recommended for school accountability. In support of the will of the majority of the CSP Team, the CSP chairperson proposed that the CSP conduct separate votes on all of the indicators receiving majority support in the ASW and that the recommendations of both the ASW and the CSP Team would be moved forward to the Superintendent.

The ASW recommended two measures for use in school accountability and the CSP Team recommended five measures for use in school accountability (Table 2). Only one of the seven measures (9th Grade On-Track) were recommended by both ESSA entities. Two of the measures (9th Grade On-Track and Dual Credit Participation) are currently collected and applicable to high school accountability. Chronic Absenteeism is currently collected and applicable for all grade levels. The remaining four measures are either currently undefined, not used statewide, or are not collected at all. The OSPI would need to assess these four measures for validity, reliability, and the feasibility of inclusion in school accountability.

At the time of this writing, the Superintendent has not made final decisions with regard to the use of these four indicators in specific and the SQSS indicators in general. It is important to remember that the ESSA requires at least one SQSS measure for each grade band and that the SQSS measures can differ by grade band. The SQSS measures can be changed or replaced over time after new measures are developed and are proven ready for school accountability.

Table 2: Shows the measures recommended for school accountability by ESSA entity.

Measure	Recommended ⁺ for School Accountability Use?	
	Accountability Systems Workgroup	Consolidated State Plan Team
Chronic Absenteeism	Yes	No
9 th Graders On-Track	Yes	Yes
Disproportionate Discipline*	No	Yes
Dual Credit Participation	No	Yes
Teacher Assignment and Equity*	No	Yes
School Climate and Engagement Survey*	No	Yes
⁺ Note: shaded cells highlight the measures recommended for use in school accountability and by which ESSA entity. *Note: measures for which definitions have not yet been developed or are expected to change, instruments are not used statewide, or a new data collection will be required.		

What are the major concerns expressed by stakeholders about the two SQSS indicators recommended by the ASW: Chronic Absenteeism, and 9th Grade On-Track?

Chronic Absenteeism

General Description of the Measure: The percentage of students at a school (by student group) who are not Chronically Absent, defined as being absent for less than 18 full days of the school year.

In February 2016, the OSPI reported for the first time district-level analyses of chronic absenteeism [here](#) as part of their Performance Indicator reporting. Click [here](#) to learn more about the OSPI's resources and supports to increase regular attendance and reduce chronic absenteeism. In June 2016, the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) was released by the USED that included chronic absenteeism data for all schools and districts across the nation. The ESSA requires the OSPI to report the CRDC data on the Report Card and the OSPI will do so in the future by providing a link to the CRDC website.

The CRDC and OSPI chronic absenteeism releases highlight a nationwide and statewide problem that (according to USED Secretary John B. King) contributes to lowered educational outcomes that include low academic achievement and increased likelihood of high school dropout. In response to the elevation of this issue to a national problem, the USED developed a toolkit to address and eliminate chronic absenteeism in our schools that can be found [here](#). Click on one of the following states or school districts to learn how each is addressing chronic absenteeism: [Indiana](#), [Connecticut](#), [New York](#), [Tennessee](#), [Virginia](#).

According to an educational article in Education Week, published [here](#), many factors contribute to poor attendance, and the use of chronic absenteeism in school and district accountability systems would be a good measure to show how well schools are doing addressing student health issues, supporting low income students, coordinating mentorship programs, organizing community services, and communicating with families. While there are concerns about the collection of and use of chronic absenteeism data (click [here](#)), the preponderance of the evidence indicates that it is crucial to report on and take action to address this lost educational opportunity.

As a reminder, the ASW reached consensus on including chronic absenteeism as a measure of SQSS, meaning it was strongly supported by the ASW. Concerns regarding the use of chronic absenteeism from the ASW members primarily focus on the perceptions that this is a problem out of the control of schools and districts, that parents have a wide degree of discretion in keeping their children out of school, and that the measure will disproportionately impact particular student groups. The concerns listed below were taken from ASW meeting documents and are largely unedited so as to capture the passion expressed by the authors of the comments. Remember, the comments below are reflective of the minority, not the majority supporting use of this measure.

- Could have an unfair impact on districts or schools with high numbers of migrant students, other highly mobile student groups, and other factors that lead to absenteeism beyond the school's scope of influence
- Chronic Absenteeism may not always be a culturally responsive indicator and is a challenge in districts that have generational chronic absences.
- It could disadvantage youth who have other obligations outside of school.
- Many of the chronic absentees need social emotional support. Proper funding and supports are needed to actively engage social workers to do home visits and work with the students and families involved.

- Parents may be part of the cause of chronic absenteeism in the early grades, as they can excuse the absences, and therefore the measure may be perceived as penalizing schools for something only partially in their control.
- This data may be vulnerable to being manipulated and may not be applicable for all schools (such as ALEs, and virtual schools).

9th Graders On-Track

General Description of the Measure: The percentage of first-time 9th graders at a school (by student group) who did not fail a course.

In a summary of recent research found [here](#), the importance of 9th grade success as measured by credit attainment or credit accumulation was well illustrated. The academic performance and outcomes are considerably lower for students who do not pass a course in the 9th grade. Students who are under-prepared academically for high school coursework are the most likely to fail one or more courses and ultimately drop out, but even students who are well-prepared academically and high-achieving in middle school may face considerable challenges when they enter high school. One of the five recommendations made by the Breakthrough Collaborative to support students to overcome the challenges of 9th grade is to monitor students' academic progress and make sure students get the support they need. Click [here](#) to read more about how Chicago Public Schools increased high school graduation rates by focusing on their 9th grade on-track measure. Click on one of the following states or school districts to learn how each is using or exploring 9th grade on-track measures: [Chicago Public Schools](#), [Oregon](#), [Seattle Public Schools](#), [New York](#), [Denver Public Schools](#), [Arkansas](#).

The measure OSPI has developed is based on credit attainment (credits earned compared to credits attempted) rather than a measure of whether a student is on-track to meet career and college-ready standards. The OSPI data collection has the capacity to identify course failures in English, math, or another course, so the measure could be fine-tuned to identify specific courses if that is recommended.

As a reminder, the ASW reached consensus on including 9th Grade On-Track as a measure of SQSS, meaning it was strongly supported by the ASW. Concerns regarding the use of a 9th Grade On-Track measure from the ASW members primarily focus on the perceptions that this is a difficult indicator to measure and define. A summary of the ASW concerns are as follows. Again, the concerns listed below were taken from ASW meeting documents and are largely unedited so as to capture the feelings expressed by the authors of the comments. As before, the comments below are reflective of the minority, not the majority supporting the use of this measure for school accountability.

- Some members were uncertain about our ability to capture "on-track" accurately. We know how many credits a student earned, but do we always know the level of rigor of the courses, or if the courses are what the student needs to be "on track?"
- Some members were concerned the measure is too loose and too difficult to measure, not consistent, and measures only one grade band.
- Some members felt the high school gets penalized for students who come to them unprepared if they don't make big gains in their first year.
- Some members felt funding and proper supports may be insufficient to meet the needs of the students falling behind. Social workers, mental and physical health professionals, and additional staff are necessary.

- Some members felt there are already additional high school measures. Adding another would dilute the power of the others. How grades are assigned (determining course failure or not) varies widely between schools and teachers.
- Some members felt the 24 credit graduation requirement may get in the way and create an increase the likelihood of students not passing classes and not be able to make it up.

What do we know about some of the other measures of School Quality and Student Success examined by the ASW and considered by the CSP Team?

The Education Trust created a table found [here](#) for the purpose of providing additional information about the data quality and confidence in measures for possible inclusion in the indicators required under the ESSA. Table 3, modified from the Education Trust table, shows measures that some states are considering for inclusion in their school accountability systems as elements of the School Quality and Student Success (SQSS) indicator. While data quality matters for all indicators, some of these measures pose larger accuracy concerns than others. The table highlights the level of confidence or caution that advocates should have when thinking about whether to include each measure in school ratings, in a needs assessment that follows the rating (a look at a broader range of data to understand school-based causes of underperformance), and in public reporting.

Table 3: From Education Trust. Chart shows comments and levels of confidence from the Education Trust about the use of certain ESSA measures of SQSS for school accountability.

Measure	School Ratings	Needs Assessment	Public Reporting	Education Trust Comments
Chronic Absenteeism	Yellow	Green	Green	It is crucial to determine who counts as absent and how many absences are required to become a chronic absentee.
9 th Graders On-Track	Yellow	Green	Green	Not included in Education Trust reviews.
Dual Credit Participation	Yellow	Green	Green	It is important to include both participation and success.
Disproportionate Discipline	Yellow	Green	Green	Including suspension/expulsion rates in school ratings could incentivize schools to under report disciplinary events.
Teacher Assignment and Equity	Red	Green	Green	Cannot be disaggregated by student group within a school. Including such measures takes the focus away from how schools are serving all groups of students.
School Climate and Engagement Surveys	Yellow	Green	Green	High-quality student and parent surveys can provide important information about a school. Including this information in school ratings may pressure parents and students to "make schools look good."
College Academic Distribution Requirements (CADRs*)	Yellow	Green	Green	Must show that its college-prep course of study is aligned with admission requirements to institutions of higher education.

Indicators of Social Emotional Learning*	Red	Yellow	Red	Given concerns about validity, reliability, and possible bias, as well as their potential to contribute to a deficit-oriented mindset toward students, SEL measures should not be included in school ratings.
Number of AP, IB, and Dual Credit Courses Offered*	Red	Green	Green	Cannot be disaggregated by student group within a school. Including such measures takes the focus away from how schools are serving all groups of students.
Extent of Library Collection	Red	Green	Green	
Participation in and Access to Early Childhood Education	Red	Green	Green	May not be actionable at the school level, as districts often control which schools may offer early education programs.
<p>The chart color coding is as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GREEN means a relatively high level of confidence. While data quality is always a concern, it is less of an issue with these indicators. • YELLOW means a medium level of caution. If interested in including these measures, advocates need to pay special attention to data quality. • RED means a high level of caution/use discouraged. 				

The comments provided by the Education Trust are not applicable for all states, as the data collected and reported on can differ substantially by state. Using Teacher Assignment and Equity as an example, Washington can disaggregate by student group but cannot do it perfectly at this point in time. With more definition and guidance for CEDARS and users, the OSPI expects to develop the capacity to accurately disaggregate the measure by student group, if that were to be the recommendation.

How will the new Index look in comparison to the current Index?

The SBE is directed to develop a school Achievement Index to identify schools and school districts for recognition, for continuous improvement, and for additional state support, and to coordinate with the OSPI in submitting the Index to the USED for federal accountability in RCW 28A.657.110. In order to be approved for federal accountability purposes under the ESSA, the Index must be modified to conform to the ESSA requirements.

The ASW thoughtfully considered and discussed the needed changes to the Index to be approved by the USED as a part of the Consolidated State Plan. The ASW considered changes to the broad indicators, specific measures, summative rating computations, indicator weights, labeling of schools, and the composition of the targeted subgroup. Until the OSPI officially releases the State Plan, it would be inappropriate to include specific changes to the Index recommended by the ASW and CSP Team, other than those required in the ESSA.

The ASW had considerable discussion around the requirement to create a single summative rating for all schools. While some in the ASW felt that a summative rating was not necessarily required, others felt that the regulations were explicit in the summative rating requirement. Proposed regulations (§200.18) require states to establish systems of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools. The proposed regulations further explain that the meaningful differentiation must,

“Result in a single rating from among at least three distinct rating categories for each school, based on a school’s level of performance on each indicator, to describe a school’s summative performance and include such a rating as part of the description

of the State’s system for annual meaningful differentiation on LEA report cards consistent with proposed §§200.31 and 200.32."

Table 4: Shows how the next iteration of the Index could differ from the current Index version if the ASW and CSP Team recommendations are approved or adopted by the SBE.

Index Feature		Current Index Version	Proposed ESSA Index Version
School Rating		Summative, 1 to 10 scale	Summative Rating
		Six tier labels and color coding	At least three unspecified school or tier labels
Indicators	Elementary and Middle Schools	Proficiency Growth	Proficiency Growth English Learner – ELPA 21 SQSS*
	High Schools	Proficiency Career- and College-Readiness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extended ACGR Dual Credit Participation 	Proficiency High School Graduation English Learner – ELPA 21 SQSS
	Student Groups	Seven race/ethnicity groups SWD, ELL, FRL, and Former ELL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students Targeted Subgroup 	Seven race/ethnicity groups SWD, ELL, and FRL <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Students TBD Targeted Subgroup
Long-Term Goals	Elementary and Middle Schools	Proficiency	Proficiency English Learners – ELPA 21
	High Schools	Proficiency High School Graduation	Proficiency High School Graduation English Learner

*Note: SQSS is at least one measure of School Quality or Student Success.

What were the recommendations from the ASW and the CSP Team for the Superintendent on the topic of long-term goals?

The ASW thoughtfully discussed the many aspects of establishing ambitious long-term goals for the indicators specified in the ESSA and required in state law. The ASW and the CSP Team were reminded on multiple occasions that RCW 28A.305.130 (4)(a) authorizes the SBE to adopt school and district improvement goals in ELA, math, and high school graduation, and that the long-term goals must meet the requirements in state law and ESSA. On the design of long-term goals, the ASW did not make a specific recommendation to the CSP Team since the ASW did not come to consensus, but did provide the CSP with the three conceptual approaches to setting overall goals that were considered.

1. Use an aspirational goal of 100 percent with ambitious and achievable interim targets.
2. An ambitious goal of less than 100 percent (like the exemplary schools of today).
3. Improvement every year that is derived from the reduction of the number of non-proficient students each by a yet-to-be-determined percent, similar to the AYP safe harbor analysis.

In a “straw vote”, the CSP overwhelmingly supported the third approach but did not put forth a formal recommendation to the Superintendent other than listing the three approaches with the results of the straw vote. Aside from the straw vote, the CSP Team did not provide substantive feedback on either the number of years to attain the endpoint goal or the annual percentage reduction required for the approach. For high schools, the ASW more strongly supported (13 yes – 7 no) the establishment of long-term goals based on proficiency rates and graduation rates following a gap reduction methodology. The endpoint goal was described as 100 percent or something less and the attainment term was not discussed, the overall preference for applying a gap reduction methodology was evident.

The CSP followed the ASW recommendations on defining a measure of progress and on establishing long-term goals for English Learners (EL). The CSP Team unanimously agreed that the OSPI will develop an EL progress measure over the next year with input from the Bilingual Education and Advisory Committee (BEAC) and the AAW. The CSP Team fully understood that the establishment of long-term goals was impossible given the fact that only one year of ELPA21 data is available at this time.

When will the proposed rulemaking for ESSA statewide accountability systems be finalized?

The USED published proposed rulemaking to clarify sections required to develop statewide accountability systems under the ESSA. Please click [here](#) to learn more about this rulemaking document. National experts anticipate that the regulations will be finalized sometime shortly after the Thanksgiving holiday, but of course, the regulations could be finalized earlier or later.

Additional Materials

Additional materials will be posted online to supplement this memo.

Action

The Board will discuss whether to draft a letter to the Superintendent in response to the Consolidated State Plan, if released at the time of the meeting.

Please contact Andrew Parr at andrew.parr@k12.wa.us if you have questions regarding this memo.

Appendix A – ESSA Consolidated State Plan Approval Process

ESSA and Proposed Regulations

Statute: Section 1111(c) of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA, requires that each State plan describe a single statewide accountability system for all public schools that is based on the challenging State academic standards for reading/language arts and mathematics, described in section 1111(b)(1), in order to improve student academic achievement and school success. These provisions take effect beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, as described in section 5(e)(1)(B) of the ESSA.

Proposed §299.13(d)(2) would clarify that the Secretary will establish a deadline for submission of consolidated State plans or individual program State plans on a specific date and time. We intend to establish two deadlines by which each SEA would choose to submit either a consolidated State plan or individual program State plans: March 6 or July 5, 2017. The Secretary plans to request that SEAs file an optional notice of intent to submit indicating which of the two deadlines the SEA is planning towards in order to assist the Department in designing a high quality peer review process.

Section 1111 (a)(4)(A) Specifies that the Secretary shall

- (i) establish a peer-review process to assist in the review of State plans;
- (ii) establish multidisciplinary peer-review teams and appoint members of such teams—
 - (I) who are representative of—
 - (aa) parents, teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and the community (including the business community); and
 - (bb) researchers who are familiar with—
 - (AA) the implementation of academic standards, assessments, or accountability systems; and
 - (BB) how to meet the needs of disadvantaged students, children with disabilities, and English learners, the needs of low-performing schools, and other educational needs of students;
 - (II) that include, to the extent practicable, majority representation of individuals who, in the most recent 2 years, have had practical experience in the classroom, school administration, or State or local government (such as direct employees of a school, local educational agency, or State educational agency); and
 - (III) who represent a regionally diverse cross-section of States;
- (iii) make available to the public, including by such means as posting to the Department’s website, the list of peer reviewers who have reviewed State plans under this section;
- (iv) ensure that the peer-review teams consist of varied individuals so that the same peer reviewers are not reviewing all of the State plans;
- (v) approve a State plan not later than 120 days after its submission, unless the Secretary meets the requirements of clause (vi);

Proposed §299.13(e) would provide an SEA the opportunity to revise its initial consolidated State plan or its individual program State plan in response to a preliminary written determination by the Secretary regarding whether the State plan meets statutory and regulatory requirements based on comments from the required peer review process under sections 1111(a)(4) and 8451 of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. While the SEA revises its plan, the period of Secretarial review would be suspended. This would ensure an SEA has sufficient time to follow its process for review and revision prior to any final written determination by the Secretary under sections 1111(a)(4)(A)(v) or 8451 of the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.