

SREB

*State Implementation of College-
and Career-Readiness Standards*

Accountability

January 2015

Southern
Regional
Education
Board

SREB.org

One of six benchmarking reports on progress in 14 states

These reports were prepared at SREB by Kimberly Anderson, director, Benchmarking College- and Career-Readiness Standards, and Mary Elizabeth Mira, assistant director, Benchmarking College- and Career-Readiness Standards. Research assistance was provided by Education First.

Six individual reports make up the set — a summary report, plus five reports with detailed state profiles by topic.

Cross-State Findings Report

Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments

Aligned Teaching Resources

Professional Development

Evaluation of Teachers and Leaders

Accountability

The *Cross-State Findings Report* summarizes the findings of this research. The five accompanying reports each present a detailed profile of each state's efforts in the topic area. Together, these reports represent the cumulative findings of SREB's Benchmarking College- and Career-Readiness Standards project. These reports replace the preliminary reports SREB released in March 2014. They update the information in the preliminary reports to reflect state efforts and plans between 2010 and summer 2014. Additional benchmarking studies are forthcoming from SREB. All of the reports are available at <http://www.sreb.org/page/1600/>.

This project is supported by a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The conclusions are those of SREB and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the funder.

Accountability

Introduction to State Profiles

Statewide Accountability Systems and Measures of Student Learning of New College- and Career-Readiness Standards

All of the states in this study have recently been involved in school accountability system reform. Since 2011, the states have taken advantage of a federal program to give them flexibility around certain requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). States requesting ESEA flexibility waivers must meet federal guidelines as part of the changes they make to their statewide accountability systems. While some changes vary among states, all states must adopt certain policies the U.S. Department of Education considers fundamental to reform. These policies include, among others, having college- and career-readiness standards and assessments, aligned alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, aligned English language proficiency (ELP) standards and assessments for English learners, and educator effectiveness systems that incorporate the use of student performance data. States are working hard to integrate the work of such complex reforms.

The following profiles examine how states' new statewide accountability systems incorporate measures that hold schools accountable for student learning of the states' new college- and career-readiness standards. The profiles also explain how states' accountability reporting for the use of federal Title III funds to serve English learners incorporates such measures. In each profile, the accountability measures used by the state are listed, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards. (These profiles do not seek to explain each state's *entire* statewide accountability system, which can include many goals, only some of which relate to student learning of the state's new college- and career-readiness standards. See each state's profile for links to detailed information on the state's entire accountability system.) For trends across the states in how their accountability systems measure student learning of the states' new college- and career-readiness standards, successes, challenges, types of support needed to move this work forward, and practitioner experiences with implementation on the ground, see the accompanying *Cross-State Findings Report*.

Statewide Accountability System

As SREB researchers reviewed information about state efforts, they asked the following questions. These questions guide the organization of this section of each state profile.

- ◆ *Context:* Was the state's new accountability system designed to meet specific needs or goals established in the state? For example, did the state develop the system as part of a larger set of reform initiatives or in response to recommendations of a statewide task force?
- ◆ *English Language Arts and Math Assessments:* What are the annual summative grade-level and course assessments in English language arts (ELA) and math for which schools must meet annual targets? To what extent are the assessments aligned to the state's new college- and career-readiness

standards? (For an explanation of how assessment alignment is determined, see the Introduction to State Profiles section in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments*.)

- ◆ *Other Measures:* Does the statewide accountability system include additional types of measures that provide stakeholders with information about teaching and learning of the state’s new college- and career-readiness standards? For example, Georgia has annual targets for student Lexile scores. Lexile scores indicate the level of text complexity that students can read and comprehend and are based on students’ scores on the state’s summative reading/ELA assessments. Georgia reports that its Lexile targets have been aligned to the increased rigor of the state’s new standards.
- ◆ *Measures of College and Career Readiness:* Does the statewide accountability system include measures of college and career readiness (for example, ACT or SAT exams), and if so, to what extent are they aligned to the state’s new standards? Such measures can provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, reflecting their level of attainment of the ultimate goal of readiness for college and careers.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, states must report (at the state level and by subgrantee) on three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). These profiles address Title III AMAO measures because English learners constitute a growing and historically low-achieving student subgroup, and schools and districts often struggle in their efforts to increase achievement and meet accountability targets for these students. Understanding the extent to which the states have integrated their new college- and career-readiness standards into accountability measures for English learners can help states as they work to enhance teaching, learning, assessment and educational outcomes for these students.

As SREB researchers reviewed information about state efforts, they asked the following question. This question guides the organization of this section of each state profile.

- ◆ *How States Measure the AMAOs:* What are the assessments the state uses to measure results for each AMAO, and to what extent is each aligned to the state’s new college- and career-readiness standards?

What Makes State Efforts Stand Out?

As SREB researchers reviewed information about state accountability systems, some efforts stood out according to the criteria below.

- ◆ *General Statewide Accountability System Establishes Annual School Targets That Include:*
 - Measures of student learning in the content areas of ELA and math through annual summative grade-level and course assessments that are aligned to the state’s new college- and career-readiness standards
 - Other measures that provide additional information about teaching and learning of the state’s new standards (for example, Georgia’s Lexile targets)
 - Multiple college- and career-readiness measures (exams or other measures) that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work

◆ *Title III Accountability Reporting Establishes Annual Targets That Include:*

- AMAO calculations based on data from assessments, particularly the state's ELP assessment, that are aligned to the state's new college- and career-readiness standards

Highlights: While all states in this study have made strides in accountability system reform, **states that have made *leading efforts*** in relation to the criteria above are Georgia, Kentucky and North Carolina. Other **states with *strong efforts*** are Alabama, Colorado, Louisiana, Maryland and Pennsylvania. Leading states' efforts and other notable aspects of the work across the states are also summarized in the accompanying *Cross-State Findings Report*.

Methodology

Information for these profiles was gathered from two sources:

- ◆ Review of publicly available information, including state policy documents and reports, department websites and other sources such as U.S. Department of Education reports
- ◆ Interviews with department leaders

Each state department of education reviewed and provided feedback on drafts of its profile, to ensure the accuracy of the information.

Alabama

Statewide Accountability System

Context: Alabama designed its current state accountability system based on the work of the State Assessment and Accountability Task Force and a strategic planning process at the Alabama State Department of Education in collaboration with stakeholders statewide. Further, the state designed the system based on requirements of its 2013 Flexibility and Accountability Act and its application to waive certain accountability requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). The state's accountability model is part of Alabama's overarching strategic improvement and reform plan, called Plan 2020. Plan 2020's goals and objectives were partly built on Alabama's adoption of its new College- & Career-Ready Standards (CCRS) in 2010.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the CCRS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the CCRS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Alabama, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Alabama's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the CCRS. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see SREB's report *Alabama: 2013 Accountability Profile* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For more details, see the state's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the CCRS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- ACT Aspire tests in grades three through eight in reading and math
- Alabama Alternate Assessment (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities) in grades three through eight

◆ *High school:*

- ACT QualityCore end-of-course assessments in Algebra I and English 10
- Alabama Alternate Assessment in grade 11

Alignment of these assessments to the CCRS:

- **Aspire:** ACT reports that these assessments are fully aligned to the Common Core.
- **QualityCore:** ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which the end-of-course assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math, and literacy standards in history/social studies, science and technical subjects.
- **Alternate assessments:** Alabama reports that it currently is working to fully align these assessments to the CCRS, with implementation planned for 2014-15.

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of college and career readiness. Students can be deemed college and career ready according to any of these measures:

- ◆ Advanced Placement (AP) exams
- ◆ International Baccalaureate (IB) exams
- ◆ ACT Plus Writing Exam in grade 11
- ◆ WorkKeys exam in grade 12
- ◆ College or postsecondary credit earned while in high school
- ◆ Industry credentials

Alignment of these college- and career-readiness measures to the CCRS:

- **AP:** The College Board reports that student learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses and AP exams, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses.
- **IB exams:** In two alignment studies it conducted, the IB organization reports that the IB program framework supports implementation of the Common Core, sharing the Common Core's focus on college and career readiness.
- **ACT:** ACT reports that its ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core.
- **WorkKeys:** Extent of alignment is unknown at this time.
- **College or postsecondary credit earned in high school:** Since the CCRS are designed to prepare students for college and career, successfully earning college credit while still in high school indicates that mastery of the standards indeed prepared the students for the rigors of postsecondary coursework.
- **Industry certification exams:** The extent of alignment of these exams is unknown at this time.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the CCRS: In the table that follows, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the CCRS.

Alabama (continued)

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the CCRS:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency 	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math 	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

Colorado

Statewide Accountability System

Context: In August 2010, Colorado launched a new accountability system based on the state’s Education Accountability Act of 2009 (Senate Bill 163), designed to further the goal that all students graduate college and career ready. This state accountability system set forth requirements distinct from those of the federal accountability system under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). Then in 2012, the U.S. Department of Education approved Colorado’s application to waive certain ESEA requirements, resulting in a more aligned and unified accountability system. In 2014, per the enactment of House Bill 1182 and the state Department of Education’s Accountability Transition Plan, the new statewide assessments, fully aligned to the new Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) in 2014-15, will be administered in 2014-15 but not used for accountability purposes until 2015-16, to account for the state’s transition in assessments. School accountability ratings for 2014-15 will be based on 2013-14 assessment results and on more recent student performance data (aligned with the CAS or postsecondary workforce-readiness criteria) that districts choose to submit to the department.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the CAS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state’s accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the CAS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Colorado, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of

assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Colorado's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the CAS. (For a description of the system in detail, see Colorado's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>. For more information on Colorado's Accountability Transition Plan, see <http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/Accountability%20Transition%20Fact%20Sheet%201-29-2014%20FINAL.pdf>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the CAS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments (and another related assessment) listed below.

◆ *Elementary, middle grades and high school:*

- Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) tests in reading, writing and math for grades three through 10 (achievement and growth scores)
- Colorado Alternate Assessment (CoAlt) in reading, writing and math for grades three through 10, for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (achievement scores)
- English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment for English learners, the ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium (growth scores)

Alignment of these assessments to the CAS:

- **TCAP:** Since 2011-12, Colorado has used the TCAP, which is partially aligned to the CAS. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Colorado plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through 11 in 2014-15.
- **CoAlt:** As of 2013-14, Colorado is implementing its CoAlt test, which it reports is fully aligned to the CAS. In 2014-15, Colorado expects to either continue to use its CoAlt or to adopt the new, fully aligned assessments of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment System Consortium.
- **ACCESS for ELLs:** WIDA designed this test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.

The statewide accountability system incorporates a measure of college and career readiness.

- ◆ ACT exam (all 11th grade students in the state)

Alignment of this measure to the CAS:

- ACT reports that its ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Colorado (continued)

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the CAS: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the CAS.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the CAS:
1. Show progress toward ELP 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The WIDA ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state reading, writing and math tests and graduation rates for English learners	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above. Graduation rate is a measure that does not relate to the CAS.

Delaware

Statewide Accountability System

Context: In 2012, Delaware received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to implement a new accountability system, waiving certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). Accountability for schools in Delaware under this new accountability system began in 2012-13. In 2014, Delaware received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to extend its ESEA waiver through the 2014-15 school year and to amend some components of its system.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state’s accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the Common Core. (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information

on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This section does not seek to explain Delaware’s entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the Common Core. (For an overview of the state’s entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_wai-vers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see the state’s approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the Common Core through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary, middle grades and high schools:*

- Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) tests in reading and math for grades three through 10
- DCAS-ALT1 alternate assessments in reading and math (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, grades three through 10)

Alignment of these assessments to the Common Core:

- **DCAS:** In 2012-13, Delaware partially aligned its Delaware Comprehensive Assessment System (DCAS) in reading and math for grades three through 10. The state Department of Education modified the assessments to more closely measure the learning expectations of the Common Core. The department reports that its end-of-course assessments in Algebra II and Integrated Math III are fully aligned to the Common Core. As a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, Delaware plans to implement the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and 11 in 2014-15.
- **DCAS-ALT1:** The department reports that the DCAS-ALT1 is based on Grade Band Extensions that are aligned to the Common Core. An alignment study was conducted in August 2013 to ensure alignment of the Grade Band Extensions to the content standards and the DCAS-Alt1 items to the Grade Band Extensions. Delaware is continuing to use the Grade Band Extensions for the 2014-15 school year while the DCAS-Alt1 is operational. The state is currently exploring the possibilities of a new alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards for the 2015-16 school year.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the Common Core.

Delaware (continued)

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the Common Core:
1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

Georgia

Statewide Accountability System

Context: Georgia designed its current accountability system, the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI), to further its work on enhancing students’ college and career readiness and to build on other key reform efforts such as the state’s Race to the Top grant initiatives and its adoption of the College and Career Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS). The CCRPI, detailed in Georgia’s application to waive certain accountability requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind), was approved by the U.S. Department of Education in 2012 and became operational in 2012-13.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the CCGPS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state’s accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the CCGPS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Georgia, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Georgia’s entire statewide accountability system, which includes many goals and targets, only some of which relate to student learning of the CCGPS. (For an overview of the state’s entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_

states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see Georgia’s approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>. Georgia’s CCRPI is a particularly extensive model. The state Department of Education’s accountability Web page provides useful information and summaries at <http://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum-Instruction-and-Assessment/Accountability/Pages/default.aspx>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the CCGPS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments (and another related assessment) listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- The Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) in reading, ELA and math was used through 2013-14. For 2014-15 and beyond, the new Georgia Milestones end-of-grade (EOG) tests will be used (these are currently in development).
- CRCT-Modified (CRCT-M) and Georgia Alternate Assessment (GAA) tests (for students with disabilities and students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, respectively) have been used; however the CRCT-M was discontinued after 2013-14.
- Grades five and eight writing assessments will be used through 2014-15. In subsequent years the new Georgia Milestones tests will be used.
- ACCESS for ELLs English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium is used.

◆ *High school:*

- End-of-course tests (EOCT) in ELA and math were used through 2013-14. For 2014-15 and beyond, Georgia will use its new Georgia Milestones end-of-course (EOC) tests for ninth grade literature and composition, American literature and composition, coordinate algebra and analytic geometry (these are currently in development).
- The Georgia High School Writing Test (GHSWT) is used.
- The GAA test is used.
- The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment is an “extra credit” measure for high schools.

Alignment of these assessments to the CCGPS:

- **CRCT and EOCT:** Georgia reported that in 2012-13 it fully aligned its CRCT for grades three through eight in reading, ELA and math and its high school EOCT in ELA and math. The department reports that its new Georgia Milestones EOG and EOC tests will be fully aligned beginning in 2014-15.
- **Grades five and eight writing assessments, and GHSWT:** Georgia reported that in 2012-13 it fully aligned these assessments.
- **CRCT-M and GAA tests:** Georgia reported that in 2012-13 it fully aligned these assessments to the CCGPS (though the CRCT-M was discontinued after 2013-14). Georgia was originally a member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment consortium, but withdrew in 2014. Instead, it plans to continue administering its own fully aligned GAA tests in 2014-15.

Georgia (continued)

- **ACCESS for ELLs:** WIDA designed this test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.

The statewide accountability system includes an additional type of measure that provides stakeholders with information about student learning of the CCGPS in ELA — Lexile reading-level targets.

High schools, middle grades schools and elementary schools have annual targets for the percentage of students achieving a certain Lexile score. A Lexile score is an indicator of a student’s ability to read and comprehend increasingly difficult texts as he or she proceeds through grade levels toward the goal of college and career readiness. Students receive a Lexile score that indicates the level of text complexity that they can read and comprehend. Lexile levels are based on and correlated to the state’s reading CRCT or CRCT-M assessments and the EOCT in ELA. The department has worked with MetaMetrics to establish a relationship between its state assessments and the Lexile scale.

Alignment of Lexile measures to the CCGPS:

- Since the state adopted the CCGPS, the department realigned its Lexile targets to reflect the increased text complexity levels required by the new standards. The department reports that its current CRCT, CRCT-M and EOCT — from which the Lexile scores are gleaned — are fully aligned to the CCGPS.

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of college and career readiness. These measures include those listed below.

- ◆ ACT exam
- ◆ SAT exam
- ◆ Advanced Placement (AP) exams
- ◆ International Baccalaureate (IB) exams
- ◆ Compass college entrance exam
- ◆ National industry-recognized credentials, IB career-related certificate or Georgia-developed career pathway assessments
- ◆ Students complete career pathways in one of the following: career technical and agricultural education, advanced academics, fine arts and world languages
- ◆ Dual enrollment credit earned while in high school
- ◆ Percentage of graduates entering institutions in the Technical College System of Georgia or the University System of Georgia not requiring remediation
- ◆ *For middle grades schools:* Students complete two or more state-defined, career-related assessments or inventories, and a state-defined Individual Graduation Plan by the end of grade eight.
- ◆ *For elementary schools:* Students complete an identified number of grade-specific career-awareness lessons aligned to Georgia’s 17 Career Clusters.

Alignment of these measures to the CCGPS:

- **ACT:** ACT reports that its ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core.
- **SAT:** The College Board reports strong alignment between the SAT and the Common Core.
- **AP:** The College Board reports that student learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses and AP exams, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses.
- **IB exams:** In two alignment studies it conducted, the IB organization reports that the IB program framework supports implementation of the Common Core, sharing the Common Core’s focus on college and career readiness.
- **Compass exam:** The extent of alignment is unknown at this time.
- **The remaining college- and career-readiness measures:** These measures provide various types of information on the extent to which students acquire skills, knowledge and experience that support readiness for and success with the rigors of postsecondary work. As such, they support the philosophy and goals of the CCGPS.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the CCGPS: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the CCGPS.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the CCGPS:
1. Show progress toward ELP 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the WIDA Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

Georgia (continued)

Georgia's accountability system is a leading effort to hold schools accountable for improving student learning of the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the College and Career Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS). Accountability measures include those listed below.

- ◆ English language arts (ELA) and math annual summative content-area assessments, which the state Department of Education reports are fully aligned to the new standards
- ◆ An additional type of measure of student learning in ELA: Lexile reading-level targets that the department reports have been adjusted to reflect the increased text complexity levels required by the new standards
- ◆ Several college- and career-readiness measures (for example, exams)
- ◆ Aligned English Language Proficiency assessment used in accountability reporting for federal Title I funds and Title III funds to serve English learners

Kentucky

Statewide Accountability System

Context: Kentucky's 2009 Senate Bill 1 mandated a new public education assessment and accountability system for 2011-12, and led to the adoption of the Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS). Following a year of discussion with educators, stakeholders and the public, and incorporating input from the Kentucky School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council (members representing a variety of education stakeholders, appointed by the governor), the state Board of Education approved several regulations that define the new state accountability model — Unbridled Learning: College/Career Readiness for All. In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education approved Kentucky's Unbridled Learning plan as the state's new accountability system, waiving certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). In January 2014, the U.S. Department of Education approved amendments to Kentucky's ESEA waiver, which include incorporating the state's teacher and leader evaluation results into its accountability system. Additionally, in May 2014, the state Department of Education submitted a request for a one-year extension for implementation of the accountability system to the U.S. Department of Education.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the KCAS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning of the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the KCAS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Kentucky, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Kentucky's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the KCAS. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see Kentucky's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the KCAS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP) assessments in reading, writing and math
- Alternate K-PREP assessments (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities)

◆ *High school:*

- ACT QualityCore end-of-course assessments in English II and Algebra II
- Alternate K-PREP assessments

Alignment of these assessments to the KCAS:

- **K-PREP:** Since 2011-12, Kentucky has administered the K-PREP tests, which it reports are fully aligned to the KCAS for grades three through eight in ELA (reading and writing) and math (the KCAS standards were used as the foundation for all item development).
- **Alternate K-PREP:** Kentucky reports that these assessments are fully aligned to the KCAS. Kentucky is also monitoring the work of the two consortia developing aligned alternate assessments, Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) and the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC).
- **QualityCore:** ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which its end-of-course assessments are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math, and literacy standards in history/social studies, science and technical subjects.

The statewide accountability system includes additional measures that provide stakeholders with information about teaching and learning of the KCAS — Program Reviews and a Next-Generation Professionals component.

- ◆ *Program Reviews:* A Program Review (PR) is a process for local schools to examine their practices and outcomes and establish actions for improvement. The PR constitutes at least 20 percent of a school's annual accountability rating. Key aspects of the PR include those listed below.

Kentucky (continued)

- A PR is an examination of the implementation and outcomes of an educational program (for example, instructional practices, curriculum, student work, assessments, professional development and administrative support). PRs are conducted by school teams that include stakeholder representation (staff, parents, students and relevant community members). These teams use guidance from the department to review the program at different points during the school year and produce a summary report of status and plans for improvement.
- Every school in Kentucky must conduct an annual PR in at least one of the following areas: arts and humanities, writing, and practical living and career studies. Each area must have a PR conducted at least every four years.
- Districts complete end-of-year reviews of school programs, and department staff also review and audit the reports biannually.
- ◆ *Next-Generation Professionals component:* Beginning in 2015-16, Kentucky will incorporate its teacher and leader evaluation results into its accountability system. This component will constitute 10 percent of a school's total accountability score. No individual evaluation ratings will be made public; schools will receive an overall performance rating based on an aggregate rating for all educators. The department will gather baseline data in 2015 to set targets, including:
 - The percentage of teachers rated "Effective" or above
 - The percentage of principals rated "Effective" or above (for district accountability)

Alignment of the Additional Measures to the KCAS:

- **Program Reviews:** Because PRs are, in part, evidenced by products of student learning, PRs can provide information about student learning in the KCAS in ELA (in particular, writing) in addition to the school-level practices that support that learning.
- **Next-Generation Professionals component:** The Next-Generation Professionals component provides information about teaching and learning of the KCAS. In teacher evaluations, Kentucky's classroom observation rubric is adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching. In principal evaluations, Kentucky's principal practice rubric is based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Both the Danielson Framework and the ISLLC standards are widely regarded as defining skills and knowledge that form a basic foundation for effective teaching and leadership in a Common Core environment. Further, the student growth and achievement component of the teacher and leader evaluation systems are based in part on Kentucky's annual statewide summative assessments, which the department reports are fully aligned to the KCAS. (See the accompanying state profile on *Evaluation of Teachers and Leaders* for more information on the alignment of these systems to the KCAS.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of college and career readiness. Students take one or more of the following:

- ◆ ACT exams (Explore in grade eight, Plan in grade 10, and ACT)
- ◆ Compass college placement test
- ◆ Kentucky Online Testing Placement Exam Program (KYOTE)

Alignment of these measures to the KCAS:

- **ACT, Explore, Plan exams:** ACT reports that its College Readiness Standards, upon which these exams are based, are aligned with the Common Core, and that the ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core. ACT is discontinuing the Explore and Plan exams, and Kentucky will administer them for the last time in fall 2015. The department will create a Request for Proposal (RFP) to select an appropriate replacement for these tests.
- **Compass:** The Compass test is highly aligned to the definition of college readiness established by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education; however, a formal study of alignment to the KCAS has not been conducted.
- **KYOTE:** The KYOTE test is highly aligned to the definition of college readiness established by the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education; however, a formal study of alignment to the KCAS has not been conducted.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the KCAS: In the table that follows, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the KCAS.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the KCAS:
1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

Kentucky (continued)

Kentucky's accountability system is a leading effort to hold schools accountable for improving student learning of the state's new college- and career-readiness standards, the Kentucky Core Academic Standards (KCAS). Accountability measures include those listed below.

- ◆ English language arts (ELA) and math content-area summative assessments, which the state Department of Education reports are fully aligned to the new standards
- ◆ Additional measures that provide information about the extent to which schools are addressing and students are mastering the new standards: annual school Program Reviews and a Next-Generation Professionals component
- ◆ College- and career-readiness measures (exams)
- ◆ Aligned English language proficiency assessment used in accountability reporting for federal Title III funds to serve English learners

Louisiana

Statewide Accountability System

Context: In May 2012, Louisiana redesigned its School and District Accountability System in an effort to raise expectations for schools, reduce the complexity of its previous model and eliminate duplication and confusion caused by previously having two separate accountability systems (the state's accountability system and the federal Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, determinations). The U.S. Department of Education approved Louisiana's redesigned accountability system as detailed in its application to waive certain requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). Louisiana began implementing its new accountability system in 2012-13. The state Board of Education approved a set of transition policies to allow educators, parents and students time to learn the new expectations with regard to the assignment of school and district letter grades.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the Common Core. (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Louisiana's entire accounta-

bility system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the Common Core. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see Louisiana's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the Common Core through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) and integrated LEAP (iLEAP) in ELA and math (grades three through eight)
- LEAP Alternate Assessment Level 1 (LAA 1), for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, in ELA and math for grades three through eight

◆ *High school:*

- End-of-course tests in ELA and math
- LAA 1 in ELA and math for grade 10

Alignment of these assessments to the Common Core:

- **LEAP and iLEAP:** Louisiana reports that in 2013-14, it fully aligned these assessments to the new standards. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, Louisiana plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight in 2014-15.
- **End-of-course tests:** Louisiana reports that as of 2013-14, it fully aligned these assessments. Louisiana will not adopt the high school PARCC tests in 2014-15, and instead will continue administering its own fully-aligned high school end-of-course tests in ELA and math.
- **LAA 1:** Louisiana is currently aligning these assessments to the Common Core. The department is in the research and planning stage regarding the acquisition of new fully aligned alternate assessments, and is a member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment consortium.

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of college and career readiness for high schools.

- ◆ ACT exam (all students in 11th grade take the test)
- ◆ ACT Explore test (all students in eighth grade take the test) and ACT Plan test (all students in 10th grade take the test)
- ◆ Advanced Placement (AP) exams
- ◆ International Baccalaureate (IB) exams

Louisiana (continued)

Alignment of these assessments to the Common Core:

- **ACT, Explore and Plan tests:** ACT reports that its College Readiness Standards, upon which these exams are based, are aligned with the Common Core, and that the ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core. ACT will no longer offer its Explore and Plan tests after 2014.
- **AP:** The College Board reports that learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses and AP exams, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses.
- **IB:** In two alignment studies it conducted, the IB organization reports that the IB program framework supports implementation of the Common Core, sharing the Common Core's focus on college and career readiness.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the Common Core.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the Common Core:
1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The English Language Development Assessment (ELDA), developed by states partnering with the Council of Chief State School Officers Louisiana is a member of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) consortium, which is developing new ELP assessments for implementation in 2015-16	The ELDA is not aligned to the Common Core. ELPA21 is designing its new tests to align to the Common Core
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state ELA and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

Maryland

Statewide Accountability System

Context: In 2012, Maryland received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to implement a new statewide accountability system, waiving certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). Maryland's new system is called the School Progress Index (SPI). Maryland's 2013 Senate Bill 740, the College and Career Readiness and College Completion Act, requires reforms that build on the state's adoption of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards and its SPI. The act requires, among other things, that beginning in 2014-15 all students must be assessed for college readiness using acceptable college placement cut scores by grade 11. Maryland plans to use the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium assessments for this purpose.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Maryland, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Maryland's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/up-date_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see Maryland's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Maryland School Assessment (MSA) in reading and math is included. Maryland received approval from the U.S. Department of Education for elementary and middle grades schools to select students to participate in the PARCC spring 2014 field test in one content area (either ELA or math), while taking the MSA in the other content area. Students not selected for the field test took the MSA in both content areas. One or two classrooms from nearly every Maryland school participated in the field test. Schools field testing the PARCC assessments are permitted to retain their federal accountability designations from 2012-13 for an additional year.
- ALT-MSA (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities) in grades three through eight is included.

Maryland (continued)

◆ *High school:*

- Maryland High School Assessments (HSA) in English and math are included. Maryland did not field test the PARCC Algebra I or English 10 assessments in 2014, and therefore, all high schools will receive an accountability measure for 2014 based on the HSA.
- ALT-MSA in grade 10 is included.

Alignment of these assessments to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards:

- **MSA and HSA:** Maryland has not aligned these tests to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. As a member of PARCC, in 2014-15, Maryland expects to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in grades three through eight and the Algebra I and English 10 high school assessments.
- **ALT-MSA:** Maryland has not aligned these assessments to Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. As a member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment consortium, Maryland plans to implement the consortium's new, fully aligned assessments when they become available to member states in 2014-15.

The statewide accountability system incorporates the measures of college and career readiness, called College and Career Preparation (CCP) indicators, listed below.

- ◆ Advanced Placement (AP) exam scores
- ◆ International Baccalaureate (IB) exam scores
- ◆ Advanced standing in a state-approved career and technology education program of study (enrolled in the third course)
- ◆ Enrollment in college: Students entered a postsecondary institution (two-year, four-year or technical school) within 16 months of high school graduation

Alignment of these measures to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards:

- **AP:** The College Board reports that student learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses and AP exams, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses.
- **IB exams:** In two alignment studies it conducted, the IB organization reports that the IB program framework supports implementation of the Common Core, sharing the Common Core's focus on college and career readiness.
- **State-Approved Career and Technology Education Program:** The extent of alignment of these courses is unknown at this time.
- **Enrollment in college:** Enrollment in a postsecondary institution does not necessarily provide information related to a student's learning of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards, as acceptance and enrollment criteria vary across institutions. However, per Maryland's Senate Bill 740, beginning with 2014-15, all students must be assessed for college readiness using acceptable college placement cut scores. Maryland plans to use the Common Core-aligned PARCC assessments for this purpose. Hence, when such assessments and cut scores are in place, this indicator can provide information about how ready Maryland high school graduates are for the rigors of postsecondary work.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency 	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	<p>WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.</p> <p>Additionally, Maryland is a member of the Assessment Services Supporting ELs through Technology Systems (ASSETS) Consortium. ASSETS states are building on the work of the WIDA Consortium to create a next-generation, technology-based ELP assessment system, which is planned for implementation in 2015-16.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math 	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

Mississippi

Statewide Accountability System

Context: Mississippi redesigned the Mississippi Statewide Accountability System to provide simplicity and clarity for stakeholders and to eliminate duplication and confusion caused by previously having two separate accountability systems (the state's prior accountability system and the federal Adequate Yearly Progress, or AYP, determinations). In 2012, Mississippi's application to waive certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind) was approved by the U.S. Department of Education, and Mississippi's new system became operational in 2012-13. This system supports the state's adoption of its College- and Career-Readiness Standards (CCRS).

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the CCRS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the CCRS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Mississippi, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Mississippi's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the CCRS. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see the state's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the CCRS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2) in ELA and math is included.
- Mississippi Alternate Assessment of Extended Curriculum Frameworks (MAAECF) (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities). For the 2014 administration, Mississippi received a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education allowing schools to administer only one assessment to any individual student — either the MAAECF or the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment System Consortium field test. While student performance on the DLM field test did not count for school accountability in 2013-14, student participation in the test did count.

◆ *High school:*

- Subject Area Testing Program, Second Edition (SATP2) in English II and Algebra I is included.
- MAAECF is included (see information above regarding the field testing of the DLM alternate assessments).

Alignment of these assessments to the CCRS:

- **MCT2 and SATP2:** Mississippi has not aligned these tests to the CCRS. As a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, in 2014-15 Mississippi plans to implement the new, fully aligned PARCC tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight, and in English II and Algebra I for high school.
- **MAAECF:** Mississippi has not aligned these tests to the CCRS. As a member of the DLM alternate assessment consortium, Mississippi plans to implement the new, fully aligned DLM tests in 2014-15.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the CCRS: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the CCRS.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the CCRS:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency 	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math 	The state ELA and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

New York

Statewide Accountability System

Context: New York redesigned its accountability system to align the accountability measures to initiatives in the state's Regents Reform Agenda, which was developed to further the goal of college and career readiness for all students. A cornerstone of the Regents Reform Agenda is the complementary set of initiatives of the Common Core (adopted as New York's Common Core Learning Standards, CCLS), data-driven instruction, and a new teacher and leader effectiveness system. New York's new accountability system, as detailed in its application to waive certain requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind), was approved by the U.S. Department of Education in 2012 and became operational as of 2012-13.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the CCLS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the CCLS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to New York, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain New York's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the CCLS. (For a description of the system in detail, see the state's approved Elementary and Secondary Education Act flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the CCLS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Common Core ELA and math tests
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) in ELA and math (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities)

◆ *High school:*

- Regents Exams in English, Algebra I and II and geometry
- NYSAA

Alignment of these assessments to the CCLS:

- **Common Core ELA and math tests:** In 2012-13, New York began administering these tests, which it reports are fully aligned to the CCLS.
- **Regents Exams:** As of 2013-14, New York reports that the English and Algebra I exams are fully aligned to the CCLS. New York is in the midst of aligning other exams — geometry in 2014-15 and Algebra II in 2015-16. (In 2014-15, districts will have the option of allowing students to take two versions of the geometry exam — one based on the old state standards and one fully aligned to the CCLS — and can choose to use the higher of the two scores for accountability.)

- **Note:** New York is a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium, but it will not adopt the PARCC assessments in 2014-15. New York participated in the PARCC field testing for some students during 2013-14 and is scheduled to do so again in 2014-15. The decision to adopt new assessments for 2015-16 and beyond is yet to be made. Until the New York State Board of Regents establishes a timeline for transition, New York will continue to administer its own fully aligned assessments.
- **NYSAA:** The New York State Education Department reports that as of 2013-14, the NYSAA is fully aligned to the CCLS. As a Tier II member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment consortium, New York will monitor the consortium's work and decide in 2014-15 whether or not to adopt the consortium's new, fully aligned assessment.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the CCLS: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the CCLS.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the CCLS:
1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT)	As of 2013-14, New York reports that the NYSESLAT is partially aligned to the CCLS and will be fully aligned by 2015-16.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state ELA and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

North Carolina

Statewide Accountability System

Context: North Carolina designed its new READY accountability system based on several years' work and multiple influences — a 2008 Blue Ribbon Commission on Testing and Accountability, the state Board of Education's resulting Framework for Change reform plan, the North Carolina Accountability and Curriculum Reform Effort (ACRE), North Carolina's Race to the Top grant under the governor's College & Career Ready, Set, Go! initiative and extensive dialogue among stakeholders across the state. In 2012, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to implement the new accountability system, waiving certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). The READY accountability system was implemented in 2012-13.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the Common Core. (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain North Carolina's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the Common Core. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see North Carolina's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the Common Core through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments (and another related measure) listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- End-of-grade (EOG) assessments in ELA and math
- NCEXTEND1 alternate assessments for grades three through eight, for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities; also the NCEXTEND2 alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards, for grades three through eight (the department discontinued the NCEXTEND2 after 2013-14)

◆ *High school:*

- End-of-course (EOC) assessments in English II and Math I
- NCEXTEND1 alternate assessments for grades 10 and 11, for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are included; also the NCEXTEND2 alternate assessments based on modified academic achievement standards, for English II and Math I (the department discontinued the NCEXTEND2 after 2013-14)
- Student course completion and pass rates in Math I/Integrated Math I courses

Alignment of these measures to the Common Core:

- **EOG and EOC assessments:** North Carolina reports that these assessments are fully aligned as of 2012-13. In January 2014 the board decided to convene an advisory group to evaluate testing options and provide recommendations for 2017-18. In 2014, the North Carolina General Assembly enacted Senate Bill 812, requiring legislative approval for adoption of any assessment instrument to assess student achievement on state academic standards. North Carolina is a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium.
- **NCEXTEND1 and NCEXTEND2:** North Carolina reports that these assessments are fully aligned as of 2012-13. The state is also a member of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment System Consortium and is considering adopting the new, fully aligned DLM assessments which will become available to states in 2014-15.
- **Student course completion and pass rates in Math I/Integrated Math I courses:** These indicators show how well a school is preparing students in the content area of math.

The statewide accountability system includes an additional measure which may provide stakeholders with information about student learning of the Common Core — Graduation Project.

- ◆ *Graduation Project (optional):* This is a high school performance-based assessment that is completed over time. Through the process, students demonstrate various proficiencies including language skills, reading, writing, teamwork, problem-solving, use of technology and employability skills. Projects consist of four components (research paper, product, portfolio and oral presentation). High schools are not penalized if they do not require a graduation project; however, information is reported based on those that do or do not offer this measure.

Alignment of this measure to the Common Core:

- The Graduation Project topic is selected by the student. The project topic does not have to address Common Core content, though the process and components of the project require proficiencies within the content area of ELA/literacy. The projects are built around the premise of preparing students for postsecondary experiences, such as college or career, which is aligned to the Common Core philosophy.

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of college and career readiness.

- ◆ ACT exam for all 11th grade students in the state
- ◆ ACT WorkKeys Test for all 12th grade students completing a career and technical education concentration

Alignment of these assessments to the Common Core:

- **ACT:** ACT reports that its ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core.
- **WorkKeys Test:** Extent of alignment is unknown at this time.

North Carolina (continued)

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law; in North Carolina English learners are referred to as English Language Learners), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the Common Core.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the Common Core:
1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	State assessments in ELA and math	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

North Carolina’s accountability system is a leading effort to hold schools accountable for improving student learning of the state’s new college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core. Accountability measures include the following.

- ◆ English language arts (ELA) and math content-area summative assessments, which the state Department of Public Instruction reports are fully aligned to the new standards
- ◆ An additional measure (optional to districts) that may provide information about the extent to which students are mastering the new standards: Graduation Project
- ◆ College- and career-readiness measures (two exams)
- ◆ Aligned English Language Proficiency assessment used in accountability reporting for federal Title III funds to serve English learners

Pennsylvania

Statewide Accountability System

Context: In 2013, Pennsylvania received approval from the U.S. Department of Education to implement a new accountability system, waiving certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). The new accountability system was designed to build on and support significant reform efforts already underway, including the state's adoption of the Pennsylvania Core Standards (PCS). The new accountability system, instituting the framework of the School Performance Profile, was implemented in 2013-14.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the PCS: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the PCS (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to Pennsylvania, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Pennsylvania's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the PCS. (For a description of the system in detail, see the state's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the PCS through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary, middle grades and high school:*

- Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) in reading, writing and math for grades three through eight
- Keystone exams in Algebra I and literature
- Pennsylvania's Alternate System of Assessment (PASA) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities

Alignment of these assessments to the PCS:

- **PSSA:** Pennsylvania is currently in the process of updating these assessments to fully align to the PCS, for implementation in 2014-15.
- **Keystone Exams:** As of 2012-13, the department reports that the Algebra I and literature exams are fully aligned to the PCS.
- **PASA:** The department is in the process of aligning the PASA tests to the PCS and assessment anchors. Pennsylvania is a member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) and the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) alternate assessment consortia. In 2014-15, Pennsylvania plans to administer the PASA for accountability purposes, with voluntary participation for schools in the NCSC and DLM field tests.

Pennsylvania (continued)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of college and career readiness.

- ◆ SAT/PSAT
- ◆ ACT
- ◆ ACT Plan exam (participation rate)
- ◆ Industry standards-based competency assessments for career and technical education, such as from the National Occupational Competency Testing Institute (NOCTI) and National Institute for Metalworking Skills (NIMS)
- ◆ High schools can also earn points toward their School Performance Profile score if they offer students access to:
 - Advanced Placement (AP) courses
 - International Baccalaureate (IB) courses
 - College courses

Alignment of these measures to the PCS:

- **SAT/PSAT:** While there is no data regarding the alignment of the PCS to the SAT/PSAT, the College Board reports that the SAT and PSAT exams are aligned to the Common Core.
- **ACT:** While there is no data regarding the alignment of the PCS to the ACT, ACT reports that its ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core.
- **Plan:** While there is no data regarding the alignment of the PCS to Plan, ACT reports that its College Readiness Standards, upon which this exam is based, are aligned with the Common Core. ACT is discontinuing the Plan exam, and Pennsylvania administered it for the last time in fall 2014. ACT's Aspire exam will then replace Plan (which ACT reports is also aligned to the Common Core).
- **Industry standards-based competency assessments:** Reports on the alignment of NOCTI tests are in development. Alignment of other industry tests is unknown at this time.
- **AP courses:** While there is no data regarding the alignment of the PCS to AP courses, the College Board reports that student learning in the Common Core prepares students for AP courses, which are designed to represent the requirements of first-year college courses.
- **IB courses:** In two alignment studies it conducted, the IB organization reports that the IB program framework supports implementation of the Common Core, sharing the Common Core's focus on college and career readiness. There is no data regarding the alignment of the PCS to IB courses.
- **College courses:** Offering students access to college courses is designed to further their readiness for college and career.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the PCS: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the PCS.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the PCS:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency 	The ACCESS for ELLs ELP assessment of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium	WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the test received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math 	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

South Carolina

Statewide Accountability System

Context: South Carolina redesigned its state accountability system to prioritize the neediest schools and reduce the duplication and confusion caused by previously having two separate accountability systems (the state’s prior accountability system and the federal Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, determinations). In 2012, the U.S. Department of Education approved South Carolina’s redesigned accountability system as detailed in its application to waive certain requirements under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). The new accountability system became operational in the summer of 2012. This profile describes measures South Carolina currently uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in English language arts (ELA) and math, based on its current college- and career-readiness standards, the Common Core. Measures that South Carolina will use once it develops its new college- and career-readiness standards — for implementation in 2015-16 — are unknown at this time.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of ELA and math, based on its current standards. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state’s accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the Common Core. (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain South

South Carolina (continued)

Carolina's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the Common Core. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see South Carolina's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the Common Core through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS) in ELA, writing and math is included. Additionally, for 2013-14, the state Board of Education and Education Oversight Committee (EOC) approved a pilot in one district to administer ACT's Aspire in ELA and math for grades three through eight in lieu of state assessments. The EOC is allowed to select up to five districts to participate in pilot assessment programs.
- South Carolina Alternate Assessment (SC-Alt) for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities is included.

◆ *High school:*

- High School Assessment Program (HSAP, high school exit exam assesses ELA and math) is included. Additionally, for 2013-14, the board and the EOC approved a pilot in three districts to administer various high school assessments from ACT (Explore, Plan, the ACT, QualityCore end-of-course tests and WorkKeys) in lieu of state assessments.
- End-of-Course Examination Program (EOCEP) in biology and U.S. history is included.
- SC-Alt is included.

Alignment of these assessments to the Common Core:

- **PASS:** In 2013-14, South Carolina partially aligned these tests to the Common Core. The department modified the assessments to more closely measure the learning expectations of the Common Core. South Carolina withdrew from the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium in April 2014. The state currently is conducting a new assessment procurement process to determine which fully aligned assessment best meets the needs of its students.
- **HSAP:** The extent of alignment is unknown at this time.
- **ACT Suite of Assessments:** ACT reports that its College Readiness Benchmarks, upon which the Aspire, Explore, Plan and ACT exams are based, are aligned to the Common Core, and that the ACT exam is aligned to the Common Core. ACT discontinued the Explore and Plan exams in fall 2014. ACT reports that its QualityCore course standards, upon which the end-of-course tests are based, are fully aligned to the Common Core in ELA, math, and literacy standards in history/social studies, science and technical subjects. The extent of alignment of the WorkKeys test to the Common Core is unknown at this time.
- **EOCEP:** The EOCEP in biology and U.S. history are not aligned to the Common Core.

- **SC-Alt:** South Carolina has not aligned these tests to the Common Core. As a member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment consortium, the state administered NCSC field tests in 2013-14, and intends to use the NCSC assessments for federal accountability in 2014-15.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the state’s college- and career-readiness standards.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the Common Core:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency 	<p>2013-14: South Carolina used the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA), developed by states partnering with the Council of Chief State School Officers.</p> <p>2014-15: South Carolina will use the ACCESS for ELLs test of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium.</p> <p>2015-16 and beyond: South Carolina will determine which test it will use, based on its membership in the Assessment Services Supporting ELs through Technology Systems (ASSETS) project, and its membership in the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Consortium.</p>	<p>The ELDA is not aligned to the Common Core.</p> <p>WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs assessment to address the academic language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the assessment received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.</p> <p>ASSETS states are building on the work of the WIDA Consortium to create a next-generation, technology-based ELP assessment system.</p> <p>ELPA21 is developing a next-generation ELP assessment aligned to the Common Core.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math 	<p>State ELA and math tests</p>	<p>See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.</p>

Tennessee

Statewide Accountability System

Context: Tennessee revised its statewide accountability system to waive certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). Tennessee's new accountability system, approved by the U.S. Department of Education in 2012 and implemented in 2012-13, allows the state to pursue its goal of continuous academic improvement using its own accountability goals for schools and districts, rather than the goals previously set by the federal government.

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the Common Core. (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain Tennessee's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the Common Core. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see Tennessee's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the Common Core through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary and middle grades:*

- Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) Achievement Test in reading and math is included.
- TCAP-Alt Portfolio Assessment in reading/language arts for grades three through eight (for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities) is included. The state also used the TCAP-Modified Academic Achievement Standards (TCAP-MAAS) test for students with disabilities, though this test was discontinued after 2013-14.

◆ *High school:*

- TCAP end-of-course (EOC) exams in English II and III and Algebra I and II are included.
- TCAP-Alt Portfolio Assessment in reading/language arts is included.

Alignment of these assessments to the Common Core:

- **TCAP Achievement Test and EOC exams:** As of 2012-13, Tennessee partially aligned the TCAP Achievement Test, and as of 2013-14, Tennessee partially aligned the TCAP EOC exams. The state Department of Education narrowed the tests to reflect only content that is covered in the Common Core. In 2014, Tennessee enacted legislation delaying the transition to any new assessment for one year, and withdrew from the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for

College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium. Tennessee will continue to administer its TCAP Achievement Test and EOC exams in 2014-15, and will use a competitive bidding process to select a fully aligned assessment for 2015-16.

- **TCAP-Alt:** Tennessee has not aligned the TCAP-Alt tests to the Common Core. Tennessee is a member of the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) alternate assessment consortium. The department currently is reviewing the experiences of districts with the NCSC field test and will consider options for future assessments for the students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the Common Core: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the Common Core.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the Common Core:
1. Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) 2. Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency	The English Language Development Assessment (ELDA), developed by states partnering with the Council of Chief State School Officers. Tennessee is a member of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium. Guided by a state English as a Second Language Task Force, Tennessee plans to adopt WIDA’s ACCESS for ELLs test in 2014-15.	The ELDA is not aligned to the Common Core. WIDA designed the ACCESS for ELLs test to measure student mastery of the language skills inherent in the Common Core. In a WIDA alignment study, the assessment received a rating of moderate to strong alignment to the Common Core.
3. Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.

West Virginia

Statewide Accountability System

Context: West Virginia redesigned its accountability system to create a balanced system that includes multiple measures of student achievement and growth. Based on recommendations from the state's Accountability and Accreditation Stakeholders Advisory Committee (which includes members of the state Board of Education, teachers, administrators, district leaders and Regional Education Service Agency staff), the state Department of Education submitted an application to the U.S. Department of Education to waive certain requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, currently known as No Child Left Behind). West Virginia's application was approved in 2013, and the new accountability system became operational in 2013-14. This system supports the state's adoption of its Next Generation Content Standards and Objectives (NxG CSOs).

Statewide Accountability System and Measures of Student Learning of the NxG CSOs: This profile examines the measures the state uses to hold schools accountable for student learning in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and math. In addition, this profile addresses college- and career-readiness measures that provide information about student preparedness for the rigors of postsecondary work, if they are a part of the state's accountability system. The various measures are listed below, followed by what is known about the extent of their alignment to the NxG CSOs (or, in some cases where tests have been acquired from vendors external to West Virginia, alignment to the Common Core). (See the Introduction to State Profiles in the accompanying report on *Timeline and Approach to Standards and Assessments* for more information on how alignment of assessments was determined.) This profile does not seek to explain West Virginia's entire accountability system, which includes many goals, only some of which relate to student learning in the NxG CSOs. (For an overview of the state's entire accountability system, see *SREB States Transform School Accountability with NCLB Waivers* at http://www.sreb.org/page/1648/update_on_nclb_waivers_in_sreb_states.html. For a description of the system in detail, see West Virginia's approved ESEA flexibility request at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.)

The statewide accountability system incorporates measures of student learning of the NxG CSOs through annual targets on the ELA and math content-area summative assessments listed below.

◆ *Elementary, middle grades and high schools:*

- West Virginia Educational Standards Test 2 (WESTEST 2) in reading and math
- Alternate Performance Task Assessment (APTA) for students who have or function as if they have the most significant cognitive disabilities

Alignment of these assessments to the NxG CSOs:

- **WESTEST 2:** West Virginia has not aligned these tests to the NxG CSOs. As a member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, in 2014-15, West Virginia plans to implement the new, fully aligned Smarter Balanced tests in ELA and math for grades three through eight and 11.
- **APTA:** West Virginia has not aligned these tests to the NxG CSOs. As a member of the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment System Consortium, in 2014-15, West Virginia plans to implement the new, fully aligned DLM tests.

Accountability for the Use of Federal Title III Funds to Serve English Learners

Background: States and their subgrantees (usually districts) receive federal Title III funds to serve English learners (called Limited English Proficient students in federal law), and immigrant children and youth. In turn, they are held accountable for meeting three annual targets, or Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Title III Accountability Reporting and Measures of Student Learning of the NxG CSOs: In the table below, the left column lists the three AMAOs, the middle shows the tests used to measure results on each AMAO, and the right notes the extent to which the tests are aligned to the NxG CSOs.

The number or percentage of English learners who meet the AMAO targets:	Assessments the state uses to measure each AMAO:	Alignment of assessments to the NxG CSOs:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Show progress toward English language proficiency (ELP) Attain ELP by “crossing the finish line” to full proficiency 	The state’s West Virginia Test of English Language Learning (WESTELL)	<p>The WESTELL has not been aligned to the NxG CSOs.</p> <p>West Virginia is a member of the English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) consortium, which is developing ELP assessments aligned to the Common Core for implementation in school year 2015-16.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate content-area academic achievement in ELA and math 	The state reading and math tests	See information on the alignment of these assessments in the section above.