Above and Beyond:
How SREB States Prioritize College and Career Readiness in ESSA Accountability Plans
This presentation provides a regional perspective on the five ways SREB states prioritize readiness in their accountability systems. SREB based this presentation on an analysis of the state ESSA plans approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

The presentation is best read in conjunction with a companion set of state profiles. Each profile describes the state’s accountability system under ESSA:

- How the system addresses college and career readiness
- Long-term state goals
- Indicators of school performance
- System for differentiating and reporting on school performance
- Supports for struggling schools
Above & beyond readiness

SREB has placed a high priority on college and career readiness as a goal for students upon high school graduation. Students need to be ready for their chosen path after high school, whether it is college, technical education, the military or the workforce.

If K-12 schools align their policies and programs to the goal of readiness for all, more students will be ready for freshman courses and able to complete postsecondary education. More students will be successful in their first jobs and throughout their careers.

The newest reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), addresses some elements of this readiness priority, but does not require a comprehensive approach within state accountability systems.

Many SREB states went above and beyond the basic requirements for school accountability systems in ESSA, using the flexibility in the law to prioritize college and career readiness in five ways.
How do states prioritize readiness within their ESSA plans?

In their ESSA plans approved by the U.S. Department of Education, SREB states prioritize readiness in five ways:

1. **GOALS**
   - Set goals to establish a long-term focus on college and career readiness.

2. **INDICATORS**
   - Shape indicators of school performance to track progress toward readiness year to year.

3. **WEIGHTS**
   - Assign weights to indicators to prioritize readiness.

4. **DATA**
   - Include data on student groups in determinations of school ratings, to spotlight readiness for each student.

5. **SUPPORT SYSTEMS**
   - Establish support systems for struggling schools and districts to focus on readiness for all students.
1. Goals

ESSA requires states to establish long-term, statewide goals for academic achievement in English language arts (ELA) and math, high school graduation rates, and English language proficiency.

Five states exceeded ESSA’s goals requirement.

In addition to the required goals, these five states established goals for college and career readiness.

States to Watch
Alabama, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas went beyond ESSA’s requirements and established goals for college and career readiness in their plans.

The next slide shows the readiness goals set by these five states.
Goals

Alabama
• By 2030, 94% of high school graduates will be identified as college and career ready, by meeting at least one college- or career-readiness milestone.

Oklahoma
• By 2025, the state’s postsecondary remediation rate in math and English language arts will decline by 50%.
• By 2025, 100% of students in grades six through 12 will develop an Individual Career Academic Plan.

South Carolina
• By 2035, 90% of students will graduate college, career, and citizenship ready, as outlined by South Carolina.
• Between 2020 and 2035, the percentage of high school students graduating ready to enter postsecondary education without the need for remediation in English language arts or math will increase annually by 5%.

Tennessee
• By 2020, the state’s average ACT composite score will be 21.
• By 2020, the majority of high school graduates will earn a postsecondary certificate, diploma or degree.

Texas
• By 2030, 60% of Texans, ages 25 to 34, will have a postsecondary credential.
2. Indicators

ESSA requires states to establish five types of indicators of school performance to measure progress year to year.

1. Academic achievement on state assessments of ELA and math
2. Progress toward English language proficiency for English learners
3. School quality or student success
4. Another academic indicator, such as student growth, for elementary and middle grades schools
5. Graduation rate indicator for high schools

States can track readiness indicators along the education continuum:

A. Progress towards readiness at graduation
B. Demonstrated readiness at graduation
C. Transitions to postsecondary education and employment after graduation

Fifteen states include at least one type of readiness measure in their school performance indicators.

Four states stand out for including measures to track readiness throughout the education continuum:
Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland and Texas.
Fourteen states shaped at least one required indicator to include at least one measure of readiness.

Fourteen states shaped their *school quality or student success indicator* to include measures of readiness.

- All fourteen include a measure for high schools.
- Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana and Maryland also include a measure for elementary and middle grades schools.

Ten of these states also shaped their *academic achievement indicators* to include readiness measures.

- Alabama, Delaware, Oklahoma and Tennessee use results on the ACT or SAT exam for high schools.
- Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia established college- and career-readiness performance levels on their content area assessments.

Two states developed a unique indicator to track readiness.

- Florida created an acceleration indicator for middle grades schools and high schools.
- Maryland created an indicator for high school called Readiness for Postsecondary Success.
Indicators

A. Progress toward readiness at graduation – 13 states

- Rigorous coursework, including participation or credit earned in advanced courses or career pathways
- Attainment of college- and career-readiness performance levels on the state ELA and math assessments
- Co-curricular experiences such as work-based or service learning, internships and apprenticeships
- Earning high school credits at a pace to allow on-time graduation
- Access to a well-rounded curriculum, beyond ELA and math
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## Indicators

### B. Demonstrated readiness at graduation – 15 states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earning benchmark scores on exams for advanced school courses and college entrance, e.g., AP and IB, ACT and SAT</td>
<td>Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning degree or postsecondary credit while still in high school</td>
<td>Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earning benchmark scores on exams for career readiness, e.g., WorkKeys and ASVAB</td>
<td>Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing industry certification program or earning industry-recognized credentials while still in high school</td>
<td>Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Maryland, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting entry requirements for state university or demonstrating readiness for credit-bearing coursework without remediation</td>
<td>Maryland, Texas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators

C. Transitions from high school to postsecondary education and careers – 5 states

- Enrollment in postsecondary education without remediation
  - Georgia
  - Texas

- Attainment of associate degree
  - Louisiana
  - Texas

- Enlistment in the military
  - Alabama
  - Texas

- Gainful employment
  - Maryland
3. Weights

ESSA gives states flexibility to assign relative values, or weights, to their indicators to differentiate school performance. The relative weight given to indicators, including those measuring college and career readiness, signals their importance to the states.

Schools that serve elementary and middle grades:
Ten states include indicators with readiness measures. These indicators (one or multiple, combined) contribute between 11 and 90 percent of the total weight to the school ratings in Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia.

High schools:
Nine states assign the most weight to indicators that include readiness measures. These indicators (one or multiple, combined) contribute between 58 and 80 percent of the total weight to the school ratings in Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia.

States to Watch
Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia assign the most weight to their indicators of high school performance that include measures of readiness.
Example: Maryland high school indicator weights

Weights

10% Graduation rate
30% Academic achievement
35% School quality or student success
10% Readiness for postsecondary success
15% English language proficiency progress

Indicators that account for 75% of the weight in high school accountability ratings include measures of readiness.

How do states prioritize readiness within their ESSA plans?

Click here to learn about the measures in each indicator in Maryland’s profile.
Weights

Percent of weight for state indicators that measure college and career readiness, high school

Where policy meets practice

Note: North Carolina is omitted because it combines indicators such that weights for some could not be determined.
4. Data

ESSA requires states to differentiate the performance of all schools annually. States must publicly identify, or rate, only struggling schools—those needing comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) or targeted support and improvement (TSI).

For these required ratings, TSI must be based on performance data for student groups (economically disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, English learners, and students from major racial and ethnic groups).

Thirteen states exceeded ESSA’s school ratings requirement. These states will publicly assign all schools an overall rating, for example an A through F letter grade. Nine of these states will base the rating on data from all students as a whole.

Five of these states—Georgia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee and Texas—will include performance data from each student group in determining the overall school ratings. They do this by including student group performance in the calculation of the academic achievement indicator, having a dedicated achievement gap indicator or lowering the ratings of schools with poor student group performance.

Including data from each student group in overall school ratings pushes stakeholders to consider every student’s needs as they work to improve their school.
5. Support systems

State plans

All states’ ESSA plans list several types of support for districts, such as resource allocation reviews and liaisons to help with data analysis, needs assessment, planning and curriculum vetting. Louisiana’s plan provides the most detail about support for districts.

Eight SREB states plan to provide schools with services, including help with needs assessment, selecting interventions, progress monitoring, professional learning and on-site coaches. Tennessee’s plan provides the most detail about state support for struggling schools.


ESSA requires that states must support districts that have significant numbers or percentages of CSI and TSI schools.

ESSA requires states to begin reporting by December, 2018 which schools they identify as in need of support.

ESSA does not require states to provide services directly to schools, unless the schools remain in a CSI status for an extended period of time.

How do states prioritize readiness within their ESSA plans?

GOALS INDICATORS WEIGHTS DATA SUPPORT SYSTEMS

States to Watch
Louisiana and South Carolina began to identify struggling schools in 2017-18 – ahead of other states and before ESSA required.

The next slide addresses challenges states face in taking plans into action.
Support systems

Moving from plan to action

Most state ESSA plans provide general lists of supports for schools and districts. In implementing their plans, state leaders who have committed their states to college and career readiness will need to ensure that everyone from the state to the local level focuses on helping every child progress on the indicators of readiness in the state’s accountability system.

This task will be challenging, as in many states the readiness measures in school accountability indicators are new.

Other challenges in the state’s work to serve struggling districts and school include:

- How many schools and districts are identified for support
- How many staff members the state education agency can dedicate to working directly with districts and schools
- The capacity of partners such as regional centers
- Budgets and other available resources
What’s next for state leaders?

Engaging stakeholders

ESSA requires states to involve stakeholders in the development of their accountability plans. Stakeholders include the governor, members of the state legislature, the state board of education, districts, educators, school leaders, parents and community leaders.

States involved stakeholders in a variety of ways, from statewide meetings to local gatherings to online surveys.

As the new state accountability systems take effect, state leaders should continue to engage stakeholders. Continuing engagement will help state leaders ensure that their accountability systems support the efforts of all schools to meet state goals and help each student prepare for success after high school.

State to Watch

In Tennessee, the SEA launched the Education Research Alliance guided by Vanderbilt University faculty. SEA leaders, an advisory committee of stakeholders and the Alliance will suggest ideas and track state efforts to continuously improve implementation of the state ESSA plan and the state education agency’s strategic plan.

The next slide details three ways state leaders can engage stakeholders.
What’s next for state leaders?

Engaging stakeholders

State leaders can strengthen implementation of ESSA accountability by engaging stakeholders.

Report cards
Gather insights and suggestions from stakeholders to inform the design of school, district and state report cards that provide clear, accessible and actionable information for educators, parents and communities.

School improvement efforts
Involve stakeholders in school improvement so that efforts address the experiences, strengths and needs of each student.

Focus state and local leaders
Consider stakeholder feedback on how the new accountability system is working to help improve each child’s achievement, ensuring that state leaders remain responsive to the needs of all students, families and educators.
What’s next for state leaders?

Continuous improvement of accountability systems for college and career readiness

States can make their accountability systems dynamic drivers of change by **studying how their systems are working**. Data on the state’s own efforts to implement the accountability system, together with data on school and district performance and local improvement efforts, can help state leaders understand how well the accountability system is working to improve local education systems.

Armed with this information, states can **adjust their accountability systems** so they better support educators and families in preparing students for success after high school.

ESSA allows states to modify their plans annually.

**States to Watch**
- **Adding measures**: Louisiana’s and Maryland’s plans call for adding specific new measures in the next two years. Other states’ plans mention possible new measures in the coming years.
- **Refining measures and adjusting targets**: All states can refine their measures and adjust their interim targets when needed, to make their systems work better for each student in every school.

The next slide details how states can continuously improve their systems.
What’s next for state leaders?

Continuous improvement of accountability systems for college and career readiness

States might make these updates:

Add or refine indicators
Some states’ ESSA plans, for example Louisiana and Maryland, describe indicators that the states still need to finish developing. States may also decide to add new readiness measures to more fully address all three types of readiness expectations (see slides 8-10).

Refine policies
States could refine measures or policies to help students get the most value out of meeting state readiness expectations. For example, a state may modify their indicators to recognize only technical credentials earned in high-demand industries. Or states may align policies so credits that count toward a school accountability indicator (e.g., dual enrollment) may be transferred to any public postsecondary institution in the state.

Adjust targets
States may decide to change interim school performance targets for readiness measures based on data from early years of implementation. Especially for new readiness measures, states will need to pay attention to progress and adjust so the targets are aggressive and well-paced but also reasonable.
### Measures of College and Career Readiness Within Indicators of School Performance

*Measures listed on slides 8-10, according to whether they establish expectations for college or career readiness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Progress toward readiness at graduation</th>
<th>Demonstrated readiness</th>
<th>Successful transition after graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College ready</td>
<td>Career ready</td>
<td>College ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Weights of indicators

**Percent weight or points of total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School level¹</th>
<th>Academic achievement</th>
<th>Other academic achievement</th>
<th>ELP²</th>
<th>Graduation rate</th>
<th>SQSS³</th>
<th>Additional indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>200 of 700 points</td>
<td>400 of 700 points</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 of 700 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>200 of 900 points</td>
<td>400 of 900 points</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200 of 900 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>200 of 1,000 points</td>
<td>400 of 1,000 points</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 of 1,000 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>25 of 135 points</td>
<td>48 of 135 points</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62 of 135 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>40 of 150 points</td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95 of 150 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1 E: elementary grades, M: middle grades, H: high school.
2 ELP: English Language Proficiency.
3 SQSS: School Quality and Student Success.
* This indicator is combined with another academic one.
** This indicator is not weighted.
*** This indicator is combined with SQSS.

As of August 2018, Florida’s ESSA plan had not been approved. Information on Florida in this presentation is based on analysis of the plan Florida submitted to the US ED on April 20, 2018.
### Weights of indicators

**Percent weight or points of total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>School level¹</th>
<th>Academic achievement</th>
<th>Other academic achievement</th>
<th>ELP²</th>
<th>Graduation rate</th>
<th>SQSS³</th>
<th>Additional indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>190 of 700 points</td>
<td>380 of 700 points</td>
<td>35 of 700 points</td>
<td>95 of 700 points</td>
<td>190 of 1,000 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>190 of 1,000 points</td>
<td>380 of 1,000 points</td>
<td>50 of 1,000 points</td>
<td>190 of 1,000 points</td>
<td>190 of 1,000 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>NA⁴</td>
<td>NA⁴</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>35 of 90 points</td>
<td>30 of 90 points</td>
<td>15 of 90 points</td>
<td>10 of 90 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>45 of 90 points</td>
<td>15 of 90 points</td>
<td>10 of 90 points</td>
<td>20 of 90 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>E/M</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

2. ELP: English Language Proficiency.
3. SQSS: School Quality and Student Success.
4. NA: not available. North Carolina combines indicators such that weights for some indicators cannot be determined.

*This indicator is combined with another academic one.

Virginia is not listed in this table, as it does not assign weight to its indicators.
To develop this presentation, SREB’s benchmarking readiness project staff reviewed state ESSA plans approved by the U.S. Department of Education (US ED) as of August 27, 2018: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia.

Staff also reviewed the plan that Florida submitted to the US ED on April 20, 2018. As of August 27, 2018, the plan had not been approved by the US ED.

Staff used structured protocols to gather consistent information from all the state plans.

Information in this presentation complements that in the state profiles that SREB’s benchmarking readiness project staff developed. To ensure the accuracy of the profiles, staff consulted representatives in the state education agencies. Fourteen state education agencies sent feedback.

Policymakers, state education agencies, district and school leaders, and others can use this presentation and the state profiles to understand state accountability systems and priorities for college and career readiness. This information can inform efforts to continually improve state policy, local practice and student outcomes.

Click here to read the profiles!