### Elementary Secondary Education Act: From NCLB to Every Student Success Act
Potential Opportunities and Empowerment for students and educators

*Information compiled by NCAE using NEA, USDOE and NC DPI resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>No Child Left Behind (NCLB)</th>
<th>ESEA Waivers</th>
<th>Every Student Success Act (ESSA)</th>
<th>Impact on NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Quality</td>
<td>The federal definition of a &quot;Highly Qualified&quot; teacher: one who is fully certified and/or licensed by the state, holds at least a bachelor’s degree from a four-year institution and demonstrates competence in core academic areas. Teacher Assistants in Title I schools must be HQ. Adjusted NCLB under Race to the Top: State educator evaluation systems must include a component measuring teacher impact on student growth. EC teachers not Highly Qualified in subject area (due to not being licensed in specific core subject) in NC had to complete course work take Praxis or team teach with Regular Ed teacher for TOR. To be &quot;highly qualified&quot;, teachers were required to demonstrate competency by meeting the following criteria: Holding a Bachelor’s degree or higher; and Holding full North Carolina State Teaching Certification; and Having a major, or coursework equivalent to a major (24 semester hours), from an accredited four-year college(s) or university in the assigned core content area; or holding an advanced degree in that content area; or holding National Board Certification in that content area; or having passed the PRAXIS II in that content area. Teacher Assistants in Title I schools were give three years to become HQ. NCAE worked with members pursuing HQ through the WorkKeys assessments.</td>
<td>A major improvement over No Child Left Behind’s one-size-fits-all approach to educating students is Every Student Succeeds Act ensures that teachers’ voices are part of decision-making at the federal, state, and local levels. Requires consultation with organizations representing educators in multiple places, ensuring that teachers and their local NEA Affiliate have a say in decision-making: Makes resources available to states that could be used to develop or strengthen teacher induction and mentoring programs. Provides a definition of professional development embedded in research based on standards developed by teachers—for example, Learning Forward’s Standards for Professional Learning. Allows district funds to be used to enhance collaboration and teacher-led professional development aligned with students’ learning needs. Prohibits the federal government from mandating teacher evaluations or defining teacher effectiveness. No Federal mandate to have test scores as part of teacher evaluation. Calls for committees of practitioners where teachers and para educators (with recent classroom experience), parents, and community members can work together to improve their local schools. Teacher Assistants in Title I schools must be highly qualified. Build a pipeline of diverse, fully qualified educators who are available to every student in every zip code, and who are prepared to teach in today’s classrooms.</td>
<td>Possibilities include: Revising the NC Educator Evaluation System; Removing Standard Six and Eight as separate standards and collapsing assessment and growth into standards 1-5 as an artifact. Ramping up the NC Mentor and Induction Support work. Support for PLC work with embedded professional development based on needs of staff. HQ could be gone in 2017-18; and the state determines licensure requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>No Child Left Behind (NCLB)</th>
<th>ESEA Waivers</th>
<th>Every Student Success Act (ESSA)</th>
<th>Impact in NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Accountability Indicators | **Elementary and middle schools:**  
  - test scores and  
  - one indicator selected by the state | Multiple indicators are permitted. | Eliminates the current format of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), the impossible one size fits all goal driving No Child Left Behind’s failed accountability system | Creates pilot programs for state-designed assessment systems that allow for local district assessments and/or innovative methods to assess students. |
| | **High schools:**  
  - test scores  
  - graduation rates | **All waivers end August 1, 2016** | Each state creates own accountability system that must:  
  - annually assess students in grades 3-8 in reading and math  
  - one high school assessment annually  
  - assess science in three different grades (3-12) annually | In NC Proof of Concept formative assessments could be extended beyond current pilot phase. |
| | | Decouple standardized testing from high stakes decisions. High stake decisions will no longer hinge of standardized testing  
  - 8th grade students taking Alg I will not be mandated to take both Alg I and EOG Math  
  - Incorporates the SMART Act to provide funding for states to audit and streamline assessments, and eliminate those that are unnecessary or duplicative  
  - Creates a state pilot program (in seven states initially, then could be available to all) for local assessments driven by teaching and learning, not accountability alone, that could be used in place of the state’s standardized tests  
  - Requires school districts to inform parents and guardians of opt-out policies, and allows them to have their children opt out of statewide standardized tests where state and local policies permit  
  - Allows states to set a cap limiting the amount of time students spend taking annual standardized tests  
  - Data for sub-groups must still be collected  
  - Requires states compare Economically Disadvantage students (ED) to non ED students, and compare Students with Disabilities (SWD) to non-SWD | A major victory and an item NC pushed for was to eliminate the double testing for 8th graders in Math. |
| | | | Some of our state assessment requirements currently exceed federal requirements. |
| | | | Accountability for charter schools must be overseen in accordance to State charter school laws. |
| | | | Current policies in place that could be seen as a conflict with ESSA:  
  - Student growth a part of a future performance pay plan SL 2013-360, Section 9.5  
  - Student growth as 20% of A-F school performance grade formula GS 115C-83.15 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>No Child Left Behind (NCLB)</th>
<th>ESEA Waivers</th>
<th>Every Student Success Act (ESSA)</th>
<th>Impact on NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals for Student Achievement</td>
<td>Federally set goal: calling for 100 percent of all students to reach “proficiency” in math and English language arts by 2014. States had to set annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for demonstrating adequate yearly progress toward the goal of having 100 percent of students reach proficiency.</td>
<td>States must set AMOs that either 1. reduce by half the percentage of students who are not proficient within six years; 2. are set in annual equal increments toward the goal of having 100 percent of students reach “proficiency” by 2020; or 3. are ambitious but achievable and must be approved by the U.S. DOE</td>
<td>States must set long-term student achievement goals with measurements of interim progress. To help ensure resource equity and opportunity for all students, regardless of ZIP code, state-designed accountability systems must include at least one “dashboard” indicator of school success or student support—for example, access to advanced coursework, fine arts, and regular physical education; school climate and safety; discipline policies; bullying prevention; and the availability of counselors or nurses</td>
<td>Today’s middle and high school students have spent their entire K-12 experience under No Child Left Behind Act. Passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) ushers in a new era in public education for students, families, and educators, and closes the chapter on the formerly one size-fits-all approach. ESSA will ensure every student has access to a high quality education, regardless of ZIP code, that will help prepare them for a variety of postsecondary options. NC will need to add to the current NC Report Card/SAS Report Dashboard to include item(s) not related to a test score. SBE is responsible for academic achievement standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for High School Graduation Rates</td>
<td>States must set a long-term high school graduation rate goal and annual targets for meeting that long-term goal that are “continuous and substantial” (as defined in federal regulation).</td>
<td>No change in policy</td>
<td>States must set a long-term goal for the four-year high school graduation rate with measurements of interim progress. States may set goals for extended-year high school graduation rates, but those goals must be higher than the four-year graduation rate goal. All high school students must be college/career ready upon graduation.</td>
<td>NC has a 5-year cohort graduation for some specific schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools Identified for Comprehensive Reform Based on Performance of All Students</td>
<td>No such requirement.</td>
<td>States must classify the lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools as “priority” schools. States must classify Title I high schools with a graduation rate below 60 percent as “priority” or “focus” schools.</td>
<td>States must identify the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools for comprehensive support. □ States must identify all high schools with a graduation rate at or below 67 percent for comprehensive support. □ Identify these LPS at least once every three years. □ Use a comprehensive assessment tool to assist in identifying issues</td>
<td>NC has a plan in place already to support the lowest-performing schools. District-transformation Teams and Assessment Tools to support reorganization if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Area</td>
<td>No Child Left Behind (NCLB)</td>
<td>ESEA Waivers</td>
<td>Every Student Success Act (ESSA)</td>
<td>Impact on NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools Identified for Targeted Reform Based on Performance of Subgroups of Students</strong></td>
<td>Any school that misses a performance target for any subgroup for two or more consecutive years is identified for improvement.</td>
<td>States must classify 10 percent of Title I schools with the largest achievement gaps as “focus” schools.</td>
<td>Any school with a subgroup of students that is consistently underperforming based on all indicators in state accountability system is identified by the state for targeted intervention and support. States must identify these schools annually. Schools have 4-years to improve rigor</td>
<td>ELL is supported with Title I now instead of Title II funds. Weighted funding options for At-risk, Rural, and ELL. State A–F rating will continue and could become part of the index indicator for schools along with other data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention and Support for Struggling Schools</strong></td>
<td>Interventions escalate based on the number of years a school is identified for improvement. Interventions include: - public school choice, - supplemental educational services, - corrective action, and - restructuring.</td>
<td>Priority schools must implement comprehensive interventions that incorporate seven turnaround principles: 1. strong leadership, 2. effective teaching, 3. redesigning school time, 4. strengthening instructional program, 5. using data to strengthen instruction, 6. strengthening school climate, and 7. family and community engagement. Focus schools must implement interventions determined by the school district.</td>
<td>Two categories of interventions and support: comprehensive and targeted. The following schools must implement comprehensive, locally-determined, evidence-based interventions:  - lowest-performing 5 percent of Title I schools;  - high schools with graduation rates at or below 67 percent; and  - schools with a subgroup performing at the level of the lowest-performing 5 percent of all Title I–receiving schools, based on the state accountability system, that do not improve within a state-set period of time. In addition, districts may allow students in these schools to transfer to other public schools in the district. Schools with a low-performing subgroup must implement evidence-based, locally-determined targeted intervention. A school with a subgroup performing at the level of the lowest-performing 5 percent of all Title I–receiving schools, based on the state accountability system, also must identify resource inequities to address through the implementation of its improvement plan. Schools have 4-years to improve rigor</td>
<td>One size does not fit all. State Transformation Department will replicate some work done with priority schools under NCLB and RT3. Pending policy to provide LEAs with low-performing schools some flexibility similar to charter schools. Flexibility such as: - Longer school year - Longer school day - Different curriculum - Restart for staff State policy could have higher or different benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Improvement Funding</strong></td>
<td>A separate federal funding stream is authorized for school improvement. States are required to implement specific intervention models to receive funding.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>States must use 7 percent of their Title I allocations for school improvement activities. States may use 3 percent of their Title I allocations for “direct student services,” including Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and other advanced coursework; career and technical education that leads to an industry-recognized credential; credit recovery; and personalized learning. Continues “maintenance of effort” requirements to ensure that federal funds are not used to reduce state and local funds.</td>
<td>NC currently covers cost of AP exams for all students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
local investments in education.

**Does NOT include Title I “portability”—**a misguided approach that would dilute the impact of Title I, harm students attending Title I schools, and do nothing to address the real issue: providing adequate funding to help the students most in need succeed.

Pilot program for weighted student-funding programs. [ELL, economically disadvantaged, high-poverty schools]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Assessment Opt-Out</th>
<th>States must assess 95 percent of all students</th>
<th>States must assess 95 percent of all students</th>
<th>States must assess 95 percent of all students</th>
<th>Students still counted, must track data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td>Schools must meet increasingly rigorous targets each year or implement interventions that escalate annually.</td>
<td>Priority schools must implement interventions for at least three years; states set criteria to enable schools to exit priority status.</td>
<td>Schools implementing <em>comprehensive</em> interventions have four years to meet state-set criteria allowing them to exit the <em>comprehensive</em> interventions status.</td>
<td><strong>Transition year for implementing ESSA is 2016-17 and the first full year is 2017-18.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>States must identify focus schools annually and set criteria to enable schools to exit focus status.</td>
<td>States must identify focus schools annually and set criteria to enable schools to exit focus status.</td>
<td>States must identify focus schools annually and set criteria to enable schools to exit focus status.</td>
<td>States must identify focus schools annually and set criteria to enable schools to exit focus status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students still counted, must track data</td>
<td>Students still counted, must track data</td>
<td>Students still counted, must track data</td>
<td>Students still counted, must track data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition year for implementing ESSA is 2016-17 and the first full year is 2017-18.**