Technical Assistance Brief: Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and English Language Proficiency

Considerations for Including English Language Proficiency Indicators in State Accountability Systems

Prepared for Pennsylvania Department of Education and the Pennsylvania ESSA Accountability Work Group

Prepared by: Becky Smerdon, Kellie Kim, and Augustus Mays

About the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center:
The Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center at WestEd (MACC@WestEd) helps state leaders with their initiatives to implement, support, scale up, and sustain statewide education reforms. We work closely with state leaders in the Mid-Atlantic region of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. To learn more about MACC@WestEd visit macc-atwested.org or to learn about the technical assistance network funded by the U.S. Department of Education, visit www.ed.gov.

Copyright © 2016 WestEd All rights reserved.

Disclaimer Language
The contents of this report were developed under a cooperative agreement under prime award #S283B120026 between the U.S. Department of Education and WestEd. The findings and opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. Readers of this report should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Table of Contents

I. Purpose 4

II. Targeted ESSA Policy Overview 6

Requirements for English Language Proficiency Standards..... 6

English Language Proficiency Goals and Annual Indicators 6

Weighting of Performance Indicators 7

III. Review of Accountability Systems in Select States..... 8

States vary in their stages of implementing the systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support..... 8

States included various English language proficiency indicators in their accountability systems. 8

Weighting of the English language proficiency indicators in the state accountability systems vary among these states. 9

IV. Pennsylvania's English Language Proficiency Testing.....10

V. Key Considerations for States 13

References 14

Appendix.....15

Endnotes 20

List of Tables

Table 1. Pennsylvania's AMAO Definitions and Targets 15

Table 2. Pennsylvania's Criteria for Student Exit from an Engligh Language Instructional Program.....11

I. Purpose

With the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) designed a stakeholder engagement process that relies on participation from a group of diverse thought leaders and practitioners to inform its state plan (PDE, 2016a). These stakeholders have been divided into four workgroups: Assessment, Accountability, Educator Certification, and Educator Evaluation. In June 2016, PDE requested that the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center at WestEd (MACC@WestEd) provide a brief summarizing states' use of English language proficiency indicator(s) for English learners in their state accountability systems to inform the discussions of the ESSA Accountability Work Group.

One major change to Title I under ESSA is the required inclusion of an indicator of "Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency" for English learners in a state's accountability system. State accountability systems are required to include long-term goals and interim measures of the percentage of English learners making progress toward English language proficiency, as defined by the state and as measured on the state's English language proficiency assessments, within a state-determined timeline (Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), 2016; ESSA §1111(c)(4)(A)(ii)); Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 2016).

In May 2016, the Center for American Progress (CAP) published a report on statewide accountability systems in 50 states and the District of Columbia (Martin, Sargrad & Batel, 2016). The authors summarized seven categories of indicators used in state accountability systems, including English language acquisition indicators.[11] The report identifies six states that currently include English language proficiency in their state accountability systems:

- Arizona
- Colorado
- Georgia
- Illinois
- Massachusetts
- Texas

This brief summarizes how these six states use English language proficiency in their state accountability systems (e.g., indicators, weights) for considerations by the PDE ESSA Accountability Work Group as they discuss potentially incorporating English language proficiency indicators into Pennsylvania's state accountability system. The MACC@WestEd conducted a review of each of the six state education agencies' websites, relevant state and federal documents, and webinars/presentations by the state education agencies on this topic.

This brief is divided into four sections:

- The **Targeted ESSA Policy Overview** section briefly describes ESSA provisions on English language proficiency standards and English proficiency goals and annual indicators.

[1] Other indicator categories included achievement, student growth, early warning, persistence, college- and career-ready, and "other" indicators (Martin et al., 2016).

- The **Review of Accountability Systems in Select States** section briefly describes how the six states identified in the CAP report currently incorporate English language proficiency indicators into their state accountability systems.

- The **Pennsylvania English Language Proficiency Testing** section provides a summary of Pennsylvania's current state assessment of English language proficiency.

- **Key Considerations for States** identifies questions states may wish to address as they develop their state plans.

References and a table summarizing the six states' accountability systems as they relate to English language proficiency are provided at the end of this document.

II. Targeted ESSA Policy Overview

Although ESSA addresses responsibilities at the state and local levels related to English learners and/or accountability in numerous places, this section briefly describes two specific ESSA provisions relating to the requirements for English language proficiency standards and English language proficiency goals and annual indicators.

Requirements for English Language Proficiency Standards[2]

Under ESSA, states must demonstrate in their Title I plans that they have adopted English language proficiency standards that:

- Are derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing;
- Address the different proficiency levels of English learners; and
- Are aligned with the challenging state's academic standards.

These rules largely reflect existing Title III requirements under No Child Left Behind, although ESSA now requires that states' English language proficiency standards address the different proficiency levels of English learners. (Under No Child Left Behind, states could previously establish a single definition of "proficiency" rather than defining multiple proficiency levels.)

ESSA specifies that the content of the standards is set entirely by individual states and the U.S. Department of Education cannot require states submit their standards for any reason and prohibits the U.S. Secretary of Education from exercising any direction or control over a state's standards.

English Language Proficiency Goals and Annual Indicators[3]

No Child Left Behind did not require inclusion of an English language proficiency indicator as part of accountability requirements under Title I (Adequate Yearly Progress, or AYP). Instead, Title III had its own accountability system under which states held Title III-funded local education agencies (LEAs, district level) accountable for reaching three "annual measurable achievement objectives" (AMAOs), one of which was achieving annual increases in the number or percentage of English learners making progress (AMAO 1), and another achieving annual increases in the number or percentage of English learners attaining English proficiency (AMAO 2).

Under ESSA, states must now develop accountability systems that include long-term goals and interim benchmarks for increases in the percentage of English learners who make progress in achieving English language proficiency, as defined by the state and as measured by the state's English language proficiency assessments, within a state-determined timeline (CCSSO, 2016; ESSA §1111(c)(4)(B)(iv)). In addition, the state's system of accountability indicators must include a measure of the extent to which all English learners in the state are

[2] ESEA as amended by ESSA§ 1111 (State Plans) (b)(1)(F).
[3] ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii) and (B)(iv).

making progress in achieving English language proficiency. Progress toward proficiency would be as defined by the state and as measured by the state's English language proficiency assessments, within a state-determined timeline, in each of grades 3-8 and in the high school grade in which the state administers assessments in reading or language arts and math. The high school English language proficiency assessment data for a student must be measured against the student's results for the previous year (CCSSO, 2016; ESSA §1111(c)(4)(B)(iv)(II)).

Weighting of Performance Indicators[4]

ESSA requires that state accountability systems include indicators of all of the following:

- Student proficiency on state assessments and, at state option, student academic growth as demonstrated on those assessments

- For schools that are not high schools, student academic growth or another valid and reliable academic indicator

- For high schools, the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and, at state option, an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- As described above, the progress of English learners in achieving English language proficiency (as measured using the state's English language proficiency assessment)

- At least one indicator of "school quality or student success" that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance and is a valid, reliable, comparable and statewide indicator. Examples listed in the statute include measures of student engagement, educator engagement, student access to and completion of advanced coursework, postsecondary readiness, and school climate and safety (CCSSO, 2016)

With the exception of the indicator on English language proficiency, all of the indicators must be measured separately for all students in a school and for each student subgroup. The law further specifies that a state's system for measuring school performance must give "substantial weight" to each indicator and also that the indicators listed in (1) through (4) above must have "much greater weight" than the school quality or student success indicators described in (5).

[4] ESSA§ 1111 (c)[statewide accountability system](4)(C)

III. Review of Accountability Systems in Select States[5]

To gather information about the six states that the CAP report (Martin, Sargrad & Batel, 2016) identified as including English language proficiency in their state accountability systems, we examined publicly available documents including their Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) flexibility waivers and state education agency websites. If information from these primary sources was unclear, the authors contacted state agencies for clarification.

Four categories related to English language proficiency in the contexts of state accountability systems were identified:

1. Current status of state accountability systems;
2. Use of English language proficiency indicator(s) in the current accountability systems;
3. Measures of English language proficiency; and
4. Weighting of the English language proficiency indicator(s).

These six states vary in the extent to which they have implemented the accountability plans they proposed under their ESEA flexibility waivers. This section summarizes the approaches/plans being implemented or proposed by the six states—Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Texas—based on information gathered from the aforementioned sources. A detailed state-by-state comparison chart is presented in the Appendix.

States vary in their stages of implementing the systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support.

All six states proposed designing and implementing state accountability systems that align federal and state requirements in their ESEA flexibility proposals. Massachusetts has implemented an accountability system that integrated federal requirements and the state accountability system starting in 2012-13. Georgia implemented the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI), its statewide accountability system, in 2012, under Georgia's ESEA flexibility waiver as a replacement for NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress (GaDOE, n.d.). The remaining four states are in the process of transitioning to new accountability systems and engaging stakeholders in the process as required in ESSA.

States included various English language proficiency indicators in their accountability systems.

As the CAP report (2016) indicated, our review of the six states showed that they incorporated or have a plan to incorporate measures of English language proficiency, growth, or attainment in their state accountability systems.

[5] States may not post all relevant documents on their websites, especially states that are designing new systems. And since many states are in the process of engaging stakeholders to gather their input to develop new plans to meet provisions and requirements under ESSA, changes may take place as they refine the proposed plans in the documents the authors have reviewed.

- Arizona includes an English learner reclassification rate that accounts for the percentage of English learners attaining the performance standard for fluent English proficient on the state's English language proficiency assessment, the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA).

- Three of the six states - Colorado, Georgia, and Massachusetts - use ACCESS for ELLs[6] as the measure of English language proficiency (based on the WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) English Language Development standards); Illinois has proposed using the same measure.

    - Colorado uses median and adequate growth percentiles to calculate their English language proficiency indicator.

    - Georgia uses percent of English learners with positive movement from one Performance Band to a higher Performance Band.

    - Massachusetts creates an English language proficiency indicator using Student Growth Percentiles (SPG).

    - Illinois has proposed to develop an English language proficiency indicator using percentage of students making progress (0.5 increase or greater in English language proficiency level or attaining the maximum score of 6.0).

- Texas creates the English Learner Progress Measure, which is a combination of Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) and State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) to measure the progress of English learners (annual academic progress goals are set for English learners depending on their English language proficiency level, years in country, and level of prior formal schooling).[7]

Weighting of the English language proficiency indicators in the state accountability systems vary among these states.

Three states weight the English language proficiency indicator in their accountability systems:

- In Colorado, the English language proficiency indicator comprises 14.3 percent of the Growth Indicator, one of the four performance indicators in the state's accountability system.

- Georgia and Massachusetts schools can receive bonus/extra points related to English language proficiency progress and attainment.

Like Pennsylvania, all six states are reexamining their accountability plans following the passage of ESSA.

[6] Assessing Communication and Comprehension in English State-to-State for English Language Learners

[7] It's important to note that Texas' system is about English learners' academic progress and attainment. It implicitly specifies English language proficiency progress, but does so in order to establish a "lookup table" of expected academic progress based on English learners' proficiency level and time, with a one-year extension possible for students with interrupted formal education.

IV. Pennsylvania's English Language Proficiency Testing

In Pennsylvania's schools, there are more than 47,000 English learners speaking 229 different languages.[8] English language proficiency is not currently a component of Pennsylvania's state Title I accountability system as described in the state's ESEA flexibility waiver (PDE, 2015a). LEAs that wish to apply for Title III supplemental program funding are required to meet Title III English language proficiency accountability performance targets called Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). This section provides a summary of Pennsylvania's current measurement of English language proficiency and AMAOs.

Pennsylvania is a member of the World Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium (WIDA) Consortium and uses the Assessing Communication and Comprehension in English State- to-State for English Language Learners (ACCESS for ELLs, or ACCESS)[9] assessment as its required instrument for annual assessment of English language proficiency. Pennsylvania's Title III AMAOs are presented in Table 1:

Table 1. Pennsylvania's AMAO Definitions and Targets

AMAO Definition and Student Target	LEA's AMAO Target
AMAO1 Annual increase in the number or percentage of children *making progress* toward English proficiency. Students are expected to make a composite score gain of 0.6 or greater on *ACCESS*.	**2013-2014: 61%** **2014-2015: 64%** **2015-2016: 67% (final target)**
AMAO2 Annual increase in the number or percentage of children *attaining* English proficiency. Students in grades K through 12 are expected to attain a composite score or 4.5 or higher.	**2013-2014: 26%** **2014-2015: 28%** **2015-2016: 30%(final target)**

Note. Confidence intervals are applied to AMAO targets.
Source. PDE (2013), slides 27-30.

[8] See PDE website.
[9] The WIDA Consortium developed the ACCESS for ELLs assessment. ACCESS for ELLs assesses social and instructional English as well as the language associated with language arts, mathematics, science and social studies within the school context across the four language domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing (see WIDA's website).

All LEAs must include required exit criteria to provide "valid and reliable evidence of a student's English Language Proficiency" to exit from an English Language Instructional Program. To meet the state's exit criteria, LEAs must ensure students meet (a) two required exit criteria and (b) one additional exit criteria, as described in Table 2, below:

Table 2. Pennsylvania's Criteria for Student Exit from an English Language Instructional Program

Two Required Criteria
Required Criteria #1 Composite score of 5.0 on an *ACCESS Kindergarten* assessment OR Composite score of 5.0 on a Tier C *ACCESS* assessment Score cut-off flexibility is available in special circumstances, as follows: • The ACCESS assessment is administered in January, but a student may just miss the ACCESS cut off score at that time. If a student scores close to but below the 5.0 score in January, he or she may take the *WIDA ACCESS Placement Test* (W-APT) assessment between June and September and qualify for exit based on W-APT performance. ACCESS cut-off score flexibility is not allowable for Kindergarteners. OR • A score of proficient on the annual Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) in English Language Arts or on the Keystone Literature assessment can be used along with Required Criteria #2 to justify exit for students who achieve a composite ACCESS score between 4.5 and 4.9 on the January administration of ACCESS. In this case, W-APT scores are not necessary to demonstrate progress from the time of ACCESS administration to the end of the school year.
Required Criteria #2 Score Basic on the PSSA Math or Algebra I Keystone AND Score Basic on the English Language Arts PSSA or Literature Keystone[10] Score cut-off flexibility is available in special circumstances, as follows: • For students that (a) Were administered a PSSA Math and/or PSSA English Language Arts assessment in school year 2014-15, and did not score Basic or higher, OR (b) are in a grade not assessed with a PSSA or Keystone assessment, OR (c) were opted out of participation in a PSSA or Keystone assessment due to a religious objection or conflict. Each of the remaining exit criteria must be met to exit: Required Criteria #1 AND Additional Criteria #1 AND Additional Criteria #2. • For students transferring from other states, the academic achievement results used for accountability in those states may be considered when the academic proficiency level is comparable to Basic on the PSSA/Keystone assessments.

[10] If the new proposed federal regulations are adopted as proposed, the use of statewide academic assessments will be disallowed in a determination of English language proficiency under Title I, ESSA.

Two Additional Criteria
Additional Criteria #1 Final grades of C or better in core subject areas (mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies)[11]
Additional Criteria #2 Scores on district-wide or local assessments[12] that are comparable to the Basic performance level on • Math PSSA or Algebra I Keystone AND • English Language Arts PSSA or Literature Keystone Assessments

Source. PDE (2015b).

[11] If the new proposed federal regulations are adopted as proposed, this would not be allowed under Title I, ESSA.
[12] If the new proposed federal regulations are adopted as proposed, a "local option" would be disallowed under Title I, ESSA.

V. Key Considerations for States

As states develop their plans, they may wish to consider the following questions:

- Should they use their current English language proficiency assessments and AMAO criteria to inform the development of long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for their accountability system under ESSA? Should another indicator and different criteria be used instead?

- What timeline should they establish for these long-term goals and interim measures of progress?

Additionally, states may wish to consult with accountability leadership in select states that include English language proficiency in their state accountability systems to understand, for example:

- What were their considerations regarding how to include measures of English language proficiency in their state accountability systems?

- What are the strengths and weaknesses of their approaches?

- How are stakeholders responding to their approaches? For example, are there concerns about complexity, validity, utility, fairness, or unintended consequences?

References

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2016). *Major provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) related to the education of English learners. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2016/ESSA/CCSSOResourceonESSAELLs02.23.2016.p df*

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015. Public Law 114-95, 114th Congress.

Martin, C., Sargrad, S., & Batel, S. (2016). *Making the grade: A 50—state analysis of school accountability systems*. Washington DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/13125015/AccountabilityLandscape-report1-summary.pdf

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).

Pennsylvania Department of Education [PDE]. (2013). *Title III requirements and responsibilities* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from Pennsylvania Association Federal Program Coordinators Web site: http://www.pafpc.org/cms/lib2/PA00001534/Centricity/Domain/8/Title%20III%20Requirements%20and%20Responsibilities%20%20PAFPC%202013.pptx

PDE (2015a, September 1). *ESEA Flexibility: Request from Pennsylvania*. Submitted to U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education, http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/map/pa.html

PDE (2015b, September). *State required exit criteria for Pennsylvania's English language instructional programs for English language learners.* Retrieved from http://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/Teachers-Administrators/Curriculum/ESL/State%20Required%20Exit%20Criteria%20for%20PAs%20LIEP.pdf

PDE (2016). *Every Student Succeeds Act.* Retrieved from PDE's website http://www.education.pa.gov/Pages/Every-Student-Succeeds-Act.aspx#tab-1

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.(2016). *Accountability for English Language Learners (ELLs) FAQ*s. Madison, WI: Author. Retrieved from http://dpi.wi.gov/accountability/ellamao/faq

Appendix

	Arizona[I]	Colorado	Georgia[II]	Illinois[III]	Massachusetts[IV]	Texas[V]
Number (percent) of EL students 2014-15	85,000 (7%)[VI]	128,042 (14.2%)[VII]	127,868 (7.3%) [VIII]	211,619 (10.3%)[ix]	85,762 (9%)[X]	948,391 (18.2%)[XI]
State accountability systems	Arizona is currently transitioning to a new state accountability system that will replace the A-F Letter Grade accountability system, which was adopted in 2011 This new system will align state and federal accountability requirements SB1289 prohibits A-F Letter Grades for school years 2014-15 and 2015-16. It also requires ADE to continue to identify schools with "below average levels of performance."	Colorado launched its new state accountability system in 2010, which applies to all students and districts In its approved ESEA flexibility plan, Colorado proposed a single, comprehensive accountability system that meets the requirements of and exceeds the expectations in NCLB Title I accountability regulations During the 2015 legislative session, the CO General Assembly passed HB15-1323 that created a hold for 2015 school and district accountability	The College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) is Georgia's accountability system that meets state and federal requirements CCRPI is Georgia's annual tool for measuring how well schools, districts, and the state itself are preparing students for the next educational level and includes four main components: (1) achievement, (2) progress, (3) achievement gap, and (4) challenge points	Illinois established a Multiple Measures Index and AMOs in 2015	Massachusetts has an accountability system that integrated Federal requirements and state accountability system and implemented it starting 2012-13 (See Massachusetts Case Study Brief for more information.)	Texas proposed an integrated accountability system starting 2013-14, but it was not implemented During 2015, the Texas General Assembly passed HB 2804 that created an A-F Letter Grade accountability system, which will be implemented in 2017-18 For 2016, system included 4 indices: student achievement, student progress, closing performance gaps, postsecondary readiness The accountability system will be again raised in legislative session winter 2016
English language attainment/ proficiency indicator is part of the accountability system	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Arizona[I]	Colorado	Georgia[II]	Illinois[III]	Massachusetts[IV]	Texas[V]
Use of English language attainment/ proficiency indicators in the state accountability system	Criteria to determine reward, focus, and priority schools (RFP criteria) may include either ELP indicator (i.e., ELL reclassification rate) or percent passing science • Focus schools have an ELL reclassification rate in the state's lowest quartile • Reward schools have an ELL reclassification rate in the state's top quartile • Priority school classification does not consider ELL reclassification rate	Colorado includes median and adequate growth percentiles for the Colorado English Language Proficiency Assessment (ACCESS) as an additional content area for the Academic Growth to Standard indicator[xii] All schools are awarded points based on performance on a number of indicators, which are aggregates of sub-indicators (one of which is ELP), and are categorized into: Performance Plan (highest rating) schools; Improvement Plan schools; Priority Improvement Plan schools; and Turnaround Plan schools • Turnaround schools and priority improvement schools are further grouped into priority schools, focus schools, other title I schools, and CO turnaround network	Georgia has aligned its differentiated recognition and accountability system with its CCRPI. The index is being used to identify reward, priority and focus schools, and to establish exit criteria for priority and focus schools All elementary and middle schools get a score from 1-100 on Georgia's CCRPI based, in part, on adequate positive movement on the ACCESS For all high schools, not just Title I schools, "extra credit" points are awarded for adequate positive movement on ACCESS	Using the Multiple Measures Index (MMI), Illinois classifies schools and districts into 5 levels • Level 2 denotes focus schools, level 1 denotes priority schools.[xiii]	Based on the Progress & Performance Index (PPI), the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education classifies schools and districts according to the five levels of the state's accountability system • Level 3 denotes focus schools; levels 4 & 5 are priority schools	The Title I accountability system uses performance indicators (which incorporates the English Learner Progress Measure) to identify priority schools, the lowest 5%, and focus schools, the 10% with the widest performance gaps among student subgroups (not otherwise identified as priority schools).

	Arizona[I]	Colorado	Georgia[II]	Illinois[III]	Massachusetts[IV]	Texas[V]
Measures of English language attainment/ Proficiency in the accountability system	Reclassification rate	ACCESS for ELLs	ACCESS for ELLs	Proposed: ACCESS for ELLs: Percentage making progress (0.5 increase or max score of 6.0)	ACCESS for ELLS: Student Growth Percentile (SPG)	Texas English Language Proficiency System (TELPAS) & STAAR

	Arizona[I]	Colorado	Georgia[II]	Illinois[III]	Massachusetts[IV]	Texas[V]
Weighting of the English language attainment/ proficiency indicator in the accountability system	• Weight of each indicator or assessment to be determined by Arizona Department of Education (ADE) • Indicators include ELP and growth on ELP	14.3 % of the Academic Growth Indicator: Colorado's school performance framework comprises 4 performance indicators: Academic Achievement indicator (25 points for Elementary& Middle School; 15 for High School), Academic Growth indicator (50 points for Elementary & Middle School; 35 for High School), and Academic Growth Gaps (25 points for Elementary & Middle School; 15 for High School) • Academic Growth indicator includes: • Colorado growth model CSAP (CO student assessment program), which comprises reading (28.6%), mathematics (28.6%), and writing (28.6%); and (2) CELApro (14.3%)[xiv]	The four components (achievement, progress, achievement gap, and challenge) encompass multiple indicators and are combined for a total CCRPI score on a scale of 0 to 100, with a possibility of 10 additional points. Achievement (50 points), Progress (40 points), Achievement Gap (10 points) & Challenge (up to 10 points) Achievement indicator includes ELP	Proposed: ELP is part of the Multiple Measures Index (2 indices for 3--8: achievement & progress with context as a bonus; 3 indices for 9-12: achievement, progress, and outcomes). ELP, along with growth in content proficiency, is used to calculate the progress index. ELP scores range from 0 to 100 (decline to meet target) and is averaged with growth in content proficiency scores (also 0 to 100).	Schools and districts that obtain a median Student Growth Percentile of 60 or higher are awarded 25 PPI points on their Progress and Performance Index (PPI)	No weighting. TEA identifies different cut scores on State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) assessments for English Learners[xv]

	Arizona[I]	Colorado	Georgia[II]	Illinois[III]	Massachusetts[IV]	Texas[V]
Sources of information	Arizona Department of Education website ADE (July 2015). State of Arizona ESEA flexibility request The Grader, June 2016 AZ's A-F Letter Grade Accountability System: ELL Point Criteria – FY 2014	Colorado Department of Education (CDE) website CDE (November 2015). State of Colorado ESEA Flexibility Request	GaDOE website GaDOE ESEA Flexibility Request (June 2015) GaDOE (May 2016). Principals' Guide to CCRPI GaDOE (June 30, 2016). 2016 CCRPI Series: Session 2. GaDOE (n.d.). An overview of the CCRPI	Illinois State Board of Education website Illinois State Board of Education (September 2014). ESEA Flexibility Resubmission Illinois State Board of Education	MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website MA ESE. (2015c). *School leader's guide to the 2015 accountability determinations.* Malden, MA: Author.	Texas Education Agency (TEA, n.d.). TEA (n.d.) TEA (2016). Accountability Manual

Endnotes

[i] The primary source of information is the state's most recent ESEA flexibility plan approved in August 2015, prior to the reauthorization of ESEA (i.e., ESSA). ESSA has implications for a new A-F Letter Grade Accountability system, AZ state accountability system, and AZ Department of Education (ADE) is currently developing recommendations for an accountability system for the State Board of Education to adopt.

[ii] GaDOE ESEA Flexibility Request (June 2015) https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/flex-renewal/garenewalreq2015.pdf is the primary source of information. Authors corresponded with GaDOE Director of Accountability, Allison Timberlake, via emails to clarify or confirm information available in the approved ESEA flexibility plan (7/14/2016).

[iii] The information on Illinois is based on the state's most recent ESEA flexibility plan approved in April 2014, and personal communication with Melina Wright, NCLB Liaison, IL Department of Education.

[iv] Massachusetts's ESEA flexibility plan was approved July 2015. Information on MA is primarily based on the state's accountability guide for school leaders.

[v]The information on TX is based on the state's most recent ESEA flexibility plan approved September 2015, TEA's 2016 Accountability Manual, and personal communication with Jamie Crowe, Director of Performance Reporting. (7/19/16)

[vi] Arizona Department of Education. http://www.azed.gov/english-language-learners/ell-data/ell-demographics-2014/

[vii] Colorado Department of Education https://edx.cde.state.co.us/SchoolView/DataCenter/reports.jspx?_adf_ctrl-state=pac20phbp_4&_afrWindowMode=0&_afrLoop=12088576612090598&_adf.ctrl-state=35g4vflbj_4

[viii] Georgia Department of Education http://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/communications/Documents/Quick%20Facts%20About%20Georgia%20Public%20Education%202 015%20-%20UPDATED.pdf

[ix] Percentage provided, number calculated by authors http://www.illinoisreportcard.com/State.aspx?source=StudentCharacteristics&source2=Enrollment&Stateid =IL https://www2.ed.gov/policy/eseaflex/il.pdf (this is from 2012)

[x] http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/selectedpopulations.aspx

[xi] http://tea.texas.gov/communications/pocket-edition/

[xii] CDE (November 2015). P. 90

[xiii] As of January 2014, Illinois wrote about plans to develop and implement the MMI. We have found no evidence that it has been used to in Title I accountability.

[xiv] Note that CELApro was replaced with ACCESS. See CDE (November 2015) P. 89 for details.

[xv] The Texas English Language Learner (ELL) Progress Measure provides performance expectations on the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR®) content-area assessments for Texas ELL students. The STAAR expectations take into account the level of English Language Proficiency ELL students possess, thus providing a more meaningful gauge of annual improvement or progress for these students than the general STAAR progress measure.
The ELL Progress measure is designed to take into account the time needed to acquire English Language Proficiency and to fully demonstrate grade-level academic skills in English.

[xvi] The primary source of information is the state's most recent ESEA flexibility plan approved in August

2015, prior to the reauthorization of ESEA (i.e., ESSA). ESSA has implications for a new A-F Letter Grade Accountability system, AZ state accountability system, and AZ Department of Education (ADE) is currently developing recommendations for an accountability system for the State Board of Education to adopt.

[xvii] GaDOE ESEA Flexibility Request (June 2015) https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/flex-renewal/garenewalreq2015.pdf is the primary source of information. Authors corresponded with GaDOE Director of Accountability, Allison Timberlake, via emails to clarify or confirm information available in the approved ESEA flexibility plan (7/14/2016).

[xviii] The information on Illinois is based on the state's most recent ESEA flexibility plan approved in April 2014, and personal communication with Melina Wright, NCLB Liaison, IL Department of Education.

[xix] Massachusetts's ESEA flexibility plan was approved July 2015. Information on MA is primarily based on the state's accountability guide for school leaders.

[xx]The information on TX is based on the state's most recent ESEA flexibility plan approved September 2015, TEA's 2016 Accountability Manual, and personal communication with Jamie Crowe, Director of Performance Reporting. (7/19/16)

The U.S. Department of Education has selected WestEd as the agency to operate the Mid-Atlantic Comprehensive Center (MACC@WestEd) beginning in October 2012. The MACC@WestEd works collaboratively with the Mid-Atlantic States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania as well as with the District of Columbia to help SEAs implement, support, scale up, and sustain statewide education reforms. It is part of a federal technical assistance network of 15 Regional Comprehensive Centers and seven supporting Content Centers. The network of centers also works closely with the Regional Educational Laboratories and other technical assistance providers to ensure effective coordination of services.

WestEd - a national nonpartisan, nonprofit research, developoment, and service agency - works with education and other communities to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults. WestEd has 15 offices nationwide from Washington and Boston to Arizona and California, with its headquarters in San Francisco. For more information about WestEd, visit WestEd.org; call 415-565-3000 or, toll-free, (877) 4-WestEd; or write: WestEd, 730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1242.

© WestEd. All rights reserved.