

**May 2016 Proposed ESSA Regulations  
Alignment to CCSSO Principles and Roadmap**

This document provides a summary version of the "Roadmap" workbook created by CCSSO, EducationCounsel, and Achieve to support states in implementing the nine CCSSO Principles for next-generation accountability systems. For each principle, this document includes what states could do and must do in implementing next-generation accountability systems under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and it inserts relevant information from the U.S. Department of Education's (USED) May 31<sup>st</sup>, 2016 proposed regulations on Title I of ESSA. Please note that this is a *working draft* that will be continuously updated – particularly as proposed regulations become finalized and further proposed Title I regulations are released from USED over the next year.

Principle 1:	Main Point	
CCR Alignment	Align accountability system goals with the broader goal of helping all students master the knowledge and skills necessary for success in college and career	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish <b>college and career ready state standards</b>, and align accountability system goals with college and career ready performance, such as reflected in the state's standards.</li> <li><b>Define college and career readiness</b> to include the full range of deeper learning knowledge, skills, and dispositions – academic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal – that evidence shows are necessary for success in college, career, and life (from early learning through K12)</li> </ul> <p>Use this robust definition of college and career readiness to <b>create a clear "line of sight"</b> for all state policies and practices including accountability and supports.</p>	
	ESSA Statute	ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Set challenging state academic standards aligned with entrance requirements for credit-bearing coursework in the state's system of public higher education and relevant career and technical education state standards. ESSA § 1111(b)(1)(D)(i).</li> <li>Use those standards to carry out systems of assessment, accountability, and school improvement (ESSA § 1111(b)(1)(A)), and base the state's accountability system on those challenging standards. ESSA § 1111(c)(4).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States would be required to <b>apply the same high standards of academic achievement to all students and each subgroup of students</b>, except students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards.</li> </ul>

Principle 2:	Main Point	
Annual Determinations	Make annual accountability determinations for all public schools/districts based on clear goals to advance continuous improvement.	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a clear, shared <b><i>vision for the role of accountability</i></b> and how it connects – as a process – to meaningful supports and continuous improvement for all public schools/districts.</li> <li>Make and report on <b><i>annual accountability determinations</i></b> for all public schools and districts that are valid, meaningful, and understandable, including through index systems and/or data dashboard (as described in Principle 3), and consider how you will address school classifications (including lowest-performing as well as highest-performing and/or the full range of schools, as appropriate).</li> <li>Ensure meaningful <b><i>accountability goals</i></b> for performance and improvement for all public schools and subgroups, such that all students are on track to college and career readiness.</li> </ul>	
	ESSA Statute	ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish ambitious, state-defined long-term goals, including measurements of interim progress, on all required indicators and for all students and subgroups. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(A)</li> <li>Establish a system for meaningfully differentiating on an annual basis all public schools in the state (based on accountability indicators, as described in Principle 3), ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(C), and identify for support and improvement the lowest-performing schools and subgroups (as described in Principles 7 and 8).</li> </ul>	<u>Goals:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires each state’s system of annual meaningful differentiation to include at least three distinct levels of performance for schools on each indicator, and <b><i>set those performance levels in a way that is consistent with the school’s attainment of the state’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.</i></b></li> <li>Affirms from statute that goals are required for academic indicators.</li> <li>For the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, states would be required to <b><i>establish goals that are based on grade-level proficiency on the State’s academic assessments</i></b> and set separately for reading/language arts and math.</li> <li>If a state chooses to use a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, then it must <b><i>establish goals and measurements of interim progress for both (with more rigorous goals for the extended-year rate).</i></b></li> <li>States are required to develop a <b><i>uniform procedure for determining long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English Learners (ELs)</i></b> that (1) would be applied consistently to all ELs in a state, (2) must take into account the student’s ELP level, and (3) may consider one or more specified student-level factors at the time of a student’s identification as an EL.</li> </ul> <u>Aggregation of measures:</u>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Requires each state’s system of annual meaningful differentiation to <b><i>include at least three distinct levels of performance for schools on each indicator</i></b>, and set those performance levels in a way that is <b><i>consistent with the school’s attainment of the state’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress</i></b>.</li><li>▪ Requires states to assign a <b><i>comprehensive, summative rating for each school</i></b> from among at least three distinct rating categories for each school, based on a school’s level of performance on each indicator, including a category for the lowest-performing schools. However, <b><i>states would also report a school’s performance on each indicator, in addition to the school’s summative result</i></b>.</li></ul>
--	--

Principle 3:	Main Point
Focus on Outcomes	Base accountability determinations on multiple, high-quality measures that are aligned with advancing college and career ready goals.
<p><b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b></p> <p><i>Each state COULD...</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Include multiple measures</b> in the state’s accountability system to make initial accountability determinations (and as part of deeper data reporting and diagnostics, as described in Principle 6), including but not limited to high-quality assessments and accurate graduation rates, based on both <b>status and growth</b> in performance, as appropriate.</li> <li>▪ Include <b>all students</b> as appropriate (and subgroups as described below).</li> <li>▪ Ensure that all metrics are <b>meaningful, measurable, and teachable and learnable</b> with regard to the goal of improving CCR student outcomes and closing achievement gaps (connected by evidence and/or researched-based presumptions).</li> <li>▪ Consider <b>additional measures of the full range of CCR student outcomes</b>, including the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that result in college, career, and civic readiness, such as additional CCR measures<sup>1</sup> (e.g., advanced course taking, students “on track,” college credit, college entrance without remediation, workforce certificates); measures of engagement and/or higher-order/social-emotional skills; and those best measured through performance-based demonstrations of learning.</li> <li>▪ Consider <b>additional measures of school quality and equity</b>, including for example, opportunity for student learning and access to critical resources (e.g., curriculum, access to early learning, high-quality teaching/leading, funding, facilities, and technology); and school climate/environment and conditions of learning (e.g. school discipline, attendance, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Determine <b>how to weigh measures</b> and <b>how to present measures</b> for initial accountability determinations – whether as a <b>data dashboard, index system, or both</b>, across multiple measures.</li> <li>▪ Consider the value of and mechanism for including a mix of <b>state and local measures</b> to spur innovation and authenticity, where there is sufficient validity, capacity, scale, etc.</li> <li>▪ Consider efforts to improve quality and utility in the state’s <b>system of assessments</b>, including the number and mix of interim and summative assessments, state and local assessments, and the inclusion of performance-based assessments, so that diagnostic, instructional, and accountability purposes are met with the minimum number of high quality assessments needed, assessments are clearly being used for their intended purposes.<sup>2</sup></li> <li>▪ Consider how all accountability measures and their combination advance the <b>shifts in teaching and learning</b> for CCR student outcomes – for example by valuing student progress toward mastery of key knowledge and skills.</li> <li>▪ Consider any <b>unintended negative consequences</b> of different indicators and/or accountability designs.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> Other possible measures include, for example, additional academic subjects beyond reading and math; successful completion of advanced coursework; college credit accumulation; college entry, remediation, and persistence rates; career preparedness as measured by industry certifications and other measures; performance on national or international assessments (e.g., NAEP or PISA); reading proficiency in the early grades; and measures of deeper learning/social-emotional skills (such as critical thinking, problem solving, communication, collaboration, and academic mindset).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2013/CCSSO%20Assessment%20Quality%20Principles%2010-1-13%20FINAL.pdf>

	ESSA Statute	ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each state's accountability system must be based on multiple indicators and measure annual performance on those indicators (including status and/or growth as determined by the state).</li> <li>This includes (1) state assessments in math and reading/language arts (3-8 and once in high school), (2) one other indicator for elementary and middle schools, (3) graduation rates for high schools, (4) English proficiency for ELLs, and (5) at least one other indicator that is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (such as measures of student engagement, educator engagement, advanced coursework, postsecondary readiness, or school climate and safety). ESSA § 1111 (c)(4)(B).</li> <li>In making annual determinations, indicators 1-4 above must each be given "substantial weight" and "in the aggregate, much greater weight" than the other indicator(s) in 5. ESSA § 1111 (c)(4)(C).</li> <li>Systems must annually measure at least 95% of all students (and students in each subgroup), and states shall determine how this factors into accountability. ESSA § 1111 (c)(4)(E).</li> <li>ESSA requires state high-quality assessments in reading/language arts and math in grades 3-8 and once in high school (and grade-span tests in science) and establishes a range of assessment pilots and programs, including a pilot for innovative assessment models (up to 7 states in the first 3 years) (see ESSA § 1204); providing for locally-selected, nationally-recognized high</li> </ul>	<p><u>Indicator selection:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarifies that states must use the <b>same measures within each indicator for all schools</b> (except that states <i>may vary the measures within the School Quality and Student Success Indicator(s) by grade span</i>).</li> <li>Requires states to ensure that each measure within an indicator: (1) is valid, reliable, and comparable; (2) is calculated the same for all schools across the state; (3) can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students; and <b>(4) includes a different measure than the state uses for any other indicator</b>.</li> <li>For the <b>School Quality and Student Success Indicator(s)</b>, requires states to ensure that each measure is <b>supported by research finding that progress is likely to increase student academic achievement/graduation rates</b>. Each measure must also help meaningfully differentiate among schools (as demonstrated by varied results across all schools).</li> <li>Clarifies factors in selecting a <b>Progress in Achieving ELP Indicator</b>.</li> </ul> <p><u>Weighting of Indicators:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires states to use <b>consistent weighting among the indicators</b> for all schools within each grade span.</li> <li>Clarifies that the Academic Achievement Indicator must <b>equally weight grade-level proficiency on reading/language arts and math assessments</b>.</li> <li>Clarifies that:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A school identified for comprehensive or targeted support <b>cannot be removed from identification on the basis of the School Quality or Student Success Indicator unless it is also making significant progress for all students on an academic indicator</b>;</li> <li>A school achieving the lowest level of performance on any academic indicator <b>must receive a different summative rating</b> than a school performing at the highest level on all indicators.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Clarifies that although academic indicators must aggregate to a</li> </ul>

	<p>school assessments (see ESSA § 1111(b)(2)(H); and a use of funds to audit assessment systems (for quality and burden) (see ESSA § 1202).</p>	<p>"substantial" weight, <i>each individual indicator may carry different weight</i> within that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarifies rules around <i>ELP inclusion and n-size</i>.</li> </ul> <p><u>95% Participation Rate:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires states to <i>take rigorous accountability and/or supports and improvement action</i> for a school that misses the 95% percent participation requirement.</li> <li>Requires schools and LEAs with a significant number of schools missing the 95% percent participation requirement for any subgroups <i>to develop and implement improvement plans with stakeholders</i>.</li> <li><b>NOTE:</b> These proposed regulations do not address assessment provisions under ESSA.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

Principle 4: Disaggregation	Main Point	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<b>Continue commitment to disaggregation of data – for reporting and accountability – and to closing achievement gaps in education opportunity and outcomes.</b>	
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<b>ESSA Statute</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA requires that each state set long-term and interim accountability goals disaggregated by subgroup. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(A).</li> <li>ESSA requires that states annually measure and make accountability determinations for each school overall and for each subgroup. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(B), (C).</li> <li>ESSA requires that each state/district annually report accountability data for each school overall and for each subgroup, as well as other data points. ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(C).</li> <li>ESSA requires that states set a statistically-sound “minimum number” for subgroup data reporting and accountability, in consultation with key stakeholders. ESSA § 1111(c)(3)(A).</li> </ul>	<b>ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would not proscribe further parameters for a state’s subgroup n-size for accountability purposes, but requires that any state with <b><i>an n-size larger than 30 students submit a justification in the state plan.</i></b></li> <li>Ensures states consider each student subgroup separately. <b><i>A combined subgroup of students – or “super subgroup” – cannot replace an individual subgroup.</i></b></li> <li>Clarifies that the n size that yields statistically reliable information for reporting purposes <b><i>may be lower than</i></b> the n size for accountability purposes.</li> </ul>



Principle 5:	Main Point	
Data Reporting	Report data in a manner that is rich, timely, accessible, and actionable to a range of critical stakeholders.	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Produce (at least) <b>annual state and local report cards</b> that present key accountability data and determinations, including disaggregated data as appropriate (as in the “data dashboard” discussed in Principle 3).</li> <li>Include as appropriate <b>additional data</b> beyond those used in initial accountability determinations <b>to further inform data analysis and continuous school improvement</b>, including other data related to, for example, social-emotional skills; school climate; and access to resources.</li> <li>Design report cards to be <b>most useful to key stakeholders</b> (including teachers, principals, parents, policymakers, etc) in terms of format, design, substance, and distribution.</li> <li>Consider <b>aligning report cards with processes for continuous improvement</b> by incorporating data gathered through diagnostic/school quality review processes (see Principle 6).</li> </ul>	
	ESSA Statute	ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA requires that each state and district produce annual report cards and report data – overall and by subgroup, as appropriate – with regard to accountability determinations, measures used in accountability systems, and other key variables (including at a minimum, for example, preschool enrollment, access to high-quality teachers and leaders, etc.). See, e.g., ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(C).</li> <li>ESSA requires that these report cards be clear, concise, understandable, accessible, and developed with input from stakeholders. See e.g., ESSA § 1111(h)(1)(B)</li> </ul>	<p><u>State and LEA report cards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarifies that state and LEA report cards <b>must be developed in consultations with parents</b> and must be in a format and language that is easily understandable, in addition to meeting the statute's minimum requirements.</li> <li>Clarifies that state and LEA report cards <b>include clearly labeled overview sections</b> for a number of the major indicators and determinations from the accountability and reporting system, for each subgroup and all students.</li> <li>The LEA overviews must also be <b>directly sent to parents</b> in each LEA.</li> <li>Requires dissemination of state and LEA report cards <b>no later than December 31 each year</b>, beginning with report cards based on 2017-18 information. State and LEA report cards must go out at the same time.</li> <li><b>Defines specific terms</b> for reporting disaggregated data on subgroups.</li> </ul> <p><u>Description and results of a state's accountability system:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restates statutory requirements and clarifies that states must <b>report a school's performance on each indicator, and the school's summative result</b>.</li> <li>Requires state and LEA report cards to <b>include the reason and subgroups</b> that led to each school's identification for support and improvement.</li> <li><b>Requires specific calculation rules and clarifies certain definitions</b> for reporting on student achievement and progress, high school graduation rates, per-pupil expenditures, postsecondary enrollment, and educator qualifications for increased transparency, and uniformity across a state.</li> </ul>



Principle 6: Diagnostic Review	Main Point	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<b>Include deeper diagnostic review to better connect accountability determinations and data analysis to a range of supports and interventions.</b>	
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<b>ESSA Statute</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA requires for lowest-performing schools that there be a school-level needs assessment to inform plans for comprehensive support and improvement. ESSA § 1111(d)(1)(B)(iii).</li> </ul>	<b>ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For comprehensive support and improvement, requires a LEA to <b>conduct a needs assessment with stakeholders</b> that examines: (1) academic achievement information; (2) school's performance, on all indicators and on long-term and interim goals; (3) the reasons the school was identified; (4) at the LEA's discretion, the school's performance on additional, locally selected indicators.</li> <li>In addition, the comprehensive support and improvement plan must identify <b>and address resource inequities at the LEA and school level</b>.</li> <li>If exit criteria are not met, <b>additional review and interventions are required</b> to support continuous improvement.</li> </ul>

<b>Principle 7: Systems for General Improvement</b>	<b>Main Point</b>	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<b>Build statewide systems of supports and capacity to promote continuous improvement across all schools and districts.</b>	
	<b>ESSA Statute</b>	<b>ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)</b>
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA provides states with <i>wide latitude</i> in how they will set accountability classifications and systems of improvement beyond lowest performing schools (discussed below).</li> <li>ESSA allows states to use up to 3% of Title I funds for "Direct Student Services" - with a priority on services in districts with high concentrations of schools identified for improvement. These direct student services could indirectly benefit all schools and students in these districts by building systems of supports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the proposed regulations do not provide specific clarity or parameters around statewide systems of support, the <b><i>proposed regulations regarding continuous improvement – particularly for low-performing schools – can inform and shape statewide systems of support.</i></b> (See Principle 9)</li> </ul>

Principle 8: Lowest-Performing Schools	Main Point	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<b>Ensure significant, sustained, evidence-based interventions in lowest-performing schools.</b>	
	ESSA Statute	ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA requires that states beginning in 2017-18 (and at least once every three years thereafter) identify for comprehensive support and improvement a group of lowest-performing schools based on the state's accountability system (described in Principle 2), including at least the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools receiving Title I funds and all high schools graduating less than 67% of their students. ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(D).</li> <li>ESSA requires that, for these schools, districts develop, with stakeholders, a comprehensive support and improvement plan (based on all accountability indicators and a school-level needs assessment, identifying resource inequities, including evidence-based interventions, and approved by the state) for all lowest-performing</li> </ul>	<u>Identification of schools</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires each state to identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement <b>by the beginning of a school year based on, at a minimum, the basis of their performance in the previous school year.</b> (e.g. a school identified for support and improvement for 2017-18 would be based on performance for the 2016-17 school year, at a minimum). This would occur once every 3 years.</li> <li>To identify the lowest-performing 5% of all Title I schools, states are required to <b>take into account a school's summative rating for all students on the state's accountability indicators (averaged over no more than three years), and the statutory weighting requirements for academic indicators.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>This would begin in the 2017-18 school year</b> for low-performing schools and low graduation-rate schools, occurring once every 3 years, thereafter;</li> <li>States would then identify schools with chronically low-performing subgroups <b>by 2020-21</b> and every 3 years after.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Requires states to identify for targeted support and improvement:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Schools with at least one low-performing subgroup of students (beginning in the 2017-18 school year)</b> - performing at a level at or below all students in any of the lowest-performing 5% of schools in comprehensive support and improvement; and</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

	<p>schools, with the option of a one-year planning period. These districts may also provide public school choice to students in those schools. ESSA § 1111(d)(1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA also requires that states beginning in 2017-18 identify for targeted support and improvement schools in which subgroups are “consistently underperforming” based on the state’s accountability system. ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(A).</li> <li>ESSA requires that such schools develop a targeted support and improvement plan, including evidence-based interventions, along with district approval. ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(B).</li> </ul>	<p>2. <b><i>Schools with consistently underperforming subgroups (beginning in the 2018-19 school year).</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This could include, at the State’ discretion, schools with low assessment participation rates.</li> <li>"Consistently underperforming" must be defined by the state using a uniform definition across all LEAs.</li> </ul> <p><u>School Improvement plans</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For comprehensive support and improvement, requires a LEA to <b><i>conduct a needs assessment with stakeholders</i></b> that examines: (1) academic achievement information; (2) school’s performance, on all indicators and on long-term and interim goals; (3) the reasons the school was identified; (4) at the LEA's discretion, the school’s performance on additional, locally selected indicators.</li> <li>Such a needs assessment and the resulting improvement plan could be conducted <b><i>using a planning year</i></b>, through the beginning of the next school year.</li> <li>The comprehensive and targeted support and improvement plans must include <b><i>one or more interventions that are evidence-based</i></b> – supported – to the greatest extent practicable – by the highest level of evidence available and the needs of the school.</li> <li>In addition, plans must <b><i>identify and address resource inequities</i></b> at the LEA- and school-level and, as applicable, within schools.</li> <li>Requires states to ensure that any school meeting the exit criteria for support and improvement both <b><i>increases student outcomes</i></b> and <b><i>no longer meets the criteria for support and improvement</i></b>;</li> <li>If exit criteria are not met, <b><i>additional review and interventions are required</i></b> to support continuous improvement.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

Principle 9: Continuous Improvement	Main Point	
<b>Opportunities for State Leadership</b>  <i>Each state COULD...</i>	<b>Establish systems of periodic review and continuous improvement in the state's system of accountability and supports itself, to best advance CCR teaching and learning.</b>	
<b>ESSA Requirements</b>  <i>Each state MUST...</i>	<b>ESSA Statute</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA requires that states and districts periodically review and revise as appropriate their state and local plans under Title I. ESSA §§ 1111(a)(6)(A)(ii), 1112(a)(5).</li> <li>ESSA requires, for example, that plans for comprehensive supports and improvement for lowest-performing schools be periodically reviewed, that the state periodically review resource allocations for school improvement in schools receiving comprehensive and targeted supports, and that that more rigorous actions be taken if there is not sufficient improvement over time. See ESSA §(d)(1), (3).</li> <li>ESSA requires that state and local plans, as well as specific components of those plans related to assessment, accountability, and supports, be developed in consultation with an array of stakeholders. See, e.g., ESSA § 1111(a)(1)(A).</li> </ul>	<b>ESSA Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (May 2016)</b> <p><u>State plans</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterates the statute that <b>at least once every four years, a state must review and revise its state plan(s)</b> and submit the revisions to the Secretary for review and approval.</li> <li>States must engage in <b>"timely and meaningful" consultation with stakeholders</b> and note/incorporate feedback throughout the consolidated state plan process: during the design and development, following the completion of the state plan, and prior to the submission of any revisions or amendments, as outlined by the statute.</li> </ul> <p><u>Continuous improvement for schools in comprehensive or targeted support and improvement</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For comprehensive support and improvement plans, requires a LEA to <b>conduct a needs assessment with stakeholders</b> that examines: performance on academic and other indicators and the reasons for identification. The plan must also <b>describe how stakeholders provided input and how they will participate in implementation</b>.</li> <li>Requires that, if a school does not meet exit criteria for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, the <b>LEA/school</b></li> </ul>

		<p><b><i>must review its data and amend its plan</i></b> to ensure continuous improvement, including <b><i>conducting a new school-level needs assessment for schools in comprehensive support and improvement.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Requires that, for all schools failing to meet exit criteria, a state must <b><i>increase its monitoring, support, and periodic review</i></b> of amended plans.</li></ul>
--	--	--