

COMPARISON CHART OF ESEA PROPOSALS

	ESEA/NCLB (Current law)	S. 1177 - Every Child Achieves Act (ECAA)	H.R. 5 - Student Success Act (SSA)
Testing	<p>States must test students in grades 3 through 8 in reading and math, plus science in certain grade spans.</p> <p>The results must be made public and include data to show how different subgroups of students, such as racial minorities, are doing relative to other students.</p> <p>Districts can offer local assessments in place of state tests – but they have to be comparable to the state test. (This section has not been used)</p> <p>95% of students must participate in tests, or schools will be considered as not meeting achievement targets.</p>	<p>States must test students in grades 3 through 8 in reading and math, plus science in certain grade spans.</p> <p>The results must be made public, and provide data to show how different subgroups of students, such as racial minorities, are doing relative to other subgroups.</p> <p>Up to 5 states can get permission from the U.S. Department of Education to try out new forms of assessments, such as competency-based or performance assessments in selected school districts, with the goal of eventually taking the new system statewide.</p> <p>Bill is silent on opt-out issue</p> <p>Encourages states and districts to take a look at the number of tests they require and get rid of any assessments that are duplicative or of low-quality.</p>	<p>States must test students in grades 3 through 8 in reading and math, plus science in certain grade spans.</p> <p>The results must be made public, and provide data to show how different subgroups of students, such as racial minorities, are doing relative to other students.</p> <p>States could allow districts to offer local assessments instead of state tests, as long as the results are comparable to state assessments. The local tests would have to be included in the state's plan for using federal Title I money, which requires USDOE approval. But a state would not need express permission from USDOE to offer local tests.</p> <p>Parents could decide to opt their children out of tests without any penalties for their schools.</p> <p>Encourages states and districts to take a look at the number of tests they require and get rid of any assessments that are duplicative or low-quality.</p>

	ESEA/NCLB	ECAA	SSA
Accountability	<p>States must set annual goals for student achievement, with the ultimate aim of bringing every student to the proficiency level on state tests by the 2013-14 school year.</p> <p>States were required to set smaller, annual student achievement goals, both for particular subgroups of students - such as English-language learners and students in special education - and for the student population as a whole.</p> <p>Schools that fell behind on these goals were considered as not making "adequate yearly progress," or AYP.</p> <p>The 2013-14 100% proficiency deadline turned out to be unrealistic. By 2015, no state had gotten all of its students over that bar.</p>	<p>Deletes AYP and the 2013-14 proficiency goal. Requires states to develop their own accountability systems.</p> <p>State test results would have to figure into these systems, but states could decide how much weight to give to them.</p> <p>States would have to factor high school graduation rates and English-language proficiency into their accountability systems and include other measures that they think are appropriate.</p> <p>States would have to set goals for student achievement, but there would not be any pre-prescribed federal options, like there are under waivers.</p> <p>Deletes the 100% proficiency requirement.</p>	<p>States would be allowed to get out of AYP and the 2013-14 proficiency goal and develop their own accountability systems.</p> <p>States have leeway regarding what local accountability systems would look like, including whether or not to include student growth on standardized tests as a factor.</p> <p>State systems would have to consider overall school performance, and the performance of particular subgroups (such as English-language learners and racial minorities).</p> <p>Deletes the 100% proficiency requirement.</p>

	ESEA/NCLB	ECAA	SSA
Standards	States must set "challenging" academic standards and measure student progress toward meeting them.	States have to set challenging academic standards in reading and math. The Secretary of Education is prohibited from using federal funding to entice states to adopt a particular set of standards, including the Common Core standards.	States must set challenging academic standards in reading and math. The Secretary of Education is prohibited from "coercing" a state to adopt a particular set of standards, including the Common Core standards. Includes language that makes it clear states can drop the Common Core standards, with no penalties
Teacher Quality	States have to ensure that all teachers are "highly qualified," which generally means that they have a bachelor's degree in the subject they are teaching as well as state certification. States are also supposed to ensure that "highly qualified" teachers are evenly distributed among schools with high concentrations of poverty and wealthier schools.	Eliminates the definition of "highly qualified teacher" and instead lets states decide what constitutes teacher quality. States would still have to address equitable teacher distribution. States can use federal funding to develop teacher evaluation systems, but it is not a requirement	Deletes "highly qualified" teacher requirements and consolidates other teacher quality programs. States can use federal teacher-quality funding to set up teacher evaluations if they want to, but it's not a requirement.
Low-Performing Schools	Schools that continually fail to meet achievement targets—either for the student population as a whole or particular subgroups of kids—face increasingly serious sanctions, including a requirement to offer school choice and free tutoring.	Deletes the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program, but includes other federal funding directed at low-performing schools.	The bill would get rid of the SIG program which offers formula grants to states to fix up low-performing schools. Instead, states would set aside 7% of their Title I money for school improvement.

	ESEA/NCLB	ECAA	SSA
Low-Performing Schools <i>(continued)</i>	Schools that underperform for years could face state takeover and be shut down, turned into charters, or subjected to other serious intervention.	School districts would be in charge of figuring out how to fix under-performing schools, with help from states. States would have to monitor district turnarounds, and step in if low-performing schools aren't getting any better. The federal government would be prohibited from telling states or districts how to fix struggling schools.	States would have to intervene in Title I schools that aren't performing well, but the bill is open as to how states and districts would address low-performing schools. No specification on how many schools a state would need to try to fix at a time.
School Choice	Schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress under the law for two years in a row must allow students to transfer to a better-performing school. After three years, they must offer free tutoring. Districts have to set aside 20% of their Title I funds for disadvantaged students to pay for these fixes.	States can allow students in low-performing schools to transfer to a better-performing school, but it is not required.	States can choose to offer school choice programs using Title I funding for disadvantaged students. The bill includes "Title I portability," which means federal funding for poor students could follow children to any public school, but not a private school. States would have to set aside 3% of their Title I funds for a competitive-grant program that would allow districts to offer school choice or free tutoring.
Funding	States have to keep their own spending to a certain level in order to tap federal funds (this is called "maintenance of effort").	Changes the formula for distributing Title I dollars for disadvantaged kids, so that there's less of an emphasis on population, and more on poverty. The changes wouldn't kick in until the Title I program reaches \$17 billion.	Repeals maintenance of effort, which calls for states and districts to keep up their own spending at a certain level in order to tap federal funds.

	ESEA/NCLB	ECAA	SSA
Funding <i>(continued)</i>	<p>Federal money can't replace state and local dollars.</p> <p>If 40% of a school's population is in poverty, the school can use federal Title I money with all its students. Otherwise, Title I funds have to be targeted to low-income kids.</p>	<p>Keeps in place "maintenance of effort," which requires a level for states to keep their own funding at in order to tap federal Title I funds. But it would give states and school districts more flexibility in how they meet their required level of funding.</p> <p>School would still be required to target Title I funds to low-income students, unless 40% of students are in poverty.</p>	<p>Keeps in place the "supplement-not-supplant" rule, which essentially says that federal funds can't replace state and local dollars.</p> <p>Maintains current law regarding use of funds for schoolwide Title I programs. (40% in poverty).</p>
Preschool	<p>The law authorizes a wide range of programs, including separate funding streams for disadvantaged students, English-language learners, migrant students, after-school programs, education technology and other areas.</p> <p>There is no separate funding stream for preschool.</p>	<p>Maintains separate programs for disadvantaged students, migrant kids, English-language learners, and other special populations.</p> <p>Eliminates some federal programs.</p> <p>Creates a new preschool program – it would look a lot like the Obama administration's preschool development grants.</p>	<p>The bill would merge programs aimed at migrant students, English-language learners, and neglected and delinquent children with the much larger Title I program for disadvantaged students.</p> <p>Districts could use the funds for any activity allowed under those programs.</p> <p>No money could be transferred out of Title I schools, but funds could go to other low-income schools.</p> <p>The bill would get rid of, or consolidate, nearly 70 programs – many of which haven't been funded in years.</p>