

## ESSA State Plan Equity Report Card

As part of our Equity & Excellence Project (EEP), the National Urban League has reviewed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated State Plans for 36 states and the District of Columbia where we have Urban League affiliates. Under ESSA, the U.S. Department of Education tasked each state with developing a consolidated, streamlined set of requirements for states to address in their plans and submit for federal approval. All plans were approved as of September 2018. These plans provide a preliminary indicator of how states intend to implement the new law and represent a blueprint for state- and district-level decisions that will work to move each state from promise to practice during implementation.

During our analysis, we assessed how well states incorporated equity into their plans and developed a series of report cards that use a green-yellow-red highlight system to rate the plans on 12 Equity Indicators including: early childhood learning, supports for struggling schools, and resource equity. These indicators were selected based on the evidence demonstrating their effectiveness for advancing equity and excellence for vulnerable students in our nation's public schools.

These report cards do not constitute an assessment or analysis of a state's school system. Rather, they identify the extent to which states have included the 12 equity indicators in their ESSA plans. Each state's ranking was determined based on its weighted average performances across each of our 12 equity indicators. Extra weight was placed on those areas that the National Urban League believes are especially critical to advancing equity—subgroup performance, supports, and interventions for struggling schools and for resource equity.

We believe these Consolidated State Plans are a reflection of each state's priorities and represent a road map that will guide a state's investments in districts, schools and communities. We hope that the absence of information in a state's plan is not an indication of its commitment to these education equity priorities and we remain optimistic that states and districts will continue to adopt these 12 equity levers into their plans as they move into implementation.

For more information on our findings, please read our executive summary and full report on naturbanleague.org.



Plan Approved: May 3, 2018; Link to full text can be found here

Equity Indicators	NUL Score
<ol> <li>Goals and Indicators         <ul> <li>Virginia's long-term goal is to have 75% of students proficient in reading and math by 2025.</li> <li>The state has set a goal of having 75% of students in each subgroup proficient in reading and 70% of students in each subgroup proficient in math by 2025.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	⊠ <mark>Excellent</mark> □ Sufficient □ Poor
<ul> <li>2. Subgroup Performance <ul> <li>Virginia's accountability system, Standards of Accountability (SOA) will apply to all schools and subgroups.</li> <li>The state uses subgroup performance to identify schools for "targeted support and improvement" (TSI).</li> <li>Achievement gaps are considered in the state's accreditation system, which rates schools on proficiency and growth, achievement gaps, graduation and completion, and drop-out rate.</li> <li>The state of Virginia is using an n-size of 30, which will likely mask the performance of subgroups. It should consider lowering their n-size to 10, as is the recommendation of the National Center on Educational Statistics.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	□ Excellent □ Sufficient ⊠ <mark>Poor</mark>
<ul> <li>3. Supports &amp; Interventions for Struggling Schools</li> <li>Virginia's definition of "consistently underperforming" identifies schools using the following steps: (1) any subgroup that did not meet an interim measure of progress in reading, math, and graduation rate for two consecutive years, and is in the lowest two quartiles for academic growth in reading or math; (2) any school that did not meet the interim measure for English Learners' (EL) progress to proficiency and is in lowest two quartiles for EL progress; and (3) any school that did not meet the interim measure of progress for chronic absenteeism for two consecutive years and has state accreditation rating with conditions or was denied accreditation.</li> <li>The exit criteria is a two-year period, plus improvement in areas that triggered intervention.</li> <li>Overall, Virginia's identification methods greatly narrow the universe of schools that can be supported. For instance, "additional targeted support and improvement" (ATSI) schools have to show low subgroup performance on ALL indicators to be identified for the most modest level of intervention. Meanwhile, ANY amount of growth can take a school out of comprehensive support and improvement.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Excellent</li> <li>○ Sufficient</li> <li>□ Poor</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>4. Resource Equity <ul> <li>Virginia does not collect or report teacher effectiveness data at the state-level. Rather, the plan says that effectiveness is locally defined. However, Virginia does include a definition of "teacher incompetency" that it utilizes for decision-making.</li> <li>The plan states that as of spring 2018, Virginia will develop guidelines and collection methods and then publish aggregate school-level data by September 15, 2019.</li> <li>Virginia's plan doesn't mention reviewing its own resource allocation among districts or responding to inequities in school-level spending.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	□Excellent □Sufficient ⊠ Poor

(-)	National
	Urban League

<ul> <li>5. Educator Equity <ul> <li>There is no mention of cultural competence as a priority for teacher professional learning outside English Language teachers or a program for "targeted high needs local education agencies" (LEAs).</li> <li>There is a plan for data collection and public reporting on teacher effectiveness at the school-level, however, there is no information regarding timelines and targets to be met.</li> <li>The plan describes no templates for professional development, best practices, incentives or dedicated funding for LEAs who identify teacher equity gaps to address them; and uses state set-aside funds only for general professional development, recruitment and communications improvements.</li> <li>Continued workgroup meetings are the only efforts described to address teacher and leader diversity in critical shortage areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Excellent</li> <li>□ Sufficient</li> <li>□ Poor</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>6. Stakeholder Engagement <ul> <li>There is no explicit information regarding the diversity of stakeholders that were consulted.</li> <li>Where stakeholder engagement is mentioned, on more than one occasion it appears that these groups are education-focused organizations. The state should make efforts to engage a diverse range of stakeholders including community-based organizations through the implementation phase of ESSA.</li> </ul></li></ul>	□Excellent □Sufficient ⊠ <mark>Poor</mark>
<ul> <li>7. Breaking the School to Prison Pipeline</li> <li>Virginia highlights an effective state-level program, Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports Research and Implementation Center, which has produced positive results. However, while 91 schools in 35 districts are engaged, there is no information regarding selection criteria or expansion to a full statewide professional development module.</li> <li>Virginia's plan should include a measure of school discipline in its accountability system to move to excellent.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Excellent</li> <li>⊠ Sufficient</li> <li>□ Poor</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>8. Equitable Access to Early Childhood Learning <ul> <li>Virginia includes spending for Early Learning in Title I &amp; Title IV.</li> <li>The state's plan does not mention the use of Title II funds for expanding professional development for early learning capacity building opportunities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Excellent</li> <li>⊠ Sufficient</li> <li>□ Poor</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>9. Equitable Implementation of College and Career Standards <ul> <li>Virginia's plan does not include a college and career readiness (CCR) measure in its accountability plan.</li> <li>The state's plan does not give credit for untested students when schools fail to meet the 95% participation rate for assessments.</li> <li>While describing reporting requirements for some career education, the plan does not describe how this information is tracked, measured or evaluated or how progress is measured.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>□ Excellent</li> <li>⊠ Sufficient</li> <li>□ Poor</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>10. Out of School Time Learning         <ul> <li>The bulk of funds that could be directed to extend learning statewide are not targeted or designated for activities beyond general state supports for learning.</li> <li>The competitively awarded 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grants are targeted to CSI schools and schools with disproportionately low income students and include some state support for professional development, visits and data collection.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	□Excellent □Sufficient ⊠ <mark>Poor</mark>



<ul> <li>11. Equitable Access to High Quality Curricula <ul> <li>Career and technical education (CTE) is only discussed in the context of migrant or at-risk students.</li> <li>Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) and science, technology, engineering, arts and math (STEAM) are offerings on a list of potential professional development with very little information published regarding access, rollout, or alignment with a larger statewide vision.</li> </ul></li></ul>	<ul> <li>□ Excellent</li> <li>⊠ Sufficient</li> <li>□ Poor</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>12. Clear Reporting and Transparent Data Systems That Are Easy to Understand <ul> <li>Virginia provides some information as to what will be included in its public reporting system, but nothing in terms of format, or usability with the end-user in mind.</li> <li>Virginia does not assign ratings or grades other than for ESSA-required targeted and comprehensive support in its plan, however the state's separate school accreditation system does.</li> <li>Virginia's Plan describes no public reporting for teacher quality data, only how LEAs will use in an internal process nor does it mention new requirements around reporting school-level spending.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	□Excellent □Sufficient ⊠ Poor
Overall Rating	Poor