

ACCOUNTABILITY: THEN AND NOW

Issue	No Child Left Behind	Every Student Succeeds Act (with Proposed Regulations)
Expectations for Students	Unrealistic goals and targets created incentives for States to lower standards for students, well below levels needed to succeed after high school.	States must set expectations for all students that will put them on a path to succeed in college or career, with flexibility to design accountability systems that best support this goal.
Goals and Timelines	States were held to a federally-prescribed timeline for all students to achieve proficiency in reading and math.	States set their own ambitious goals and short-term measures of progress that hold high expectations for all students and reflect the progress necessary to close achievement gaps.
Measures of School Quality	School performance was defined and measured narrowly, with a heavy focus on math and reading test scores and high school graduation rates.	Increased state flexibility to take a more holistic view of school performance based on multiple measures including: achievement in reading and math; academic progress in elementary and middle schools; graduation rates in high schools; rates of progress for English learners achieving language proficiency; and a state-determined indicator of school quality or student success.
Transparency around Performance	Schools that did not meet benchmarks were given a “pass/fail” mark and a label (e.g., corrective action) associated with the types of improvement efforts that had to be undertaken in the school – information that was not meaningful or particularly useful to parents and the public.	States create a multi-level rating system that clearly communicates to parents and communities how their schools are doing, taking into account all of the measures of school performance. Information displayed in a timely manner on annual report cards, designed with input from parents.
Interventions	Federally-prescribed interventions for schools and districts identified as “failing.”	Locally-tailored, evidenced-based interventions for schools identified for support. Improvement plans designed in collaboration with teachers, principals, parents, and other stakeholders.
Resources	Districts were directed to set-aside substantial amounts of funding for specific federally-prescribed interventions, which were not consistently effective.	Districts no longer forced to set aside funds. State funds are prioritized to a state’s lowest-performing five percent of schools, high schools with low graduation rates, and schools with persistent low performance among subgroups of students. Flexibility to use funds for locally-tailored, evidence-based strategies.