



FACT SHEET

Vermont Accountability

By Samantha Batel and Laura Jimenez August 2017

TABLE 1
Vermont accountability scorecard

Design model	Performance Index				
Summative classifications	Off target, near target, on target, bull's-eye				
School classification indicators	Indicator weights				
	2017-18 school year		2018-19 school year		
	Elementary and middle schools	High schools	Elementary and middle schools	High schools	
Academic achievement					
Subject(s)	Measure(s)				
English language arts, math, and science*	Average scale scores	40.0%	30.0%	45.0%	25.0%
Student growth					
Subject(s)	Measure(s)				
English language arts and math	Student growth percentiles	40.0%	30.0%	35.0%	20.0%
English learner progress					
Year-to-year gains in proficiency and growth to target measure		20.0%	15.0%	10.0%	10.0%
Early warning					
		—	—	—	—
Persistence					
Four- and six-year graduation rates		—	25.0%	—	20.0%
College and career readiness					
(1) Percent of students meeting assessment benchmarks, including SAT or ACT; Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery or earning an industry-recognized credential; (2) postsecondary outcomes, including enrollment in college, trade schools, and the workforce and military enlistments		—	—	—	20.0%
Enrichment and environment					
Physical fitness and test participation**		—	—	10.0%	5.0%

*Science will be its own indicator when it is added in the 2018-19 school year.

**If a school has lower than 95 percent participation, the school's rating will be lowered by multiplying its preliminary score by the percentage of eligible students participating in the assessment.

Notes: Vermont's system uses an equity index to report subgroup performance alongside the performance of all students. In addition, a state's description of its school classification system may differ from this organization's, which was designed to make cross-state comparisons. This analysis assumes that all applicable indicators are used for school classifications. Actual indicators applied may vary based on student demographics and grade configurations. For example, Vermont would not use English progress measures to classify schools that do not have sufficient numbers of English learners in their student population.

Source: The authors reviewed the submitted consolidated state plans of 16 states and Washington, D.C., under the Every Student Succeeds Act. See U.S. Department of Education, "ESSA State Plan Submission," available at <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html> (last accessed July 2017).

TABLE 2
Vermont timeline to identify and intervene in schools

State-level annual activities to identify low-performing schools

First cohort timeline		Second cohort timeline
2017-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collect data to identify comprehensive and targeted support schools Instruct identified schools and their districts to engage in planning for remainder of school year Review and approve applications for funding 	2020-21
2018-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify comprehensive support schools of identification* Launch district and school support system 	2021-22
2019-20	See above and Notify targeted support schools of identification	2022-23
2020-21	See above and Determine if schools met improvement targets by end of school year	2023-24

*Comprehensive support schools are identified every three years and targeted support schools are identified annually.

Source: The authors reviewed the submitted consolidated state plans of 16 states and Washington, D.C., under the Every Student Succeeds Act. See U.S. Department of Education, "ESSA State Plan Submission," available at <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html> (last accessed June 2017).

TABLE 3
Vermont school improvement funding

Grant structure and amounts

Competitive grants	TBD
Formula grants	TBD
Maximum amount, comprehensive schools	TBD
Maximum amount, targeted schools	TBD

Source: The authors reviewed the submitted consolidated state plans of 16 states and Washington, D.C., under the Every Student Succeeds Act. See U.S. Department of Education, "ESSA State Plan Submission," available at <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html> (last accessed June 2017).

TABLE 4
Vermont school identification details

Alignment with statutory requirements for school identification

School type	Outstanding issues in identification methods
Lowest performing, Title I	—
Low graduation rate	—
Chronically low-performing subgroups	—
Consistently underperforming subgroups*	—
Low-performing subgroups**	Unclear if the performance of all subgroups considered

*Vermont's consistently underperforming schools are its low-performing schools that have not improved after a year.

**Note: Absent additional guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, identification of low-performing subgroup schools must consider a school's performance among each subgroup of students in the school.

Source: The authors reviewed the submitted consolidated state plans of 16 states and Washington, D.C., under the Every Student Succeeds Act. See U.S. Department of Education, "ESSA State Plan Submission," available at <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html> (last accessed June 2017).

A selection of Vermont's key school improvement strategies

- A tiered support system that provides assistance to districts and schools aligning with the state Education Quality standards
- A state-identified menu of evidence-based practices for improvement of student outcomes
- Increased oversight of spending the longer schools remain in low-performing status

Source: The authors reviewed the submitted consolidated state plans of 16 states and Washington, D.C., under the Every Student Succeeds Act. See U.S. Department of Education, "ESSA State Plan Submission," available at <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html> (last accessed June 2017).