

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Overview



Fact Sheet 26-05 (Updates 19-02)

April 2026

ESSA Summary

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) is a federal law that outlines how states can use federal money to support public schools. Enacted in 2015, it maintains key accountability requirements introduced under the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), such as statewide assessments, but it shifts most authority for accountability systems, standards, and consequences from the federal government to the states.

ESSA aims to provide disadvantaged students with opportunities to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education. Funding is allocated to states through formula grants. Some ESSA programs can provide additional funding through competitive grants. Currently, New York State receives approximately \$1.4 billion annually from ESSA Title I, the section of the law that addresses improving academic achievement for disadvantaged students. ESSA requires states to assess and report how they provide students with equitable access to federally funded programs and mandates that districts disclose per-pupil spending for each school by funding source.

Contents

ESSA Summary	1
Accountability Systems Overview	1
Accountability Categories	2
Accountability Indicators	4
Long-Term Goals (LTG) and Measures of Interim Progress (MIP)	5
CSI and TSI Identification Process	5
Required Interventions.....	8
Participation Rates and Opt-Outs.....	10
Equitable Access Requirements.....	10
Educator Preparation and Support	11
Additional Resources.....	12
Appendix A: Implementation Timeline (2018 – 2026)	12
Appendix B: Calculating Academic Achievement (Adjustments for Opt-Outs).....	13
Appendix C: CCCR Indicators.....	15
Appendix D: LTG and MIP	16

Accountability Systems Overview

ESSA REQUIREMENT

States must develop an accountability plan that meets ESSA requirements. The U.S. Department of Education (USDE) must approve all state plans for compliance and is prohibited by law from dictating specific mandates. Stakeholders must be involved in plan development.

States must create an accountability system that:

- Measures academic achievement
- Measures progress toward long term academic goals
- Includes additional indicators regarding school quality
- Differentiates school performance annually

NEW YORK STATE’S APPROACH

The New York’s State Education Department’s (SED) updated accountability plan was approved by the U.S. Secretary of Education in January 2025. The Board of Regents (BOR) approved regulations implementing the system beginning 2025-2026. SED refers to this plan as part of the Reimagine Phase of NYS’s accountability system, and its approval ensures that NYS will continue to receive Title I Funds.

New York evaluates schools using a set of academic and school quality indicators and assigns each indicator a performance level on a 1 to 4 scale. These levels are combined through decision rules to determine a school’s accountability status.

For the Implementation Timeline (2018 – 2026) see Appendix A.

Accountability Categories

ESSA REQUIREMENT

ESSA requires that states identify schools for support based on performance. There are two main categories in federal law:

1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) Schools: schools that are among the lowest performing 5% statewide or high schools which have a graduation rate below 67%.
2. Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Schools: schools where specific subgroups (racial, special education, ELLs) of students are underperforming, even if the All Students group is not in the bottom 5%.

ESSA also requires that states

- Identify schools needing targeted support (subgroups underperforming)
- Develop improvement plans with evidence-based interventions¹

NEW YORK STATE’S APPROACH

SED adopted the CSI and TSI terminology aligned with ESSA and added state-specific rules. The frequency or support model determinations can be seen below:

Schools and Subgroups		Schools, Subgroups and Districts	Districts	
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)	Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI)	Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)	Local Support and Improvement (LSI)	Target District
Identified every three years (2025-2026; 2028-2029, etc)		Identified annually (2025-2026; 2026-2027; 2027-2028, etc)		

(Graphic credit: adapted from NYSED)

¹ Evidence-based intervention –an activity, strategy, or intervention that has met the criteria outlined in section 8101(21)(A) of ESSA by demonstrating either: a statistically significant effect on improving student or other relevant outcomes; a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student other relevant outcomes; and includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

The table below outlines how NYS places schools and districts into accountability categories with additional detail and description:

Category	Description
LSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts are identified for LSI annually when they do not have any component schools identified for CSI, ATSI, or TSI. • Schools are identified for LSI annually when they do not have any accountability subgroups, including the All Students group, identified for CSI, ATSI, or TSI. • A school identified for LSI will continue to use the systems and processes established at the local level for continuous improvement efforts. There is no change in regulatory requirements for this group of schools.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any school not identified as a CSI or TSI school but receives a Level 1 on any indicator
Target Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any district with one or more CSI or TSI school <i>or</i> • A district with one or more district-wide accountability subgroup that meets all the identification criteria
TSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any school with subgroup performance that would have led to designation as a CSI school. Not limited to 10%
ATSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A TSI school that fails to demonstrate sufficient progress • Schools that do not exit TSI status are identified for additional support • Continued lack of improvement may result in identification as CSI
CSI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest performing in the <i>All Students</i> group for both elementary/middle school and high school levels using a combined academic performance index and decision rules that identify at least the lowest 5% but could be more. • Any high school with a graduation rate lower than 67%
Receivership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term, low-performing schools are assigned a receiver and required to demonstrate measurable annual improvement, with escalating consequences if progress is not made. There are two types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified schools: Remain in receivership if re-identified as CSI under ESSA must show annual progress or face appointment of an independent receiver. • Newly identified schools: Enter after 3 consecutive years as CSI (lowest 5% or graduation rate <67%); superintendent serves as receiver for up to 2 years, after which an independent receiver may be appointed if progress is insufficient.

States are required to rate academic measures more heavily than school quality and student success measures. The methodology the state has applied evaluates each indicator separately and assigns a performance level from 1 to 4. SED then uses a series of decision rules to differentiate schools and identify those that need support. These rules give greater weight to academic indicators over school quality or student success indicators.

To see an example of this formula, see Appendix B.

For more information on Receivership, See NYSUT Fact Sheet: [School Receivership](#)

Accountability Indicators

ESSA REQUIREMENT

While states have flexibility to select specific measures, ESSA mandates that state accountability systems must:

1. Use multiple indicators of school performance;
2. Include academic indicators and at least one school quality/student success indicator;
3. Assign substantial weight to academic indicators and greater weight to them overall than to school quality/student success indicators; and
4. Use these indicators to identify schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI).

ESSA defines two required categories of indicators:

- Academic indicators, including:
 - Proficiency on state assessments (ELA and math)
 - Graduation rate (for high schools)
 - An additional academic measure for elementary/middle schools (commonly growth)
 -
- School quality/student success indicators, for which states must select at least one, such as:
 - Chronic absenteeism
 - School climate
 - College and career readiness
 - Access to advanced coursework

In addition, ESSA requires states to publicly report on other indicators, such as educator effectiveness, school conditions, and access to educational opportunities, even when they are not used to determine accountability status.

NEW YORK STATE’S APPROACH

The New York State accountability system includes both federally required indicators and additional indicators selected by the BOR. The following table provides ESSA’s required and NYS’s added indicators for immediate use:

INDICATORS	ELEMENTARY/ MIDDLE SCHOOL	HIGH SCHOOL
<i>ESSA Required Indicators</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic achievement in Grades 3-8 ELA and math assessments • English Language proficiency scores for English Language learners • 95% participation rate • Long-term and interim measures of progress goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic achievement on ELA and Math Regents Exams • High School Graduation rate of 67% across a 4-, 5-, and 6-year cohort • English Language proficiency scores for English Language learners • 95% participation rate • Long-term and interim measures of progress goals

<i>Additional Academic Indicators (Selected by BOR)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student growth in Grades 3-8 ELA and math • Science assessments in Grades 4 and 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Studies Regents Exam
<i>Additional School Quality or Student Success Indicators (Selected by BOR)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance • College, career, and civic readiness

Each indicator is converted into a performance level and combined using state decision rules to determine a school’s accountability status.

Districts are required to present state, district, and school results within 30 days of the Commissioner’s release of the reports. Districts may also include additional information beyond what is required, such as school climate survey results, student access to specific learning opportunities, and teacher turnover.

For more information on calculating Academic Achievement and adjusting for Opt-Outs, see Appendix B.

For more information on how attendance impacts performance levels, see Appendix C.

Long-Term Goals (LTG) and Measures of Interim Progress (MIP)

ESSA REQUIREMENT

States must establish long-term goals and interim progress measures for

1. Academic achievement
2. Graduation rate
3. English language proficiency

NEW YORK STATE’S APPROACH

New York State sets an LTG for each indicator that reflects the level of performance it expects schools and districts to achieve over time. MIPs establish annual benchmarks toward these goals. The current cycle sets three-year goals, with the 2028–2029 school year serving as the target year for achieving the state’s LTGs. LTGs will be established before the start of the 2029–2030 school year.

For an example of how NYS calculates a LTG and annual MIP for the Academic Achievement Index for the All Students Group in Grades 3 – 8 ELA, see Appendix D

For tables for NYS MIPS and LTGs for ELA, math, graduation rate, and English Language proficiency, see the Appendix in [Understanding the New York State Accountability System under the Every Student Succeeds Act \(ESSA\) for 2025– 2026 Accountability Statuses Based on 2024–2025 Results](#)

CSI and TSI Identification Process

ESSA REQUIREMENT

ESSA requires states to create an accountability system that identifies schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) and Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). These requirements are overseen by the USDE.

NEW YORK STATE'S APPROACH

While ESSA requires states to give greater weight to academic indicators than to school quality or student success indicators, it does not prescribe a specific methodology for doing so. SED has developed its own accountability approach that evaluates each indicator separately and assigns schools a performance level on a scale of 1 to 4. The state then applies a set of decision rules to determine how these indicator results are combined to differentiate school performance and identify schools in need of support. This approach includes separate ratings for individual indicators and uses a structured process for weighing indicators.

Process for Identifying CSI Schools

SED has identified schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) in the 2025–2026 school year based on 2024–2025 school year results and will do so every three years.

Elementary and middle schools are identified for CSI if the All Students group or an eligible accountability subgroup meets Scenario 1 or Scenario 2 in the Decision Tables at the end of this section, or Scenario 3 if necessary to ensure that at least the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools in the state are identified.

High schools are identified for CSI status if the All Students group meets the criterion in the three scenarios or if the All Students group has a four-year graduation rate below 67% and the school does not have a five-year or six-year graduation rate that is at or above 67%.

For the 2025–2026 identification cycle (based on 2024–2025 results), an elementary/middle school or high school with a subgroup identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) that does not meet the criteria to exit the ATSI support model may instead be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI). When this occurs, the school's designation changes from ATSI to CSI. The same scenarios used to identify ATSI are also used to determine whether the subgroup has met the criteria to exit ATSI.

Process for Identifying TSI Schools

SED identifies schools for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) each year based on the performance of accountability subgroups, using Scenarios 1 and 2 in the Decision Tables at the end of this section. Beginning in the 2025–2026 school year (based on 2024–2025 results), if a school's accountability subgroup meets the TSI identification criteria for three consecutive years, it will be identified for TSI.

In the first year a subgroup meets the criteria, it is identified as PTSI-1. If the same subgroup meets the criteria for a second consecutive year, it is identified as PTSI-2. If the subgroup meets the criteria for a third consecutive year, it is identified for TSI.

Subgroups identified for PTSI fall within the Local Support and Improvement (LSI) support model and are notified of their performance to support continuous improvement. Subgroups and schools identified for PTSI may exit their support model in any school year after identification.

Decision Tables

The purpose of the decision tables is to provide a structured method for determining whether a school or subgroup meets the criteria for identification under New York State’s accountability system. They translate the accountability indicators and performance levels into clear rules for identifying schools and subgroups that require additional support or intervention. Following the tables is a brief explanation of each indicator.

CSI Identification Tables

Elementary/ Middle School Identification Scenarios (CSI)					
Scenario	Weighted	Core	Student Growth	ELP	Attendance
1	Level 1	Level 1	At Least One Level 1		
2	Level 2	Level 1	Level 1	Level 1 or None	
3	Level 1	Level 1	Level 2	Either Level 2	

High School Identification Scenarios (CSI)						
Scenario	Weighted	Core	Grad Rate	ELP	Attendance	CCCR
1	Level 1	Level 1	Level 1	At Least One Level 1		
2	Level 1 or 2	Either Level 1		At Least One Level 1		
3	Level 1 or 2	Either Level 1		Level 1 or None	Level 1 or 2	

TSI Identification Tables

Elementary/ Middle School Identification Scenarios (TSI)					
Scenario	Weighted	Core	Student Growth	ELP	Attendance
1	Level 1	Level 1	At Least One Level 1		
2	Level 2	Level 1	Level 1	Level 1 or 2 or None	

High School Identification Scenarios (TSI)						
Scenario	Weighted	Core	Grad Rate	ELP	Attendance	CCCR
1	Level 1	Level 1	Level 1	At Least One Level 1		
2	Level 1 or 2	Either Level 1		At Least One Level 1		

Definitions

“None”: New York State uses an “n-size,” of 20, which is the minimum number of student results needed to measure how any group or subgroup of students is performing based on data from one year. This count is based on results from continuously enrolled students. If “None” applies, that means there are insufficient results (below 20) to assign an accountability level for a subgroup.

Weighted and Core (Weighted Academic Achievement and Core Subject Performance): These calculate levels based on student performance on state assessments in ELA, mathematics, science, and (for high schools) social studies. Results are converted into a performance index that gives partial credit for students approaching proficiency and additional credit for advanced performance. The weighted average achievement index is based on all continuously enrolled students. The core subject performance index is based on only those students who took the exam.

Student Growth: For elementary and middle schools, the state measures academic growth by comparing student progress to that of similar students statewide. SED combines and averages one year of data to calculate the mean growth percentile (MGP) to create a growth index.

Grad Rate (Graduation Rate): For high school, accountability is based on graduation rates instead of student growth. This measure is the unweighted average of the 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year cohort graduation rates. These are measured against log-term and MIP goals and converted to a Performance Index (PI²).

ELP (English Language Proficiency): All ELLs/MLLs take an English language proficiency test to determine identification and placement. SED is transitioning to WIDA assessments, with the final administration of the NYSESLAT in 2026. The Screener assessments will be implemented in Fall 2027 following the first administration of the WIDA ACCESS.

Attendance: This new attendance indicator replaces chronic absenteeism. Students in grades 1–12 enrolled for at least 30 instructional days and attending at least one day are placed into one of four levels based on their attendance percentage. Levels 1 and 2 represent chronically absent students: Level 1 is for attendance rate below 85%, and Level 2 is for 85.1–90%. Level 3 includes students attending 90.1–95% of days, and Level 4 is for attendance rate above 95%. Suspensions are not counted as absences.

CCCR (College, Career, and Civic Readiness): measures the percentage of students who demonstrate college, career, and civic readiness. This is determined using indicators such as diplomas earned, credentials, advanced course credits, and participation in career and technical education (CTE) programs, along with other similar measures.

To understand how these are converted to levels to determine school accountability status, see:

- [Appendix B: Calculating Academic Achievement](#)
- [Appendix C: CCCR Indicators](#)
- [NYSUT Fact Sheet: ESSA Local Leaders' Guide to Accountability Measures and Requirements](#)
- [Understanding the New York State Accountability System under the Every Student Succeeds Act \(ESSA\) for 2025–2026 Accountability Statuses Based on 2024–2025 Results](#)

Required Interventions

ESSA REQUIREMENT

Schools identified for improvement must implement evidence-based interventions. For Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools, ESSA requires:

- A comprehensive needs assessment
- An evidence-based improvement plan
- State review and approval of the plan

ESSA does not mandate specific intervention models, require schools to use a federal list of approved programs, require interventions to come from a specific organization or provider, or prescribe specific curricula or instructional methods. The law explicitly limits federal authority in these areas and gives states flexibility.

² Performance Index (PI) – based on measures of proficiency on state assessments, a school earns partial credit for students who are partially proficient, full credit for proficient students and extra credit for advanced students. The PI will be a number between 0-250.

NEW YORK STATE'S APPROACH

Districts are required to complete a comprehensive diagnostic needs assessment using the Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE³) along with other data. Intervention plans are developed with stakeholder involvement and progress reviews completed annually. The State's role is to assist districts with CSI schools by providing technical assistance and resources, monitoring intervention progress, and providing training. SED is less engaged with TSI schools, and districts determine the appropriate interventions in these schools.

CSI (Comprehensive Support and Improvement) Schools

Once a school is identified as a CSI School, it must take the following steps and apply the following interventions:

- Conduct a Comprehensive Diagnostic Needs Assessment and develop an improvement plan
- Obtain approval of the improvement plan from SED
- Implement at least one evidence-based intervention and associated professional development
- Permit only incoming transfers of teachers rated effective or highly effective
- Conduct a needs assessment of the school leadership team in year two if sufficient improvement is not achieved
- Administer an annual survey of parents, teachers, and students
- Implement a Student and Parent Participatory Budgeting Process (minimum \$2,000) or select an alternative method to increase parent and student engagement
- Introduce additional interventions over time if progress goals are not met

To exit CSI Status, a school must

- perform above identification thresholds for two consecutive years
- remain off the newly generated list issued every three years
- avoid re-identification as a CSI school after three years to remain out of Receivership status

TSI (Target Support and Improvement) Schools

Once a school is identified as a TSI School, it must take the following steps and apply the following interventions:

- Conduct a Comprehensive Diagnostic Needs Assessment and develop an improvement plan
- Obtain approval of the improvement plan from district (not SED)
- Implement at least one evidence-based intervention
- Administer an annual survey of parents, teachers, and students

To exit TSI Status, a school must

- Raise the performance of low-performing subgroup(s) above the levels that would trigger identification for two consecutive years
- Avoid identification for any new subgroup

³ Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness (DTSDE) – evaluation tool used by the state to identify areas for improvement.

Participation Rates and Opt-Outs

ESSA REQUIREMENT

ESSA maintains the ESEA requirement that 95% of students participate in federally required assessments and participation rates must be reported for all accountability subgroups in every school. States must include all students in academic achievement calculations, regardless of whether they took the test.

ESSA does not prescribe how participation data must be used in state accountability systems and the USDE is prohibited from requiring states to take specific actions related to participation rates. ESSA requires districts to inform parents and guardians of assessment policies, including provisions related to opting out, where permitted under state or local policy.

NEW YORK STATE'S APPROACH

Schools with high opt-out rates may receive lower performance ratings under NYS's identification method. The Composite Performance Index (elementary/middle level) includes Academic Progress (all students, including non-testers) and Core Performance (only tested students). The Academic Progress Index is based solely on Academic Achievement (all students).

Districts that persistently and substantially fail to meet participation thresholds must:

- Submit a corrective action plan
- Implement escalating interventions if participation does not improve
- Establish a committee (including teaching and support staff) to develop the plan. Beginning with the third year of a corrective action plan, only half of the staff members can be selected by the bargaining unit.

ESSA allows parents to opt their children out of certain activities only if state or local law permits it; it does not require districts to offer this option. Since New York law does not address opt-out rights, districts are not required to inform parents about the option.

Equitable Access Requirements

ESSA REQUIREMENT

States must assess and report equitable access to federally funded programs. States are required to annually report measures of financial and teacher equity.

States must report per-pupil expenditures for each district and school and these reports must:

- Disaggregate by funding source (federal, state, local)
- Include both personnel and non-personnel expenditures
-

States must report the rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective teachers, out-of-field teachers, and inexperienced teachers. These rates must be compared to non-low-income, non-minority students.

ESSA allows states to define "effective teacher" and prohibits the USDE from mandating a specific evaluation system or requiring student performance measures in teacher evaluations.

NEW YORK STATE’S APPROACH

Districts must report per-pupil expenditures for the district and each school building. The report must include the funding source (federal, state, or local). It must include personnel and non-personnel expenditures.

The state must report the rate of assignments of minority and low-income students to ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers in Title I schools compared to non-low-income, non-minority students in non-Title I schools at the district level. SED also collects and reports data on teacher and principal turnover/retention, absences, tenure status, and demographics.

New York State does not create a separate ESSA-specific definition of an “effective teacher.” Instead, it relies on its existing evaluation system under Education Law §3012-d (APPR), transitioning to the STEPS program, for teacher evaluation.

New York applies the following definitions:

- Out-of-field teacher: a teacher without certification in the content area they teach
- Inexperienced teacher: a teacher with three or fewer years of experience

Educator Preparation and Support

ESSA REQUIREMENTS

Title II focuses on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals.

- ESSA expands protections for collective bargaining, extending explicit protections (previously under Title I in ESEA) to Title II.
- States and districts may not be required to implement provisions that conflict with locally negotiated collective bargaining agreements.
- ESSA maintains paraprofessional qualification requirements established under prior law.

NEW YORK STATE’S APPROACH

New York continues to implement its existing teacher and school leader certification and licensure system, which includes:

- Completion of a state-approved preparation program
- Recommendation from a preparation program
- Passing required certification exams
- Completion of Dignity for All Students Act (DASA) training
- Fingerprint clearance

New York applies ESSA requirements in a manner consistent with existing collective bargaining agreements, as required under federal law.

The state continues to enforce paraprofessional certification requirements aligned with ESSA provisions carried forward from prior law.

Additional Resources

- SED ESSA Webpage - <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/essa.html>
- SED Accountability Resources - School and District Accountability Resources and Data | New York State Education Department
- Full Text of the Federal Law - [PUBL095.PS](#)
- USDE Resources - [Every Student Succeeds Act \(ESSA\) | U.S. Department of Education](#)
- SED Educator Diversity Report: <https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/programs/educator-quality/educator-diversity-report-december-2019.pdf>
- Fact Sheet - ESSA Local Leader Guide to Accountability Measures and Requirements <https://www.nysut.org/resources/all-listing/research/fact-sheets/essa-local-leader-guide-to-accountability>

Appendix A: Implementation Timeline (2018 – 2026)

- 2018-19: NYS lowest performing schools are identified using the 2017-18 school year results.
- 2019-2020: USDE grants accountability waivers that provide flexibility for state tests, pausing the system due to the COVID pandemic.
- 2020-2021: The accountability flexibility status remains in place.
- 2021-2022: SED's waiver request seeking flexibility from federal accountability requirements is denied by USDE. SED begins developing plans for the Restart of the accountability system.
- 2022-2023: SED Restarts the accountability system using the 2021-2022 school year results.
- 2023-2024: SED institutes *Rebuild Year 1* using 2022-2023 school year results to calculate indicators.
- 2024-2025: SED institutes *Rebuild Year 2* using 2023-2024 school year results to calculate indicators.
- 2025-2026 and Beyond: SED institutes *Reimagine* using 2024-2025 school year results to calculate indicators.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the USDE approved a two-year pause in accountability determinations for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 school years. The accountability system restarted in the 2022-23 school year based on 2021-22 school year results.

Appendix B: Calculating Academic Achievement (Adjustments for Opt-Outs)

The State calculates a Performance Index (PI) for achievement on State ELA, mathematics, and science assessments using two measures:

1. Weighted Academic Achievement Index – based on all continuously enrolled students.
2. Core Subject Performance Index – based only on students who take the assessments.

These two measures are combined to create the Composite Performance Index, which serves as the Academic Achievement Indicator.

Below are the steps to determine the Academic Achievement Indicator

STEP 1. CALCULATE THE PERFORMANCE INDEX (PI)

Student scale scores are first converted into performance levels. Each level receives a different weight when calculating the PI.

Level	Proficiency	Credit
1	Basic	None
2	Basic Proficient	Partial
3	Proficient	Full
4	Advanced	Extra

The PI for each school is calculated based on the number of students at each level. The index ranges from 0 – 250. For example, if all students are proficient (Level 3) and none are advanced, the school would have a PI of 200. A PI is calculated for each accountability subgroup.

Formula to Calculate the Weighted Academic Achievement Index	Formula to Calculate the Core Subject Performance Index
(# students at Level 2) + (# students at Level 3 X 2) + (# students at Level 4 X 2.5) -----divided by----- The greater of either: (a) # of continuously enrolled students who are tested (b) 95% of continuously enrolled students <i>with or without test scores</i> -----and then multiplied by----- 100	(# students at Level 2) + (# students at Level 3 X 2) + (# students at Level 4 X 2.5) -----divided by----- The greater of either: (a) # of continuously enrolled students who are tested -----and then multiplied by----- 100

STEP 2. CONVERT INDEX SCORES TO PERFORMANCE LEVELS

Schools are ranked by combining the ELA, math, and science Performance Indices. Rankings are converted into performance levels based on percentile ranking.

This process is conducted separately for

- Weighted Academic Achievement Index
- Core Subject Performance Index
- Each accountability subgroup

Percentile Rank	Level
10% or less	1
10.1 – 50%	2
50.1% - 75%	3
Greater than 75%	4

STEP 3. COMBINE THE TWO PERFORMANCE LEVELS

The Weighted Academic Achievement Level and the Core Subject Performance Index Level are added together to create a Composite Performance Level ranging from 1 – 8. In this example, Schools A and B have the same Composite Performance Level.

School	Weighted (Academic) Achievement Level	Core (Subject) Performance Level	Composite Performance Level
A	2	2	4
B	3	1	4
C	2	3	5
D	4	4	8

STEP 4. DETERMINE FINAL SCHOOL RANKING

If two schools have the same Composite Performance Level, the higher of the two index measures is used to determine the final ranking.

School	Weighted Index	Core Index	Higher Rank	Composite Level	Final Rank
A	1,100	1,100	1,100	4	1,099
B	1,150	1,150	1,150	4	1,120
C	1,190	1,250	1,259	5	1,220
D	2,600	2,600	2,600	8	2,625

For purposes of this process, higher ranking numbers indicate better performing schools.

In this example, Schools A and B have the same Composite Performance Level. School B receives the higher ranking because its higher index score (1,150) exceeds School A's 1,100.

STEP 5. ASSIGN COMPOSITE PERFORMANCE ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS

All schools are ranked based on their Final Rank and converted to a Composite Performance Achievement Level based on their percentile ranking. For example:

School	Final Rank	Percentile	Composite Performance Achievement Level
A	1,099	34.5	2
B	1,120	41.0	2
C	1,220	52.0	3
D	2,625	82.5	4

Appendix C: CCCR Indicators

CCCR measures the percentage of students who demonstrate college, career, and civic readiness. This is determined using indicators such as diplomas earned, credentials, advanced course credits, and participation in career and technical education (CTE) programs, along with other similar measures. These indicators are weighted differently, meaning some contribute more to the overall measure than others.

Weight	CCR Readiness Measure
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation • Regents or Local Diploma with CTE Endorsement • Cohort Regents Diploma with Seal of Biliteracy • Annual Regents Diploma with Seal of Biliteracy • Regents Diploma and score of 3 or higher on an AP exam • Regents Diploma and score of 4 or higher on IB exam • P-Tech and Regents Diploma Requirements • Regents Diploma with Smart Scholars • Regents Diploma with Smart Transfer Early College • Regents Diploma with Seal of Civic Readiness • Regents Diploma and high school credit through participation in dual enrollment (in high school and accredited college) course • Skills and Achievement Commencement Credential with an average score of 4 on the New York State Alternate Assessment Examinations (NYSAA) in language arts, mathematics, and science
1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regents Diploma and high school credit earned through participation in an AP or IB course. • Regents Diploma with CDOS Credential • Skills and Achievement Commencement Credential with an average score of 3 on the New York State Alternate Assessment Examinations (NYSAA) in language arts, mathematics, and science.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regents Diploma • Local Diploma • Skills and Achievement Commencement Credential with an average score of 2 on the New York State Alternate Assessment Examinations (NYSAA) in language arts, mathematics, and science.
.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High School Equivalency Diploma¹² • CDOS Credential
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No High School or High School Equivalency Diploma

Appendix D: LTG and MIP

The example below shows how New York calculates a LTG and annual MIPs for the Academic Achievement Index for the All Students group in Grades 3–8 ELA.

Measure	Value	Explanation
End Goal (LTG)	200 points	Determined by NYS
Example School Baseline Performance (2022-2023)	120.1 points	Example; this is likely different across schools
Gap Between Baseline and End Goal	79.9 points	End Goal – Baseline Performance (200 – 120.1)
Long-Term Goal (20% of the Gap Closed)	136.1 points	20% of the Gap is 16 points (79.9 X 0.20), which is added to the Baseline Performance
Target Year for Long-Term Goal	2028 - 2029	NA

The following table shows how a district arrives at the MIP using the LTG data

Measure	Value	Explanation
Annual Progress Target	3.2 points per year	3.2 comes from dividing the total improvement needed to reach the long-term goal by the number of years in the goal period (16 points /5 years)
First MIP (2024 – 2025)	123.1 points	120.1 + 3.2 (The example baseline performance + the annual progress target)
Threshold to Exceed the Long-Term Goal (2024 – 2025)	168 points	The threshold is set at LTG (136.1 pts) + 50% of the remaining gap to the end goal (1/2 of 63.9, derived from LTG 200 – 136.1)