

**ESEA Title I:  
House Discussion Draft vs. Forum on Educational Accountability (FEA)  
Assessment and Accountability Proposals**

In general: the House draft makes some improvements, but fails to address many key problems with NCLB, coming up well short of the comprehensive overhaul FEA recommends.

**House Discussion draft**

**FEA proposals**

All proficient by 2014/AYP

Rate of Improvement (ROI) model  
(based on ROI of strong Title I schools)

Grades 3-8 + HS; read/math (r+m)

Grade spans (e.g., 3-5, 6-9, 10-12); r + m

Growth model within 2014 based on state test scores only

Growth model within ROI, would include multiple measures

Limits states that can use local assessments

No limitation on states that can use local assessments if they are technically OK

Pilot project to develop local assessments

Pilot project to develop local assessments  
- desire some changes to discussion draft

Other subjects as extra AYP credit

Multiple indicators composite index replaces current AYP model

Limited weight to extras  
(r+m = 80% or so)

More weight to extras (e.g., 50 % to r + m;  
more for other subjects)

Sanctions based on fixed factors  
(automatic responses, set menu of options)

Continuous systemic improvement model,  
interventions based on evidence, tailored to specific circumstances of each school, LEA