GPS

INDICATORS
FRAMEWORK

GPS

INDICATORS FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

This chart is designed to give educators, policymakers, and advocates a framework to evaluate how well states, districts, and schools address areas critical to student success. The chart is designed similarly to a logic model—allowing states and districts to visualize the resources, policies, and practices fundamental to achieving student success.

BACKGROUND

In 2008, the National Education Association (NEA) renewed its commitment to advocate for a "great public school" for every student. Shortly thereafter, the NEA launched the Great Public Schools (GPS) Indicators Project. The primary goal of the GPS Indicators Project was to highlight the strengths and weaknesses in states' and districts' support of public schools. The project's objectives were to develop criteria in seven critical areas (i.e., characteristics or qualities of public schools, staff, and students); identify appropriate ways to measure the key criteria; and report on the status of these indicators in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

In 2010-2011, the GPS Indicators Project—with the assistance of an independent advisory panel consisting of leading researchers—developed an initial framework of indicators that would serve as a basis for analyzing resources, policies, practices, outputs, and outcomes related to the GPS criteria. The indicators are the result of more than three years of research and collaboration. The final product is seven criteria, 31 subcriteria, and more than 300 research- and evidence-based indicators at the state, district, and school levels.

HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE

The seven criteria—the components that are critical to any valid evaluation—are listed on the top row of the chart. The criteria are: 1) School Readiness; 2) Standards and Curriculum; 3) Conditions of Teaching and Learning; 4) Workforce Quality; 5) Accountability and Assessments; 6) Family and Community Engagement; and 7) School Funding.

In the row below the GPS criteria, you will find several subcriteria listed—for example, Appropriate Student Assessments—each corresponding to a single GPS criterion. These subcriteria represent the elements integral to closing opportunity and learning gaps and preparing students for the future with 21st-century skills. The subcriteria are followed by the indicators that determine the extent to which states, districts, and schools address the GPS subcriteria.

The indicators are grouped by **Resources; Policies and Practices; and Outputs and Outcomes**. **Resources** refer to the human capital, technical assistance, and funding that are needed to achieve outcomes. **Policies and Practices** are the policies and practices that need to be implemented to achieve outcomes. **Outputs**, such as percentage of eligible students enrolled in state-funded Early Head Start, are a result of the resources invested and the policies and practices implemented. **Outcomes** are the changes in knowledge, skills, and/or behavior we expect to see as a result of the outputs, such as percentage of students demonstrating readiness at kindergarten entry.

NOTE: This chart is a living document; the categories and descriptions you see here may change as advances in research are made. The NEA has provided policy materials to accompany and support our advocacy work for all children, including those in poverty, students with disabilities, and English language learners.

GREAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS CRITERIA

It is incumbent upon states and districts to collect and publicly report on the measures listed within the framework and disaggregate the data by student subgroups.* Indicators data can be used to pinpoint areas of strength and weakness and better enable stakeholders to implement legislative and practice changes at the state, district, and school levels, turning every school into a great public school.

All students have a basic right to a great public school. The framework is NEA's vision of what great public schools need and should provide. NEA's vision acknowledges that the changing global society requires a change in the criteria to prepare all students for the future. Meeting the GPS criteria requires not only the continued commitment of all educators, families, and community stakeholders but also the concerted efforts of policymakers at all levels of government. We believe these criteria will produce the following outcomes:

- Students prepared for the future with 21st-century skills;
- Engaged students and an enthusiasm for learning;
- Reduction of opportunity and learning gaps; and
- Educators equipped with the skills, resources, and tools they need to get the job done.

These criteria form the basis for the NEA's priorities in all legislation, including successive reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and they are the foundation of related resources, including the NEA Opportunity Checklist and NEA Opportunity Audit. For more information, please visit **nea.org/gpsindicators**.

NOTE: These criteria are taken from the NEA's Positive Agenda for ESEA Reauthorization, adopted July 2006.

*Student subgroups include race, ethnicity, gender, disability, English language learners, socioeconomic status, and temporary housing.

Quality programs and services that meet the full range of all children's needs so that they come to school every day ready and able to learn.

High expectations and standards with a rigorous and comprehensive curriculum for all students.

Quality conditions for teaching and lifelong learning.

A qualified, caring, diverse, and stable workforce.

Shared responsibility for appropriate school accountability by stakeholders at all levels.

Parental, family, and community involvement and engagement.

Sufficient, equitable, and sustainable funding.

CRITERIA		School Readiness				
SUB-CRITERIA		**ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY EARLY CHILDHOOD**	**MANDATORY FULL-DAY KINDERGARTEN ATTENDANCE**	**EDUCATOR PREPARATION AND EFFECTIVENESS**	**COMPREHENSIVE SCREENING AND FOLLOW-UP**	**TRANSITIONAL ALIGNMENT**
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State subsidizes Early Head Start and Head Start. State funds pre-kindergarten (preK).	State funds full-day kindergarten, at minimum, at the same level as grades 1–12.	State provides funding for professional learning and technical assistance to state-funded preK programs. State provides financial support for teachers seeking certification in early childhood education and development. State provides financial support for educators seeking a Child Development Associate (CDA) credential or equivalent. State compensates teachers certified in early childhood education and development on the same pay scale as comparably educated K–12 teachers.	State applies the broadest possible enrollment and reimbursement criteria for in-school Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Medicaid programs. State ensures the broadest possible enrollment for eligible children in CHIP and Medicaid. State and/or district pays for school-based health workforce, including nurses and counselors.	State provides funding for transition activities. State-subsidized early learning programs receive funds for joint professional learning activities for child care providers as well as preK and kindergarten teachers.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State has comprehensive, aligned, and culturally responsive early learning and development standards. State policy prohibits the use of expulsion, suspension, and other exclusionary discipline practices in publicly funded early childhood programs. State implements a Continuous Quality Improvement System (CQIS). Data on classroom quality is systemically collected on an annual basis, and local programs and the state both use information from the CQIS to improve policy or practice. Districts offer early education services for the home (e.g., home visitation, early literacy, prenatal, social services).	State requires that districts provide full-day, five-day/week kindergarten. State requires mandatory attendance for all eligible students. Districts provide full-day, five-day/week kindergarten.	State policy has standards for preparation of early childhood educators. State monitors the credentials, licenses, and certification of all early childhood educators. State monitors the credentials, licenses, and certification of all preK–grade 3 educators.	State has implemented streamlined procedures to facilitate enrollment in CHIP and Medicaid. State requires that all school-age children are appropriately immunized before entering school. State requires that all school-age children undergo developmental and comprehensive child health screenings (e.g., ear, oral, vision).	State-subsidized early learning programs are required to implement early childhood curricula that are aligned with state preK–grade 3 early learning standards. State has a policy outlining transition from early learning programs to elementary schools. State-funded preK programs implement early childhood curricula aligned with state preK–grade 3 early learning standards. Districts conduct transition activities for preK students and their families. Districts provide transition information to preK students and their families. Districts provide joint professional learning activities for child care providers as well as preK and kindergarten teachers.
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	Percentage of eligible students enrolled in state-funded Early Head Start. Percentage of eligible students enrolled in state-funded Head Start. Percentage of eligible students enrolled in preK. Percentage of families that spend no more than 10 percent of the regional median family income on quality care. Percentage of students demonstrating readiness at kindergarten entry. Percentage of eligible students age 0–3 enrolled in an early intervention program.	Percentage of eligible students in full-day, five-day/week kindergarten.	Percentage of teachers of state-funded preK with a bachelor's degree or higher. Percentage of kindergarten teachers licensed and/or certified in early childhood education and development. Percentage of paraeducators of state-funded preK or kindergarten with a CDA or equivalent.	Percentage of eligible children enrolled in CHIP and Medicaid. Percentage of children who have undergone developmental and comprehensive child health screenings. Percentage of children age 0–8 who have received all required immunizations. Number and type of in-school health workers.	Percentage of kindergarten teachers surveyed indicating alignment between early learning programs and kindergarten. Percentage of parents surveyed who received transition information from their district.

Standards and Curriculum

CRITERIA		INTEGRATED AND CONTINUOUS CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	COMPREHENSIVE CURRICULUM CONTENT	APPROPRIATE INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES	ACCOMMODATION AND DIFFERENTIATION
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State provides high-quality resources that are aligned with standards and curriculum. Resources may include textbooks, workbooks, technology, and supplies. Districts provide resources to help educators understand and apply content standards. Resources may include funding for professional learning.	State provides funding to implement rigorous courses aligned with college- and career-ready standards for all districts.* State provides funding to ensure curricular content is inclusive of students of every ability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, and gender identity. State provides funding to implement career preparatory courses in math and science.** State provides funding to increase enrollment of historically underrepresented students in advanced courses. State provides funding to all districts for fine arts education. State provides funding to all districts for physical education. *Rigorous courses may include dual enrollment, Honors, Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and career and technical education (CTE) certification. **College preparatory courses are Algebra 1, Algebra 2, Geometry, Trigonometry, Calculus, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics.	State provides funding for job-embedded professional learning opportunities to help educators improve their instructional repertoire.	State provides funding for accommodations and differentiations in curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State policy requires educator involvement in developing content standards and curriculum guidelines. State has an autonomous curriculum review board with a majority of active preK–12 educators. State policy requires educator involvement in developing implementation plans for standards and curriculum. State developed a plan to solicit feedback from classroom teachers and adjust curriculum guidelines and resources accordingly. State policy mandates alignment among content standards, curriculum, resources, and assessments. Schools include educators in curriculum design. Schools include educators in implementation plan development for standards and curriculum.	State developed a policy that requires alignment between curricular content and rigorous standards and is inclusive of every ability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, and gender identity. Schools implement practices (e.g., universal screening, open enrollment, universal enrollment) that increase enrollment of historically underrepresented students in advanced courses. State policy recognizes the value of fine arts in curricula. State policy recognizes physical education as a core subject. Schools align curriculum content to rigorous standards that is inclusive of students of every ability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, and gender identity. Schools implement an anti-racist curriculum. Schools implement the Welcoming Schools program founded by the Human Rights Campaign. Schools implement the National Association of Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) standards for physical education.* Schools use the community as a contextualized learning environment.** *NASPE recommends 150 minutes of instructional physical education for elementary school students and 225 minutes for middle and high school students per week for the entire school year. **Connect education to community through public libraries, zoos, parks, work experience opportunities, service learning, the school library, and after-school programs.	Districts align professional learning with standards, curriculum, and assessments. Districts support regular, job-embedded professional learning opportunities.	State developed a policy that requires equitable accommodations and differentiations in curriculum, instruction, and assessment to meet the range of students' needs. Districts provide job-embedded professional learning to help educators provide accommodations to meet the range of students' needs. Schools implement Response to Intervention (RTI). Schools implement Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Schools implement Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports/Positive Behavior Supports (PBIS/PBS).
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	Percentage of educators surveyed indicating alignment among standards, curriculum, resources, and assessments. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating access to sufficient curriculum resources.	Percentage of students surveyed who agree the curriculum is inclusive of students of every ability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, and gender identity. Percentage of historically underrepresented students enrolled in the Gifted and Talented education program. Percentage of historically underrepresented students enrolled in at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course. Percentage of historically underrepresented students who have completed all college preparatory courses in math and science. Percentage of students enrolled in a fine arts course. Percentage of students enrolled in a physical education course that meets NASPE standards. Percentage of students participating in service learning and/or an after-school program. Percentage of students indicating they agree that the school curriculum is inclusive of all students.	Percentage of educators surveyed indicating alignment among professional learning, standards, curriculum, and assessments. Percentage of educators who participated in job-embedded professional learning opportunities in the previous year.	Percentage of teachers with at least eight hours of professional learning on analyzing student data to differentiate instruction for students with disabilities, as needed. Percentage of teachers with at least eight hours of professional learning on analyzing student data to differentiate instruction for students with limited English proficiency. Percentage of teachers with at least eight hours of professional learning on analyzing student data to differentiate instruction for students with gifts and talents. Percentage of teachers trained in PBIS/PBS.

Conditions of Teaching and Learning

		GUIDANCE AND SUPPORTS FOR INSTRUCTION	GUIDANCE AND SUPPORTS FOR LEARNING	EDUCATOR VOICE IN ACCOUNTABILITY	POSITIVE CLASSROOM ECOLOGY	POSITIVE SCHOOL ECOLOGY
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State provides resources for planning, instructional support, and collaboration.* Districts provide resources to guarantee dedicated time for teacher teams to plan and review student data to improve instructional results. Districts provide funding for educators to access professional learning that addresses new education research and technology that will help improve instruction or support for students. *Instructional support and collaboration may include professional learning communities, professional learning teams, lesson study, cohort learning, mentoring, and induction.	State allocates funding toward comprehensive school guidance systems with standards and benchmarks that address the social and academic needs of all students. Districts provide a favorable student-to-specialized instructional support personnel (SISP) ratio.* Districts provide adequate resources for SISP to collaborate with teachers, education support professionals (ESPs), parents, and students. *Optimal ratios include: school counselors–250:1; school nurses–750:1; school psychologists–500–700:1; school social workers–250:1.	Districts dedicate resources toward lifting and amplifying educator voice (e.g., dedicate funds to engagement). Districts dedicate funding to support educator engagement with educator leadership organizations and learning networks. Districts dedicate resources to design professional learning that supports educator leadership and teacher agency.	The state allocates funding to class size reduction. Districts allocate funds to advance educators' competence in culturally responsive pedagogy. Districts allocate funds to advance educators' awareness of implicit bias. Districts allocate funds to advance educators' understanding of trauma-informed practices. Districts allocate funds to advance educators' understanding of equity and racial and social justice.	Districts allocate funds to ensure schools are inclusive of students of every ability, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender, and gender identity. Districts allocate resources toward interventions around student safety issues (e.g., LGBTQ+ bullying and harassment). Districts allocate resources toward restorative practices. Districts allocate resources to a workforce wellness and safety program, ensuring educators of color and LGBTQ+ educators feel safe and cared for in their schools.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State policy supports regular job-embedded planning, instructional support, and collaboration. State requires districts to obtain educator input on instructional minutes. Districts implement scheduled job-embedded planning, instructional support, and collaborative time. Districts maintain and support a professional library of current education publications for staff, including publications specific to teaching and engaging Native students and students of color. Districts survey educators on teaching and learning conditions. Districts obtain educator input on instructional minutes. Districts use a variety of student, educator, and system data to plan, assess, and evaluate professional learning. Districts integrate theories, research, and models of human learning into the planning and design of professional learning.	State developed a policy that requires supports for students' social, emotional, and physical well-being. Districts implement and track guidance standards and benchmarks for all students. Districts have outreach plans for underserved student populations.* Eligible schools are enrolled in free and reduced-price school breakfast and lunch programs. Districts provide extended learning opportunities for students.** Districts provide SISP with adequate time to collaborate with teachers and ESPs. *Outreach may include peer support programs, mentors, and full-time specialized SISP. **Before- and after-school programs, academic enrichment, mentoring, tutoring, and programs that extend the school day or school year for students in need of such services.	State has an autonomous standards board, the majority of whom are active PreK–12 educators and are ethnically and racially representative of the student body. State requires that all planning and decision-making bodies related to the educator profession include active preK–12 educators. Districts provide formal opportunities for educators to participate in district policy setting (e.g., accountability systems, hiring and evaluation of administrators). *Standards board jurisdiction includes teacher licensing, teacher preparation program approval, and professional learning approval.	State policy mandates class size limits based on subject matter and grade level. State developed a comprehensive culturally responsive teaching policy, covering equity and racial and social justice, to increase educators' cultural and linguistic competence through pre-service education, licensure, and ongoing professional learning. Districts have class size limits on subject matter and grade level. Districts dedicate professional learning time to culturally responsive pedagogy. Districts dedicate professional learning time to implicit bias. Districts dedicate professional learning time to trauma-informed practices. Districts dedicate professional learning time to equity and racial and social justice.	State developed a policy that requires annual reporting by school on school climate and student engagement. State policy requires schools to collect and publicly report demographic data recording behavior and behavioral interventions leading to disciplinary exclusion from school.* Districts educate all school personnel on intervention techniques in incidents of student bullying and harassment, such as restorative practices and Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS). Schools offer alternatives to traditional behavioral interventions, such as restorative practices. Schools annually report on school climate and student engagement. Schools have data-driven, site-based school climate and student engagement plans. Schools collect and publicly report demographic data recording behavior and behavioral interventions leading to disciplinary exclusion from school. Schools report disaggregated data on incidents of student bullying on a daily or weekly basis. *These disciplinary actions include in-school/out-of-school suspensions, expulsions, arrests, and referrals to law enforcement.
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with the time dedicated to planning. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with instructional time. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with collaborative time. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with professional learning time and opportunities. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with guidance and supports for instruction.	Percentage of students meeting benchmarks. Percentage of students surveyed indicating they feel supported in their school. Percentage of eligible students who participate in a peer support program, are part of a mentoring program, and/or regularly visited by SISP. Percentage of eligible students enrolled in free and reduced-price school breakfast and lunch programs. Percentage of eligible students enrolled in an extended learning opportunity. Percentage of SISP surveyed indicating satisfaction with time dedicated toward collaboration.	Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with the number of opportunities to participate in school policy setting. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with the number of opportunities to participate in district policy setting. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with the number of formal teacher leadership opportunities.	Percentage of students surveyed indicating satisfaction with the amount of one-on-one time they receive from their teacher. Percentage of teachers who have received professional development in culturally responsive pedagogy. Percentage of teachers who have received professional learning time in implicit bias. Precentage of teachers who have received professional learning time in trauma-related practices. Percentage of teachers who have received professional learning time in equity and racial and social justice. Percentage of students surveyed indicating they feel listened to and understood by their educators.	Percentage of students subjected to disciplinary action in the past year. Percentage of students indicating they feel safe and cared for at their school. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating they feel safe and cared for at their school. Percentage of students with less than 10 absences in a school year (or less than 5 percent of the school year). Percentage of public school employees in each job category who have received in-service training on intervention techniques, such as restorative practices.

CRITERIA		Workforce Quality				
SUB-CRITERIA		**HIGH-QUALITY EDUCATOR PREPARATION AND LICENSURE**	**LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND STABILITY**	**EDUCATOR QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS**	**EDUCATOR RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION**	**INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS (ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL)**
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State provides funding for preparation programs to establish residency programs with local school districts. State provides funding for induction programs. State provides resources to grow preparation programs in minority-serving institutions.	State provides funding for educator and school leadership programs. State policy provides resources to complete voluntary national certification and endorsements that promote teacher leadership opportunities.	State provides funding for "peer assistance" and "peer assistance and review" (PAR) teams.	State provides funding and technical assistance to strengthen professional learning in areas with high concentrations of poverty, Native students, and students of color, with emphasis on mentoring, implicit bias, and cultural competency. Districts provide extra resources and assistance for those educators in hard-to-staff schools.	State and/or district contributions for health coverage increase at least enough to keep up with health care inflation. State or district provides access to affordable, quality health insurance for education employees and their families. Districts offer financial incentives for teachers to earn National Board certification. Districts offer incentives for teachers to take on differentiated or hybrid roles. Districts offer teachers starting salaries comparable to other professionals with similar skills, knowledge, and education as well as ESPs at least a minimum wage. Districts offer financial incentives for educators working in hard-to-staff schools.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State developed a policy to use Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards to accredit/approve educator preparation programs and license educators. Districts mandate successful completion of a residency program prior to obtaining initial licensure. Districts developed selection criteria to identify cooperating teachers. Districts provide training for cooperating teachers. Districts partner with teacher preparation programs on teacher residencies and induction. Preparation programs require school-based experiences beyond a semester of student teaching. Preparation programs use pre-service performance assessments to determine candidate preparedness prior to program completion and/or initial licensure. Preparation programs survey graduates about their preparedness to serve as the teacher-of-record and report their response rates. Preparation programs work with local school districts to recruit high-achieving high school graduates to pursue careers in education.	State policy includes a state-level endorsement/certificate for teacher leaders. State policy codifies the Teacher Leadership Competencies and/or other standards for teacher leadership. State policy promotes ongoing professional learning and support for principals. State policy codifies principal retention. Districts provide teacher leadership development. Districts have differentiated pay structures for clearly defined roles and responsibilities that account for hybrid/varied educator roles within a school. Districts use multiple measures to evaluate administrators and school leaders. Districts provide ongoing professional learning and support to administrators, including training in equity and racial and social justice to better support Native educators and students as well as educators and students of color.	State policy mandates multi-professional collaboration on educator support and evaluation systems staffed by active preK–12 educators. State policy requires that evaluations be based on multiple measures of performance to determine effectiveness.* State policy requires school districts to track the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders.** Districts design, monitor, and implement evaluation systems based on state framework in partnership with educators and their associations. Districts use performance evaluations employing multiple measures. Districts use evaluations aligned with induction. Districts provide educators with targeted support based on formative and summative evaluation results. Districts provide "peer assistance" or "peer assistance and review" (PAR) teams. Districts track the distribution of effective teachers and leaders. *Measures may include classroom observations, portfolios, leadership roles, and professional learning. **Teachers with full licensure and rated effective in their positions according to multiple measures of performance.	State policy supports recruitment of promising future educators, including underrepresented populations. State tracks educator shortages. Districts have plans to recruit educators from underrepresented populations, such as Native People and People of Color. Districts have plans to recruit educators for shortage areas, such as special education and second language acquisition. Districts have plans to recruit and retain accomplished educators. Districts have professional learning plans, including induction and mentoring, for teachers, ESPs, and SISP. Districts begin cultivation and recruitment a year prior to the present school year.	State law permits educators to bargain length of day/year. State law permits educators to bargain preparation periods. State law permits educators to bargain class load/size. State law permits educators to bargain dues deduction. Public education employees are represented by unions with collective bargaining rights. Local bargaining agreements include procedures for dispute resolution. Local bargaining agreements provide guaranteed and adequate defined benefit plans for all education employees.* Districts use the NEA professional growth salary framework. *Plans must be funded in a manner that assures the long-term security of the plan, provides at least 75 percent salary replacement income, and provides cost-of-living adjustments that are added to the base and in line with the rate of inflation.
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	Percentage of teachers that have passed a pre-service performance assessment prior to obtaining their initial license. Percentage of preparation program graduates surveyed indicating satisfaction with their preparedness to serve as the teacher-of-record. Percentage of licensed teachers that have successfully completed both a teacher residency program before becoming the teacher-of-record and induction program within the first three years of teaching.	Percentage of teacher leaders with a leadership endorsement/certificate. Percentage of teacher leaders who occupy hybrid roles. Percentage of principals who remain in school/district leadership for more than seven years. Percentage of teacher leaders rated effective based on multiple measures of performance.* Percentage of administrators rated effective based on multiple measures of performance. *Measures may include classroom observations, portfolios, leadership roles, and professional learning.	Percentage of teachers rated effective based on multiple measures of performance.	Presence of an educator shortage. Percentage of teachers teaching out of field. Percentage of teachers who leave the profession after five years.	Percentage of teachers surveyed indicating satisfaction with the terms of employment. Percentage of teachers surveyed indicating satisfaction with the conditions of employment. Percentage of teachers with National Board certification.

Accountability and Assessments

CRITERIA		APPROPRIATE STUDENT ASSESSMENTS	POSITIVE ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES	ADEQUATE SCHOOL CAPACITY	SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State allocates funding toward the development of a valid student assessment system. State created a commission to examine the racial bias in standardized testing and put forth recommendations.	State allocates funding to programs to ensure positive achievement outcomes for all students, including strategies to reduce opportunity and learning gaps. State funds dropout prevention with special focus on Native students and students of color.	Districts provide resources and funding for job-embedded professional learning for teachers to become proficient users of formative and summative assessment data.	State provides sufficient supports to all schools so that they perform well across multiple measures of school quality and student success. State offers additional support to schools identified for improvement.* *Support includes needs assessments, on-site evaluations, assistance and training in data analysis, additional funding for the school improvement planning process, professional learning, school support teams, and additional student resources.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State developed a policy that requires the use of both formative and summative student assessments that adhere to the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). State developed a policy that requires educators to be involved in assessment design and development. State policy requires that assessment systems employ multiple measures of student growth.* Districts use both formative and summative student assessments that adhere to the principles of UDL. Districts involve educators in assessment design and development. District assessment systems employ multiple measures of student growth. *Measures of student growth may include pre- and post-tests, percent change in GPA, group work or presentations, end-of-course papers or portfolios, and project-based inquiry activities.	State has policies and programs to prevent dropouts among Native students and students of color. State has policies and programs to increase the number of students who graduate and are college- and career-ready. Districts offer programs with 21st-century interdisciplinary themes (e.g., global and financial literacy).	State requires that districts provide resources and job-embedded professional learning for teachers to become proficient users of formative and summative assessment data. State has a comprehensive, aligned, and integrated information management system that enables districts and schools to analyze, evaluate, and continuously improve student, educator, and school performance.* Districts train school personnel to interpret data system results to inform and improve instruction and identify needed supports. Districts routinely produce monthly data reports on multiple measures of student performance by class and subject. Districts release assessment results in time to inform learning. *A comprehensive system must include multiple measures of student, educator, and school performance.	State accountability system holds schools accountable for multiple measures of school quality and student success.* State collaborates with educators to develop school performance indicators. State monitors results. Districts engage educators, families, and students in the school improvement process. *Multiple measures may include chronic absenteeism, school climate, and access to advanced and rigorous courses.
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	Percentage of teachers surveyed indicating assessments adhere to the principles of UDL. Percentage of teachers surveyed indicating satisfaction with the quality of student assessments. Percentage of teachers indicating satisfaction with the sources used to measure student growth.	Percentage of students proficient in literacy in grade 3. Percentage of students passing Algebra 1 in grades 7 and 8. Percentage of students at or above a 3.0 GPA. Percentage of students receiving a score of 3 or above on an AP exam. Percentage of students who took the SAT or ACT in the past year. Percentage of students who graduate. Percentage of students who dropout. Percentage of students who go on to a four-year college, vocational program, or public service. Percentage of students entering a two- or four-year college who do not require remediation or learning support courses.	Percentage of educators surveyed indicating feelings of confidence in analyzing and interpreting formative and summative assessment data. Percentage of educators surveyed indicating satisfaction with the time allotted to analyze assessment results and inform instruction.	Percentage of students in a school identified for improvement receiving additional supports. Percentage of schools that exit improvement status within five years.

Family and Community Engagement

		COLLABORATION WITH FAMILIES TO IMPROVE STUDENT OUTCOMES	INCLUSIVENESS AND OUTREACH TO FAMILIES	COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS (WRAP-AROUND SERVICES)	STAFF PROFESSIONAL LEARNING IN FAMILY ENGAGEMENT
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State policy provides employer incentives for parents and/or caregivers to participate in school-related activities. State provides districts with technical assistance and support to address engagement strategies. State maintains a state-level appointee or initiative for family and community engagement. State funds innovative engagement strategies targeting historically marginalized students, such as Native students and students of color.	State provides resources to school districts to engage families and the community on school district policies, processes, and procedures. Districts hire school-community liaisons who enhance outreach efforts with knowledge of a community's history, language, and cultural background.	State provides resources for an integrated system of academic enrichment and social services, such as the Community Schools model, to support children's intellectual, social, emotional, physical, and linguistic development.	State policy provides resources for professional learning in family and community engagement for all school personnel.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State policy supports family engagement connected to student learning as a driver of student academic performance and vital component of meeting school improvement goals. State requires annual reporting at the district level on family and community engagement. Districts annually report on family and community engagement. Schools recognize the diversity among families as an asset and strive to leverage this to improve student outcomes. Schools developed data-driven, site-based family and community engagement plans.	State mandates family and community outreach. State maintains an information sharing system readily available to families and communities in multiple formats and languages. Districts share information on academic standards, school procedures, and student progress data in multiple formats and languages. Districts collect parent and caregiver feedback.* Districts and schools include parents and families in decision-making on school improvement and yearly planning, purposefully seeking input from underrepresented families, such as Native families and families of color. Schools provide opportunities for parents to observe and support learning. Schools host trainings for families.** *Methods of collection include surveys, focus groups, parent governing councils, etc. **Trainings may include information sessions on school policies, standards, and community services.	State policy supports the implementation of the Community Schools model. Districts support collaborations with educators and community-based organizations to provide home visits. Schools provide on-site family/caregiver volunteer opportunities. Schools provide access to extended on-site services for students and families (e.g., school library, computer facilities, gym, etc.). Schools maintain partnerships/collaborations to provide development activities for caregivers, which may include family literacy and financial education. Schools maintain partnerships/collaborations with community providers to offer support for at-risk youth.* Schools maintain partnerships/collaborations with community providers to provide access to family support services/social services. Schools have a formal agreement with a community partner to provide student health services. *Support includes summer school, after-school programs, mentoring, and tutoring.	Districts collaborate with higher education institutions to infuse family and community involvement in education into teacher and administrator preparation programs. Districts provide professional learning in family and community engagement for all school personnel, specifically highlighting engagement of underrepresented families, such as Native families and families of color.
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	Number of formal school-parent collaborations.* Percentage of parents surveyed indicating school-parent collaboration has contributed to improved student achievement. *Collaborations may include parent governing councils, parent classroom assistants, parent recess leaders, parent lunch leaders, parent readers, and parent after-school tutors.	Percentage of parents surveyed indicating satisfactory access to school materials and information. Percentage of parents surveyed indicating they feel listened to and included, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and income. Percentage of parents surveyed indicating that they had been made aware of opportunities to join decision-making groups focused on school improvement and annual planning, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and income. Percentage of parents that attended a school training for families in the previous year.	Percentage of parents surveyed indicating satisfaction with student services. Percentage of parents surveyed indicating knowledge of and satisfaction with parent and family services.	Percentage of educators who have taken coursework, including continuing education, on family and community engagement. Percentage of school personnel who have participated in professional learning designed to improve family and community engagement.

School Funding

CRITERIA		SUFFICIENCY OF FUNDING	EQUITY IN FUNDING	PRODUCTIVE USE OF FUNDS	FUNDING SUSTAINABILITY
SUB-CRITERIA					
INDICATORS	**RESOURCES**	State maintains or increases its fiscal effort (state funding of education relative to state fiscal capacity). State guarantees each school district a sufficient foundation level with appropriate adjustments for school level, school size and location, variation in costs across regions, and student characteristics.* *Student characteristics such as special needs, English language learners, and those in poverty and concentrated poverty.	State uses "pupil weights" in its base formula to adjust for diverse student needs. State rewards under-resourced districts that make high fiscal effort.	State offers performance incentives to ensure productive use of funds by school districts. State invests in capacity building to guide districts in the efficient use of resources. State maintains or increases its investment in research and development.* *Researching and developing improvements in productivity.	State funds local efforts to diversify revenue streams.
	POLICIES & PRACTICES	State determines the cost necessary for each student to meet state content and performance standards; updates costs as significant changes are made to its standards and reports its findings publicly. State solicits educator input for cost studies. State incorporates findings of its cost study into its education finance system. State has an independent body of stakeholders that includes active preK–12 educators and administrators who annually assess if state funding is sufficient to provide all students the opportunity to meet rigorous academic standards. Districts adjust funding according to school level, school size and location, variation in costs across regions, and student characteristics.	State policy codifies equity in funding–recognizing explicitly that the amount of funding needed to provide a high-quality education varies from student to student. State mandates that districts report on the distribution of state-certified teachers, ESPs, and SISP. State mandates that districts report on average per-student expenditures disaggregated by federal, state, and local dollars. Districts use "pupil weights" in its base formula to adjust for diverse student needs. Districts report on personnel full-time equivalents (FTE) and salaries funded with state and/or local funds at the school level.* Districts report on non-personnel expenditures funded with state and/or local funds and federal, state, and/or local funds at the school level. *Personnel reporting categories include teachers, ESPs, and SISP.	State requires annual district-level compliance audits. Districts are part of a district-level consortium to bring down costs of bulk purchases. Districts post an up-to-date budget plan online.	State holds public events to inform government officials and voters of sustainability issues. State implements measures to broaden its tax base. State reports annually on the dollar amount of state tax expenditures. Districts hold public events to inform government officials and voters of sustainability issues. Districts implement measures to broaden their tax base. Districts have multi-year school budgets.
	OUTPUTS & OUTCOMES	State's ranking on fiscal effort (combined state and local direct education expenditures as a percentage of gross state product or aggregate personal income) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org.* State's ranking on sufficiency or adequacy of spending relative to common outcome goals (comparing a state's adjusted spending at a given poverty level to the estimated [modeled] spending level that would be required to achieve national average test scores in the previous year) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org. State's ranking on sufficiency or adequacy of spending on the highest-poverty districts (comparing a state's adjusted spending to that of other states at a given poverty level) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org.** *States with higher values in the graph invest more of their total economy (gross state product or GSP) in K–12 education–that is, they put forth more "effort." However, states with larger economies might exhibit less effort than states with smaller economies but still achieve the same funding levels. **States with values close to (or more than) 100 percent are those in which spending on the highest-poverty districts approaches (or exceeds) a level adequate to achieve national average test scores.	State's ranking on substantial progressivity (the ratio of adjusted state and local revenue in higher-poverty districts [10, 20, or 30 percent poverty] to that of the lowest-poverty districts [0 percent poverty] within a given state) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org.* State's ranking on systemic progressivity (the correlation between revenue and poverty [labor-market-centered] among all districts within a given state) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org.** *Values greater than 1 indicate progressive education funding–that is, moderate- and high-poverty districts receive more revenue than 0 percent poverty districts, all else being equal. States well below 1 fund education regressively; 0 percent poverty districts actually receive more revenue than moderate- and high-poverty districts. **Positive numbers indicate that higher-poverty districts tend to receive more revenue (progressivity), whereas negative numbers denote the opposite (regressive funding). The higher the number, the greater the strength of this positive or negative relationship.	Teacher/Non-teacher wage competitiveness (comparison of teachers' wages to wages of other professionals in the same state, controlling for factors such as age and education) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org. Predicted staffing ratios (teacher-to-student ratios by district poverty adjusted for district size, regional wage variation, and population density) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org; can be compared with high- and low-poverty districts in each state. Predicted class size (average class size by district poverty for both departmental and self-contained classes, adjusted for district size, regional wage variation, and population density) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org; can be compared with high- and low-poverty districts in each state. Teacher salary competitiveness ratio of actual-to-predicted teacher salaries, adjusted for degree, experience, and labor market by poverty (poverty as a percentage of poverty within the labor market) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org; can be compared with high- and low-poverty districts in each state. Coverage and charter market share (the number of school-age students enrolled in public schools as a percentage of all school-age children as well as total charter school market share by state [percent of all public school students enrolled in charter schools]) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org. Income-based early childhood schooling gap (the number of 3- and 4-year-olds from under-resourced families enrolled in school as a percentage of the total number of 3- and 4-year-olds enrolled in school) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org.	State's ranking on fiscal effort (combined state and local direct education expenditures as a percentage of gross state product or aggregate personal income) using the data sets at schoolfinancedata.org.* Percentage of districts and percentage of schools within a district with a multi-year budget plan made available publicly. *States with higher values in the graph invest more of their total economy (gross state product or GSP) in K–12 education–that is, they put forth more "effort;" however, states with larger economies might exhibit less effort than states with smaller economies but still achieve the same funding levels.

27604.0221.JR