



American Bridge

Trump Policy Brief: Accountability In Education

4.13.17

TRUMP: PUTTING THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA BEFORE SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY

In March 2017, President Trump reversed Department of Education rules designed to improve teacher preparation programs and hold schools to a higher level of accountability to their low-income, minority, and disabled students.

- ✓ Trump repealed a rule that would have incentivized federally-funded teacher preparation programs to produce effective teachers by tying students' academic success to TEACH Grants. Only participants in effective preparation programs would be eligible for the grants.
- ✓ Trump repealed a rule that would have required schools to meet the needs of all their students, including low-income students, disabled students, and minority students. The rule included a provision that 95 percent of students must be tested each year to prevent schools from encouraging low-performing students to stay home on test day. In one state, half of schools received an "A" ranking while failing to graduate over one-third of their African-American students.

Trump Repealed A Rule Meant To Incentivize Federally-Funded Teacher Preparation Programs To Produce Effective Teachers

TRUMP REPEALED AN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT RULE ON TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS, CLAIMING IT WAS TOO "BURDENSOME" AND "COSTLY"

President Trump Signed A Bill Repealing The Education Department's Teacher Preparation Rule.

According to The Hill, "President Trump plopped down in what he called a 'child's desk' Monday afternoon, a fitting setting considering he was about to repeal two Obama-era education rules affecting schoolchildren. 'It's the smallest desk I've ever seen,' the president joked as he traveled from the Oval Office to another room in the White House, where he signed two bills repealing the Education Department's teacher preparation and school accountability rules. The teacher preparation regulations included training requirements for educators, and the school accountability rules were meant to gauge schools' effectiveness." [The Hill, [3/27/17](#)]

White House: The Teacher Preparation Rule "Imposes New Burdensome And Costly Data Reporting Requirements On States And Institutions Of Higher Education." According to a statement of administration policy by the White House, "H.J. Res. 58 would nullify the final rule related to the Teacher Preparation Program Accountability System, 81 Fed. Reg. 75494 (Oct. 31, 2016), promulgated by the Department of Education. This rule establishes annual State reporting to measure the performance and quality of teacher preparation programs and tie them to program eligibility for participation in the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education grant program. The rule imposes new burdensome and costly data reporting requirements on States and institutions of higher education." [White House, [2/7/17](#)]

UNDER THE RULE, ONLY EFFECTIVE TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL "TEACH" GRANTS

AP: The Rule “Stipulated That Federally Funded Teacher Preparation Programs Must Be Evaluated Based On The Academic Outcomes Of Those Teachers' Students.” According to the Associated Press, “The Senate on Wednesday voted to repeal a key Obama-era regulation governing teacher training and evaluation. Senators voted 59-40 in favor of rescinding regulations issued by the Department of Education in October. The House voted last month to overturn the rules and the bill now goes to the White House for President Donald Trump's signature. The regulations stipulated that federally funded teacher preparation programs must be evaluated based on the academic outcomes of those teachers' students. Republican senators opposed the rules, saying they represented federal overreach and that such matters should be left for states to deal with.” [Associated Press, [2/8/17](#)]

Programs With High Ratings Based On Learning Outcomes Would Have Been Eligible To Participate In The TEACH Grant Federal Student Financial Aid Program. According to Diverse, “The regulations — if they had survived — would have required states that receive funds under the Higher Education Act to create a rating system for their teacher preparation programs, which would be rated at one of four levels: low performing, at risk, effective or exceptional. Programs would have been judged in part based on learning outcomes for K-12 students taught by their graduates. Only programs with high ratings would have been eligible to participate in the federal student financial aid program called TEACH grants.” [Diverse, [3/8/17](#)]

- **The TEACH Grant Program Gave Money To College Students Going Into Teaching, And Current Teachers Seeking Graduate Degrees, If They Agreed To Teach In A “High Need” School In A “High Need” Subject For Four Years.** According to Inside Higher Ed, “The Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program (TEACH) provides up to \$4,000 a year in grant aid to college students who plan to become teachers, as well as current teachers who pursue graduate degrees. Grant recipients agree to serve as a full-time teacher in a ‘high need’ school and teach a ‘high need’ subject for at least four academic years within eight years of finishing the program for which the person received the aid. Legislators have long searched for ways to increase the number of qualified teachers and prolong their stay in the profession, and the TEACH program, set to be funded at \$325 million over five years starting this summer, is a move in that direction.” [Inside Higher Ed, [1/9/08](#)]
- **Programs That Failed To Earn An “Effective” Rating For Two Out Of Three Years Would Lose Eligibility For Federal TEACH Grants.** According to The Washington Post, “States must rate programs ‘low-performing,’ ‘at-risk,’ or ‘effective’; those rated less than effective for two out of any three years will be stripped of their eligibility for federal Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education, or TEACH, grants - up to \$4,000 a year for aspiring teachers who commit to working in high-needs schools after graduation.” [Washington Post, [10/12/16](#)]

Data On Program Effectiveness Was Not Collected Uniformly Or, In Many Cases, At All

2015 Government Accountability Office Report: “At Least Seven States Had No Process To Evaluate Low-Performing Programs,” Which Could “Result In Teachers Who Are Not Fully Prepared To Educate Children.” According to Congressional Quarterly News, “At least seven states had no process to evaluate low-performing programs, according to a 2015 Government Accountability Office report. Evaluating educator training programs is a requirement for receiving federal funds under higher education law. ‘If states fail to assess whether [teacher preparation programs] are low-performing, potential teaching candidates may have difficulty identifying low-performing [teacher preparation programs],’ the report read. ‘This could result in teachers who are not fully prepared to educate children.’” [Congressional Quarterly News, [3/8/17](#)]

Former Baltimore City Schools Administrator Jennifer Green: “We Had No Way Of Knowing Which Programs Were Producing Effective Teachers. We Were Hiring Blind.” According to Inside Higher

Ed, “Jennifer Green, CEO of Urban Teachers, a teacher preparation program started to place educators in high-need schools, said the information that will be available as a result of the new rules will also assist school districts looking to hire recent graduates as well as students considering enrolling in one of those programs. A former Baltimore City Schools administrator, Green said the district had to make hiring choices for teachers without good information on the performance of the programs that trained them. ‘We had no way of knowing which programs were producing effective teachers. We were hiring blind,’ she said.” [Inside Higher Ed, [10/13/16](#)]

Deans for Impact Executive Director Benjamin Riley: “We Don’t Have Information We Need About What’s Working And What Isn’t.” According to Inside Higher Ed, “‘This is a real opportunity for colleges of education to be leaders in the field and to actually reflect the change that’s happening in higher education more broadly,’ said Benjamin Riley, executive director of Deans for Impact, a group that supports reforms to educator preparation. Riley said programs currently have no idea whether they are actually preparing effective educators. ‘We don’t have information we need about what’s working and what isn’t,’ he said. ‘We can sure do better than what we’re doing now.’” [Inside Higher Ed, [10/13/16](#)]

National Council On Teacher Quality Managing Director Elizabeth Ross: The Teacher Training Regulation Increased Transparency And Data, Which Was Not Collected Uniformly, At The Program Level. According to Congressional Quarterly News, “The teacher training regulation had been in the works for several years. It was prompted by people in the education field who said programs to instruct teachers needed increased monitoring, said Elizabeth Ross, who previously worked on teacher preparation issues at the Education Department and is currently managing director of state policy with the National Council on Teacher Quality. ‘The biggest benefit of these regulations is the increased data and transparency at the program level. The biggest loss of getting rid of these is the absence of that transparency,’ she said of the regulation. ‘It’s being collected, but not in a uniform format that is being made publicly available.’” [Congressional Quarterly News, 3/8/17]

University Of Virginia School Of Education Dean Robert Pianta: The Regulations Would “Provide A Major Boost” By Making Data On Teacher Performance And Learning Outcomes More Available. According to an opinion by University of Virginia Curry School of Education dean & professor Robert C. Pianta in the Huffington Post, “I am a dean of a school of education with a program in teacher preparation, and I watch our faculty, staff, and students, not only discuss rigorous performance measures but implement them, during the time our students are with us. The stumbling block to achieving our next goals in using evidence to drive program design is access to data on our graduates’ performance as teachers, including learning outcomes for students they teach. We want this information, and many of my colleagues that lead schools with teacher preparation programs have similar interests. These regulations will provide a major boost toward that goal.” [Robert C. Pianta – Huffington Post, [10/26/16](#)]

THE FINAL RULE WAS A COMPROMISE DEVELOPED AFTER YEARS OF CONSULTATION WITH EDUCATION EXPERTS

CQ: “The Teacher Training Regulation Had Been In The Works For Several Years” And “Was Prompted By People In The Education Field.” According to Congressional Quarterly News, “The teacher training regulation had been in the works for several years. It was prompted by people in the education field who said programs to instruct teachers needed increased monitoring, said Elizabeth Ross, who previously worked on teacher preparation issues at the Education Department and is currently managing director of state policy with the National Council on Teacher Quality. ‘The biggest benefit of these regulations is the increased data and transparency at the program level. The biggest loss of getting rid of these is the absence of that transparency,’ she said of the regulation. ‘It’s being collected, but not in a uniform format that is being made publicly available.’” [Congressional Quarterly News, 3/8/17]

National Council On Teacher Quality President Kate Walsh: “The Department Of Education Spent Years Developing And Finalizing These Regulations As A Compromise Among Educators And Local, State, And Federal Officials.” According to The Chronicle of Higher Education, “‘The Department of Education spent years developing and finalizing these regulations as a compromise among educators and local, state, and federal officials,’ Kate Walsh, president of the [National Council on Teacher Quality], said in a written statement. ‘Although imperfect, these regulations require states and institutions training teachers to collect and report key information about teacher-preparation programs.’” [Chronicle of Higher Education, [3/8/17](#)]

American Association Of Colleges For Teacher Education: The Rule’s Flexibility Showed That Feedback From The Profession Was Taken Into Account. According to Inside Higher Ed, “The initial rules released in 2014 came under fire for being overly reliant on student test scores to judge the effectiveness of teacher prep programs. The final rules, by way of compromise, give significantly more freedom to states to determine what measures of student outcomes they would use for ratings. In a statement, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education cited that flexibility as evidence the final rules took into account feedback from the profession. ‘The release of this rule provides a catalyst at the state level to generate data regarding our graduates’ impact in the classroom and inform continuous program improvement,’ said Sharon P. Robinson, president and CEO of AACTE.” [Inside Higher Ed, [10/13/16](#)]

Trump Repealed A Rule Meant To Ensure Schools Met The Needs Of All Students, Including Minority, Low-Income, And Disabled

TRUMP REPEALED AN EDUCATION DEPARTMENT RULE ON SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY, CLAIMING IT DID NOT GIVE ENOUGH CONTROL TO STATES

President Trump Signed A Bill Repealing An Education Department Rule On School Accountability. According to The Hill, “President Trump plopped down in what he called a ‘child’s desk’ Monday afternoon, a fitting setting considering he was about to repeal two Obama-era education rules affecting schoolchildren. ‘It’s the smallest desk I’ve ever seen,’ the president joked as he traveled from the Oval Office to another room in the White House, where he signed two bills repealing the Education Department’s teacher preparation and school accountability rules. The teacher preparation regulations included training requirements for educators, and the school accountability rules were meant to gauge schools’ effectiveness.” [The Hill, [3/27/17](#)]

- **The Hill: “The Rule Detailed How Public Schools Must Carry Out Laws Meant To Ensure They Are Meeting The Needs Of All Students.”** According to The Hill, “The Senate is taking a hammer to a pair of Obama-era education rules. Senators voted 50-49 on Thursday to roll back a regulation that placed tougher accountability measures on schools. The rule detailed how public schools must carry out laws meant to ensure they are meeting the needs of all students. Republicans are using the Congressional Review Act to nix the Obama regulations, allowing them to undo the rules without any support from Democrats.” [The Hill, [3/9/17](#)]

White House: “While School Accountability Is Important, The Administration Is Committed To Local Control Of Education And This Rule Places Additional Burden On States.” According to a statement of administration policy by the White House, “H.J. Res. 57 would nullify the final rule Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act – Accountability and State Plans, 81 Fed. Reg. 86076 (Nov. 29, 2016), promulgated by the Department of Education. This rule establishes requirements for how States must implement the statutory provisions that require States to have an accountability system based on multiple measures, including school quality or student success, to ensure

that States and districts focus on improving outcomes and measuring student progress. While school accountability is important, the Administration is committed to local control of education and this rule places additional burden on States and constrains them in areas where the ESSA intended broad flexibility. [...] If these bills were presented to the President in their current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign them into law.” [White House, [2/7/17](#)]

THE RULE BUILT UPON THE EVERY CHILD SUCCEEDS ACT, THE SUCCESSOR TO NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND THAT GAVE STATES CONSIDERABLY MORE CONTROL OVER EDUCATION POLICY

The Every Student Succeeds Act Was The Successor To No Child Left Behind. According to The Washington Post, “The regulations are meant to outline what states must do to meet their obligations under the Every Student Succeeds Act, the successor to the 2002 No Child Left Behind law. The Republican-led House voted last month to undo the regulations via the Congressional Review Act, which allows lawmakers to veto a rule they don’t like. But the CRA would also prohibit the Trump administration from issuing a rule that is ‘substantially similar.’” [Washington Post, [3/6/17](#)]

Education Week: ESSA “Rolls Back Much Of The Federal Government’s Big Footprint In Education Policy, On Everything From Testing And Teacher Quality To Low-Performing Schools.” According to Education Week, “The new Every Student Succeeds Act, signed into law Dec. 10, 2015, rolls back much of the federal government’s big footprint in education policy, on everything from testing and teacher quality to low-performing schools. And it gives new leeway to states in calling the shots. That’s a big change from the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), which ESSA replaced and updated.” [Education Week, [3/31/16](#)]

Washington Post: The Law Was “Far Less Prescriptive Than Its Predecessor” And Left States “Largely In Charge Of Deciding How To Evaluate Elementary And Secondary Schools And What To Do When They Fail.” According to the Washington Post, “The current law is far less prescriptive than its predecessor and leaves states largely in charge of deciding how to evaluate elementary and secondary schools and what to do when they fail. But the law also includes important civil rights guardrails meant to ensure that subgroups of students — such as those with disabilities, or those who are poor — don’t slip through the cracks.” [Washington Post, [3/6/17](#)]

REPUBLICANS, INCLUDING SOME IN TRUMP’S OWN ADMINISTRATION, SUPPORTED THE ESSA AND ITS ACCOUNTABILITY RULE

Senate HELP Committee Chairman Lamar Alexander Praised ESSA As Restoring “The Responsibility For Deciding What To Do About Improving Student Achievement” To States, School Districts, Classroom Teachers And Parents. According to The Brookings Institute, “Sen. Lamar Alexander put this spin on it: ESSA restores ‘to states, school districts, classroom teachers and parents the responsibility for deciding what to do about improving student achievement.’ In other words, the federal government spent 50 years trying to move the needle on educational opportunity with little to show for it.” [Brookings Institute, [12/8/15](#)]

Secretary DeVos Praised How ESSA “Encourages States To Set Forth Their Own Levels Of Achievement, Expectations, And It Asks States To Put A Plan Together That Demonstrates How They Are Going To Show That Students Are Achieving What They Should Achieve.” According to EdSource, “Speaking with Michigan-based talk show host Frank Beckman, she argued that the Every Student Succeeds Act ‘essentially does away with the notion of the Common Core.’ She said the federal law

‘encourages states to set forth their own levels of achievement, expectations, and it asks states to put a plan together that demonstrates how they are going to show that students are achieving what they should achieve.’” [EdSource, [2/17/17](#)]

Bush White House Domestic Policy Council John Bridgeland: The Final Regulations Responded To Overwhelming Feedback And Let States, Districts And Schools Choose How To Intervene In Low-Performing Schools. According to an opinion by Bush administration White House Domestic Policy Council John Bridgeland in The Cincinnati Enquirer, “The U.S. Department of Education's final regulations on school accountability preserve the law's core flexibilities and responded to overwhelming feedback. They include a delay in the implementation timeline to give states more time to plan, accurate measures of the graduation rate so parents and the public receive accurate information about school performance, and letting states, districts and schools choose how to intervene in low-performing schools.” [John Bridgeland – Cincinnati Enquirer, [3/8/17](#)]

Chamber Of Commerce: The Regulations “Provided States, Districts, And Schools The Guidance Necessary To Ensure An Orderly Transition From The Prior No Child Left Behind Act To The New, And Far More Flexible, Accountability Provisions Under ESSA.” According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, “To The Members Of The United States Congress: The Chamber opposes H.J. Res. 57, which would block regulations implementing accountability provisions in the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). The Chamber believes these regulations, although not perfect, have provided states, districts, and schools the guidance necessary to ensure an orderly transition from the prior No Child Left Behind Act to the new, and far more flexible, accountability provisions under ESSA. The Chamber is concerned that repealing the regulations could delay implementation of this critical new law.” [U.S. Chamber of Commerce, [2/6/17](#)]

THE RULES REQUIRED SCHOOL RANKINGS TO REFLECT THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL STUDENTS, INCLUDING MINORITIES, LOW-INCOME STUDENTS, AND DISABLED STUDENTS

The Rules Required That State School Accountability Plans Measure The Performance Of All Students, Including Racial Minorities, Low-Income Students And Special Education Students. According to The Associated Press, “The Education Department rules provide a framework for states to develop their own accountability plans under the bipartisan education bill signed into law by President Barack Obama. They were released last November. Under the law, states may design accountability systems that consider measures beyond test scores and high school graduation rates. The states have flexibility in deciding how much weight to give to each — as well as other measures including school climate, advanced coursework and chronic absenteeism. The rules require that the plans measure the performance of all students, including ‘sub-groups of students’ such as racial minorities, children from low-income families, and special education students.” [Associated Press, [1/30/17](#)]

The Education Trust: These Rules Were Common-Sense And Bolstered The Parts Of The Law That Make Clear That Vulnerable Students Can’t Be Ignored.” According to a press release by The Education Trust, “This resolution will cause unnecessary confusion, disrupting the work in states and wasting time that students — particularly those who are most vulnerable — cannot afford for us to waste. ESSA was the result of a strong bipartisan compromise, and we deeply appreciate the bipartisan opposition to this resolution. Members of both parties recognized these rules were common-sense and bolstered the parts of the law that make clear that vulnerable students can’t be ignored. But despite Congress’ action, equity-minded state advocates are more than ready to continue the fight to ensure the law is implemented in a way that will advance opportunity and achievement for low-income students, students of color, students with disabilities, and English learners. We will continue to stand with them and support them every step of the way.” [The Education Trust, [3/9/17](#)]

Sen. Rob Portman: The Rules Promoted “State Flexibility While Reinforcing Protections For Students Of Color, Students With Disabilities, And Students From Low-Income Families.” According to EdSource, “Ohio Sen. Rob Portman, the lone Republican who voted to preserve the regulations, said the rules balanced ‘state flexibility while reinforcing protections for students of color, students with disabilities, and students from low-income families.’” [EdSource, [3/9/17](#)]

The Rule Required Schools To Test At Least 95 Percent Of Students Each Year In Order To Prevent Schools From Encouraging Certain Students To Stay Home On Test Day

The Rule Required Schools To Test At Least 95 Percent Of Students Each Year In Order To Prevent Them Schools Encouraging Certain Students To Stay Home On Test Day And Inflate Overall Scores. According to The Washington Post, “One of the most-debated parts of the law says that schools must test at least 95 percent of eligible students each year, a provision meant to ensure that schools don’t encourage low performers to stay home on test day as a way to inflate average scores. The ascent of the opt-out movement, in which parents refuse to allow their children to take standardized tests as a way to protest the emphasis on testing, has created politically charged questions about how states should handle schools that don’t meet the participation requirement. Both the law and the regulations allow states to decide what to do about those schools — but the regulations specify that the consequence must be severe enough to force schools to come into compliance. Many Republicans and the nation’s largest teachers unions argued that the Obama administration created this requirement to punish schools out of thin air. But civil rights advocates said that without meaningful consequences, the 95 percent rule — critical for ensuring that schools are held accountable for their students’ true performance — would be meaningless.” [Washington Post, [3/6/17](#)]

Conexión Américas’ Gini Pupo-Walker: Without The Participation Requirement, Districts And Schools Would Have “A Strategic Incentive Not To Have Certain Kids Tested.” According to the Washington Post, “‘There will be districts and schools with a strategic incentive not to have certain kids tested,’ said Gini Pupo-Walker of Conexión Américas, a group that advocates for Latino families in Tennessee and is part of a statewide coalition advocating for educational equity.” [Washington Post, [3/6/17](#)]

Half Of The Schools In One State Received A Top-Ranking While Failing To Graduate More Than A Third Of Its African-American Students

Bridgeland: Before These Regulations, Half Of The High Schools Receiving An “A” In One State Graduated Less Than 60 Percent Of Their African-American Students. According to an opinion by Bush administration White House Domestic Policy Council John Bridgeland in The Cincinnati Enquirer, “In one state, for example, half of the high schools that received an ‘A’ had a graduation rate for African-American students of 60 percent or below. The regulation also ensures that while schools are measured on a variety of factors, not just test scores, students don’t have to fail in multiple areas before parents are notified that their child’s school is struggling to perform.” [John Bridgeland – Cincinnati Enquirer, [3/8/17](#)]

Bridgeland: The Regulation Ensured That Parents Would Be Notified Of Their Child’s School’s Performance When The School Was Struggling. According to an opinion by Bush administration White House Domestic Policy Council John Bridgeland in The Cincinnati Enquirer, “In one state, for example, half of the high schools that received an ‘A’ had a graduation rate for African-American students of 60 percent or below. The regulation also ensures that while schools are measured on a variety of factors, not just test scores, students don’t have to fail in multiple areas before parents are notified that their child’s school is struggling to perform.” [John Bridgeland – Cincinnati Enquirer, [3/8/17](#)]

Civil Rights Groups Expressed Concern Over Trump’s Repeal Of The Rule

A Coalition Of 46 Organizations Led By The Leadership Conference On Civil And Human Rights Urged Against Repeal: The Regulation Would Help States, Districts, And Schools “Faithfully Implement The Law And Meet Their Legal Obligations To Historically Marginalized Groups.”

According to The Leadership Conference, “On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and the 45 undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose S.J. Res. 25 and H.J. Res. 57 and to support continued implementation of the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In order for the latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to fulfill its purpose as a civil rights law and for implementation to comply with the requirements Congress set forth, federal oversight is critical. The underlying accountability and state plan regulation will help states, districts, and schools to faithfully implement the law and meet their legal obligations to historically marginalized groups of students including students of color, students with disabilities, and students who are English learners, immigrants, girls, Native American, LGBTQ or low-income. Congress should reject the effort to overturn these regulations under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) and should preserve critical protections for marginalized students.” [Leadership Conference, [3/3/17](#)]

Civil And Human Rights Leadership Conference Coalition: “States Must Not Be Permitted To Take Federal Funds While Flouting The Law’s Mandates.”

According to The Leadership Conference, “Over the course of legislative debate in 2015, Congress reached several compromises which enshrined both meaningful guardrails and state flexibility into the new law. It was these compromises – the allowance of flexibility while still maintaining core principles of fiscal responsibility and protections for marginalized students – which led to the passage of the ESSA. At the core is an offer to states – federal funding in exchange for compliance with requirements regarding accountability, protections for students, and fiscal responsibility. States must not be permitted to take federal funds while flouting the law’s mandates. The accountability and state plan regulation provides clarification and timelines which will support the vital role of the U.S. Department of Education in ensuring that states hold up their end of that deal.” [Leadership Conference, [3/3/17](#)]

NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund Director Of Policy Todd Cox: The ESSA Regulations Helped Ensure Education Officials Held Schools Accountable For The Success Of All Students And That Keep Students In The Classroom And Learning.

According to the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, “‘These ESSA regulations help ensure that state and local education officials develop and implement plans that hold schools accountable for the success of all students and that keep students in the classroom and learning,’ said Todd A. Cox, Director of Policy of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.” [NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, [2/2/17](#)]

NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund: ESSA Accountability Regulations Were “More Critical Now Than Ever In Light Of Threats To Meaningful Accountability For States And Local School Districts,” Including Betsy DeVos’ Position As Secretary Of Education.

According to the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, “Today, Republican leaders of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce introduced resolutions of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act to overturn the regulations on accountability and state plans under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). This resolution cannot move forward. The accountability regulations are more critical now than ever in light of threats to meaningful accountability for states and local school districts, including the pending nomination of Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education. Ms. DeVos has repeatedly expressed that deference, rather than demands for accountability for student outcomes, would be her approach to working with state and local officials.” [NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, [2/2/17](#)]