# Idaho's Consolidated State Plan

IDAHO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
IDAHO STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

650 W STATE STREET, 2ND FLOOR
BOISE, IDAHO 83702

(208) 332 6800

WWW.SDE.IDAHO.GOV/TOPICS/CONSOLIDATED--PLAN

Revised Final

# Idaho's Consolidated State Plan

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act

~~August 10, 2017~~February 15, 2018

## INTRODUCTION

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),[1] requires the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. ESEA section 8302 also requires the Secretary to establish the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan. Even though an SEA submits only the required information in its consolidated State plan, an SEA must still meet all ESEA requirements for each included program. In its consolidated State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan.

## COMPLETING AND SUBMITTING A CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN

Each SEA must address all of the requirements identified below for the programs that it chooses to include in its consolidated State plan. An SEA must use this template or a format that includes the required elements and that the State has developed working with the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

Each SEA must submit to the U.S. Department of Education (Department) its consolidated State plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

- **April 3, 2017;** or
- **September 18, 2017**.

Any plan that is received after April 3, but on or before September 18, 2017, will be considered to be submitted on September 18, 2017.

### Alternative Template

If an SEA does not use this template, it must:

1. Include the information on the Cover Sheet;
2. Include a table of contents or guide that clearly indicates where the SEA has addressed each requirement in its consolidated State plan;
3. Indicate that the SEA worked through CCSSO in developing its own template; and
4. Include the required information regarding equitable access to, and participation in, the programs included in its consolidated State plan as required by section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act. See Appendix C.

### Individual Program State Plan

An SEA may submit an individual program State plan that meets all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements for any program that it chooses not to include in a consolidated State plan. If an SEA intends to submit an individual program plan for any program, the SEA must submit the individual program plan by one of the

[1] *Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by ESSA.*

dates above, in concert with its consolidated State plan, if applicable.

## Consultation

Under ESEA section 8540, each SEA must consult in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's office, including during the development and prior to submission of its consolidated State plan to the Department. A Governor shall have 30 days prior to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan to the Secretary to sign the consolidated State plan. If the Governor has not signed the plan within 30 days of delivery by the SEA, the SEA shall submit the plan to the Department without such signature.

## Assurances

In order to receive fiscal year (FY) 2017 ESEA funds on July 1, 2017, for the programs that may be included in a consolidated State plan, and consistent with ESEA section 8302, each SEA must also submit a comprehensive set of assurances to the Department at a date and time established by the Secretary. In the near future, the Department will publish an information collection request that details these assurances.

**For Further Information:**
If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at OSS.[State]@ed.gov (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

## Cover Page

| Contact Information and Signatures | |
|---|---|
| **SEA Contact** (Name and Position):<br><br>Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent of Public Instruction<br><br>Dr. Linda Clark, President, Idaho State Board of Education | Telephone:<br><br>(208) 332-6815<br><br>(208) 334-2270 |
| Mailing Address:<br><br>Idaho State Department of Education<br>PO Box 83720<br>Boise ID 83720 | Email Address:<br><br>sybarra@sde.idaho.gov<br><br>clarklindaid@gmail.com |

By signing this document, I assure that:
To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.
The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.
Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)**<br><br>Superintendent Sherri Ybarra<br><br>Dr. Linda Clark, President, Idaho State Board of Education | Telephone:<br><br>(208) 332-6815<br><br>(208) 334-2270 |
| **Signature of Authorized SEA Representatives**<br><br>Superintendent Sherri Ybarra<br><br>Dr. Linda Clark, President, Idaho State Board of Education | Date:<br><br>8-16-17<br><br>8-16-17 |
| **Governor (Printed Name)**<br><br>C.L. "Butch" Otter | Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540:<br><br>8-16-17 |
| **Signature of Governor** | Date:<br><br>9-13-17 |

## COVER PAGE

### Contact Information and Signatures

**SEA Contact** (Name and Position):

Sherri Ybarra, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
(208) 332-6815
sybarra@sde.idaho.gov

Dr. Linda Clark, President, Idaho State Board of Education
(208) 334-2270
clarklindaid@gmail.com

Idaho State Department of Education
PO Box 83720
Boise ID 83720

**By signing this document, I assure that:** To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.

The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304.

Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.

**Authorized SEA Representative** (Printed Name)
Superintendent Sherri Ybarra
(208) 332-6815

Printed Name:
Sherri A. Ybarra

Dr. Linda Clark, President, Idaho State Board of Education
(208) 334-2270

Printed Name:
DR. LINDA CLARK

**Signature of Authorized SEA Representatives**
Superintendent Sherri Ybarra

Signature and Date:

Dr. Linda Clark, President, Idaho State Board of Education

Signature and Date:
2/15/18

**Governor** (Printed Name)
C.L. "Butch" Otter

Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540:
C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

**Signature of Governor**
C.L. "Butch" Otter

Signature and Date:
2-16-18

## PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED STATE PLAN

### Instructions

*Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission.*

☒ Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

**Or**

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated State plan:

☐Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies

☐Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

☐Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

☐Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

☐Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

☐Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

☐Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

☐Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

☐Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

### Instructions

*Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated State plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated State plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information, but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.*

**A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)**

1. **Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments** *(ESEA section 1111(b)(1) and (2) and 34 CFR §§ 200.1–200.8.)*[2]

2. **Eighth Grade Math Exception** *(ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4)):*

i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?

☐ Yes

☒ No

ii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:

a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;

b. The student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;

c. In high school:

1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
3. The student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.

☐ Yes

☒ No

iii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.

Not applicable.

[2] *The Secretary anticipates collecting relevant information consistent with the assessment peer review process in 34 CFR § 200.2(d). An SEA need not submit any information regarding challenging State academic standards and assessments at this time.*

3. **Native Language Assessments** (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii)):

i. Provide its definition for "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population," and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

Idaho's definition for languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, is a language spoken by 5% or more of all students, or 20% or more of English Learners.

Over 150 different language and dialects are native to Idaho students. To identify specific languages other than English that are present to a significant extent, we referenced our data from the SY1516 Consolidated State Performance Report, which captures the top five (5) commonly spoken languages shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Idaho's top five languages spoken by ~~our~~ English Learner populations**

| Language | # of EL Students |
|---|---|
| Spanish | 11,124 |
| Arabic | 389 |
| Swahili | 196 |
| Somali | 148 |
| Chinese | 133 |

Spanish is the most predominant language, representing nearly 80% of our English Language learners~~, and just under 7% of our students in tested grade levels~~.

ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

Currently the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) in Science, administered in grades 5 and 7, is offered in both English and Spanish. The statewide mathematics assessment, developed by Smarter Balanced and administered in grades ~~5~~3-8 and high school, is offered in a Spanish/English stacked translation format. Neither the ISAT English Language Arts by Smarter Balanced or the English Language Proficiency Assessment developed by WIDA, are offered in translated versions because English language is a critical component of the measured constructs of these two required statewide assessments.

iii. Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.

At this time, there are no other languages of origin for students that constitute a large enough percentage of the statewide student population to require additional translated versions of any Idaho Statewide assessment.

iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing

a. The State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);
b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and
c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

Not applicable.

4. **Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities** *(ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))*:

i. **Subgroups** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(2))*:

a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

Within Idaho's accountability system, all required historically underperforming subgroups are included in both federal reporting, as well as comprehensive and targeted school identifications.

- Economically disadvantaged are students with a free or reduced-price lunch status.
- English learners are those who have not yet tested as English proficient.
- Major racial and ethnic groups ~~Minority students~~ include American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, Hispanic or Latino.
- Students with disabilities are students that meet eligibility criteria as outlined in the Idaho Special Education Manual according to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

Not applicable.

c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student's results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.

☒ Yes
☐ No

d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:
☒ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or
☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or
☐ Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner.

**ii. Minimum N-Size** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))*:

*a.* Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

The minimum number of students required for the all-students group and each student group listed in section A(4)(i)(a) of this plan to be included for accountability is N >= 20. Previously, Idaho used N >= 25, however after Idaho's Data Management Council (DMC) changed its policy to reduce the minimum number of students for reporting purposes from 10 to 5, the ISDE will reduce the minimum number of students for accountability purposes by a commensurate 5 students.

~~The minimum number of students in each student group listed in section A(4)(i)(a) of this plan required to be included for accountability is N >= 10. Idaho has many small rural or remote school districts with small student populations. Including student groups with 10 students or more for accountability purposes will allow Idaho to capture results for more student groups in the calculations for targeted support and improvement designation, which will benefit students in Idaho who are members of historically disadvantaged populations.~~

The minimum number of students required for graduation rate to be included for accountability is N >= ~~1~~20. ~~Initially, ISDE proposed using the same N-size for graduation rate as is used for the all-students group. However, feedback from stakeholders indicated concern that N >= 20 or 25 would leave too many high schools out of Idaho's school identification calculations for graduation rate. Further analysis revealed that moving from N >= 20 to N >= 10 included 27 additional high schools and 7 additional alternative high schools in Idaho's school improvement calculations for graduation rate. Including these additional schools will ensure that Idaho is able to support as many high schools with low graduation rates as possible. Because graduation rate addresses just one cohort of students and not multiple grade spans as achievement result do, ISDE believes it is appropriate to use N >= 10 for graduation rate accountability.~~

Idaho rule IDAPA 08.02.03.112(5)(d)(i), describes the number of days students must be enrolled in school for accountability purposes: "A student who is enrolled continuously in the same public school from the end of the first eight (8) weeks or fifty-six (56) calendar days of the school year through the state approved spring testing administration period, not including the make-up portion of the test window, will be included in the calculation to

determine if the school achieved progress in any statewide assessment used for determining proficiency. A student is continuously enrolled if the student has not transferred or dropped-out of the public school. Students who are serving suspensions are still considered to be enrolled students."

*b.* Describe how the minimum number of students is statistically sound.

ISDE's analysis showed that the difference in the number of K-8 and high schools captured in Idaho's school identification system changed very little between N >=25, N >= 20, and N >= 15. ~~The t~~Table ~~below~~ 2 shows how many of Idaho's Title I schools meet the N-size requirement with N >= 20.
~~However, as shown in Table 2 below, reducing Idaho's N from N >= 25 to N >= 20, commensurate with the DMC's reduction in minimum number of students required for reporting, results in more schools for which the all-students group met the N for all indicators in Idaho's school identification system (and can therefore be used for comprehensive support and improvement designation).~~

**Table 2: Approximate Number of Title I schools included in identification system ~~when~~ N >= 20**

| School type | Achievement | Student growth | English Prof. | Graduation rate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| K-8 (349 total) | 337 | ~~333~~314 | 137 | NA |
| High school (67 total) | 64 | ~~64~~NA | 8 | 43 |
| Alternative high school (16 total) | 11 | NA~~10~~ | 1 | 13 |

| ~~*Schools meeting all student N in at least one indicator*~~~~Schools~~ | ~~N >= 25~~ | ~~N >= 20~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~K-8 (351 total)~~ | ~~330~~ | ~~333~~ |
| ~~High schools (67 total)~~ | ~~61~~ | ~~64~~ |
| ~~Alternative high schools(19 total)~~ | ~~13~~ | ~~14~~ |

~~*Schools meeting all student N for all indicators*~~

| ~~Schools~~ | ~~N >= 25~~ | ~~N >= 20~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~K-8 (351 total)~~ | ~~135~~ | ~~150~~ |

| ~~**Schools**~~ | ~~**N >= 25**~~ | ~~**N >= 20**~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~High schools (67 total)~~ | ~~5~~ | ~~7~~ |
| ~~Alternative high schools(19 total)~~ | ~~0~~ | ~~2~~ |

| | ~~N >= 20~~ | ~~N >= 10~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~Using as many data points as possible for school identification increases the robustness of the methodology, and therefore creates a more statistically sound identification system.~~<br><br>~~For student groups, using N >= 10 is necessary because Idaho has many small schools with relatively few students in these groups. Moving from all students N >= 20 to N >= 10 does not result in a significant increase in the number of schools included in comprehensive support and improvement calculations (8 additional K-8 schools, 1 additional high school), yet greatly increases the variability in Idaho's school identification results. However, moving to N >= 10 for student groups (aside from the all-students group) does allow the state to include many more of these populations, especially students with disabilities and English learners, for identification of targeted support and improvement schools as shown in Table 3 below.~~<br><br>~~**Table 3: Number of Title I schools included in identification system**~~<br>~~Schools meeting student group N in at least one indicator~~<br><br>~~*Students with Disabilities*Schools~~ | | |
| ~~K-8 (351 total)~~ | ~~216~~ | ~~297~~ |
| ~~High schools (67 total)~~ | ~~17~~ | ~~41~~ |
| ~~Alternative high schools(19 total)~~ | ~~0~~ | ~~3~~ |

| ~~***English Learners*Schools***~~ | ~~**N >= 20**~~ | ~~**N >= 10**~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~K-8 (351 total)~~ | ~~88~~ | ~~150~~ |
| ~~High schools (67 total)~~ | ~~1~~ | ~~7~~ |
| ~~Alternative high schools(19 total)~~ | ~~0~~ | ~~0~~ |

~~Using N >= 20 does not enable Idaho to ensure that schools are accountable for results~~

~~among these student groups, and therefore N >= 10 is appropriate.~~

~~Similarly, Idaho's graduating students should themselves be considered a student group for accountability purposes because graduating cohorts are much smaller than the combination of all tested grades. For this reason, using a small N-size is warranted but should not impact the statistical propriety of Idaho's accountability results. Using N >= 10 will require a high school fail to graduate 4 of 10 high school students in order to be identified for comprehensive support.~~

~~b.~~c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

Idaho solicited feedback on the state's minimum N-size for accountability purposes through our online feedback opportunities as well as our in-person feedback forums, which were attended by education stakeholders of all types. Minimum N-size was brought up specifically to understand whether stakeholders had concerns about continuing to use the N-size as determined under the NCLB flexibility waiver.

Feedback from stakeholders, including teachers, administrators, school board members, indicated that N >= 20 is preferred in order to ensure that the performance of each student alone does not have an unreasonable impact on whether the school is identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

However, legislators specifically indicated a desire for Idaho's N-size to avoid leaving very small schools out of school improvement results. Due to this feedback, Idaho's original plan called for the N-size for all students to be N >= 20, but for student groups and graduation rate Idaho would use N >= 10. Feedback from the U.S. Department of Education indicated that this approach was not in compliance with ESSA.

Because there is broad agreement among stakeholders that an N-size smaller than N >= 20 introduces too much noise into comprehensive support and improvement results, Idaho will use N >= 20 for the all students group as well as each student subgroup. However, achievement results for smaller groups of students will still be reported on the school report card as long as they meet state N-size requirements described in section A(4)(2)(e) of this plan.

~~c.~~d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.[3]

[3] Consistent with ESEA section1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974"). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute for Education Sciences report "*Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information*" to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

The State of Idaho places a high value on preserving the privacy of students and safeguarding their personally identifiable information (PII). To ensure that student data is treated with the utmost security, Idaho has enacted statutory protections found in Idaho Code § 33-133.
As part of this protection, the statute permits the release of student data in aggregate. It requires that "the minimum number of students shall be determined by the state board of education."

To provide oversight and guidance over the collection, retention, and security of student data, the State Board of Education created the Data Management Council (DMC). This controlling body has set rules on minimum numbers reported in aggregate. These minimums supersede any other minimums that may be defined elsewhere unless expressly permitted by the DMC.

~~d.~~e. If the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State's minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

DMC policy page 5 states~~:~~:

*Any release of data that would result in the ability to identify the personally identifiable information (PII) of an individual must be approved by the Data Management Council, aggregated to a minimum cell size of 5, or masked/blurred. This includes situations where a calculation can be done to arrive at a single count of less than 5 students that would risk exposure of PII. Instances where 100% or 0% of students fall within one category and would risk the exposure of PII must also be approved by the Data Management Council or masked/blurred since doing so discloses information on either all or no students and thereby violates the minimum cell size policy.*

In order to protect student privacy, we must redact data in any cells of less than 5 students or where the difference between the total of one or more cells of categorical data is less than 5 of the total student population. In addition, Data Management Council Policies and Procedures call for at least two cells to be redacted in most cases in order to prevent any cell required for redaction to be derived. Under DMC policy additional cells may be required to be redacted until the total of the exempt and therefore redacted aggregate data in a line or column equals 5 or more. Zero is considered a number.

Performance of student groups that are too small to be included in school identification will still be reported on the state website and on the state report card so long as ~~the cell size includes 5 or more students~~the reporting meets the redaction rules detailed above. Enrollment numbers and percentages will be displayed so long as there is at least one student within the subgroup.

iii. **Establishment of Long-Term Goals** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))*:

a. **Academic Achievement** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))*

1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

   Idaho's long-term goal for English/Language Art and Mathematics will be to reduce the percentage of non-proficient students by 33% over six years. "Proficient" means that a student has met or exceeded grade level standards in a specific subject as determined by performance on the associated assessment. Robust stakeholder feedback took place to set long-term goals for the state that achieve a balance of both ambitious and achievable. While several options were considered, the below long-term goals were agreed upon by all stakeholders due to the following:

   - The goals result in closing achievement gaps, especially for student groups that currently show the lowest achievement.
   - The target year – 6 years from 2017 – encompasses half of a student's K-12 career and therefore achieving the goal would impact students that are currently in the K-12 education system.

Historical data analysis indicates that, had these goals been set in the 2015 school year, a substantial number of schools would have achieved their school-level goal in 2016.

**Calculation:**
**Long-term goal** = 2016 % proficient/advanced + ~~33%~~((1/3) x (100 – ~~previous year~~2016 % proficient/advanced))
**Interim progress goal** = Difference between the long-term goal and the baseline / 6

**Table 3: Mathematics - 2016 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2017-2021 interim targets**

| Mathematics | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 41.6% | 44.8% | 48.1% | 51.3% | 54.6% | 57.8% | 61.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 30.3% | 34.2% | 38.0% | 41.9% | 45.8% | 49.7% | 53.5% |
| Students with Disabilities | 15.2% | 19.9% | 24.6% | 29.3% | 34.0% | 38.8% | 43.5% |
| English Learners | 7.1% | 12.3% | 17.4% | 22.6% | 27.7% | 32.9% | 38.1% |
| ~~Minority Students*~~ | ~~25.8%~~ | ~~29.8%~~ | ~~33.8%~~ | ~~37.8%~~ | ~~41.8%~~ | ~~45.8%~~ | ~~49.8%~~ |
| Black / African American | 22.2% | 26.5% | 30.8% | 35.2% | 39.5% | 43.8% | 48.1% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 56.8% | 59.2% | 61.6% | 64.0% | 66.4% | 68.8% | 71.2% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 19.4% | 23.9% | 28.4% | 32.8% | 37.3% | 41.8% | 46.3% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 22.0% | 26.3% | 30.7% | 35.0% | 39.3% | 43.7% | 48.0% |

| Mathematics | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 33.6% | 37.3% | 41.0% | 44.7% | 48.4% | 52.0% | 55.7% |
| White | 46.6% | 49.6% | 52.5% | 55.5% | 58.5% | 61.4% | 64.4% |
| Two Or More Races | 42.2% | 45.4% | 48.6% | 51.8% | 55.0% | 58.3% | 61.5% |

**Table 4~~5~~: English Language Arts/Literacy - 2016 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2017-2021 interim targets**

| ELA/Literacy | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 53.0% | 55.6% | 58.2% | 60.8% | 63.4% | 66.1% | 68.7% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 40.6% | 43.9% | 47.2% | 50.5% | 53.8% | 57.1% | 60.4% |
| Students with Disabilities | 15.0% | 19.7% | 24.4% | 29.2% | 33.9% | 38.6% | 43.3% |
| English Learners | 6.9% | 12.1% | 17.2% | 22.4% | 27.6% | 32.8% | 37.9% |
| ~~Minority Students*~~ | ~~37.4%~~ | ~~40.9%~~ | ~~45.4%~~ | ~~45.4%~~ | ~~49.9%~~ | ~~54.4%~~ | ~~58.9%~~ |
| Black / African American | 34.1% | 37.8% | 41.4% | 45.1% | 48.7% | 52.4% | 56.1% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 65.0% | 66.9% | 68.9% | 70.8% | 72.8% | 74.7% | 76.7% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 30.6% | 34.5% | 38.3% | 42.2% | 46.0% | 49.9% | 53.7% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 33.6% | 37.3% | 41.0% | 44.7% | 48.4% | 52.0% | 55.7% |
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 46.7% | 49.7% | 52.6% | 55.6% | 58.5% | 61.5% | 64.5% |
| White | 57.9% | 60.2% | 62.6% | 64.9% | 67.3% | 69.6% | 71.9% |
| Two Or More Races | 54.5% | 57.0% | 59.6% | 62.1% | 64.6% | 67.1% | 69.7% |

~~* Data for the minority subgroup will be further disaggregated for the purpose of reporting for American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, and Hispanic or Latino.~~

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement in Appendix A.

   Interim progress goals are in Appendix A.

   Tables ~~4~~ 3 and 4~~5~~ above provide the interim progress goals towards meeting the state's long-term goals for academic achievement in English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics.

3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

   By reducing the percentage of non-proficient students by one-third over the next six years, the students in subgroups whose baseline is farther behind the all-students group have a more ambitious long term goal, and interim measures to reach that goal, which will close achievement gaps for all student subgroups, using attainable targets.

b. **Graduation Rate.** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))*

1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

   The Idaho State Board of Education has established a goal that Idaho's 4-year cohort graduation rate will be 95% by 2023. In seeking to align the long-term goal to this established goal, the state will reduce non-graduates by 75% over six years.

   The long-term goals are set for the state, districts, and schools and are based on graduation rates from the previous school year.

   **Calculation:**
   **Long-term goal** = 2016 % graduating + (75% x (100 – ~~previous year % proficient/advanced~~2016 % graduating)) ~~+ previous year % graduating~~
   **Interim progress goal** = Difference between the long-term goal and the baseline / 6
   Note: the all students graduation rate long-term goal has been rounded up to align with the Idaho State Board of Education's existing graduation rate goal.

   **Table 5~~6~~: Graduation rate - 2016 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2017-2021 interim targets**

| Graduation Rate | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 79.7% | 82.2% | 84.8% | 87.3% | 89.9% | 92.4% | 94.9% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 71.9% | 75.4% | 78.9% | 82.4% | 86.0% | 89.5% | 93.0% |
| Students with Disabilities | 60.5% | 65.4% | 70.4% | 75.3% | 80.3% | 85.2% | 90.1% |
| English Learners | 73.3% | 76.6% | 80.0% | 83.3% | 86.7% | 90.0% | 93.3% |
| ~~Minority Students*~~ | ~~72.3%~~ | ~~75.3%~~ | ~~78.2%~~ | ~~81.2%~~ | ~~84.2%~~ | ~~87.1%~~ | ~~90.1%~~ |
| Black / African American | 77.8% | 80.6% | 83.4% | 86.1% | 88.9% | 91.7% | 94.5% |

| Graduation Rate | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 83.1% | 85.2% | 87.3% | 89.4% | 91.6% | 93.7% | 95.8% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 58.5% | 63.7% | 68.9% | 74.1% | 79.3% | 84.4% | 89.6% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 73.7% | 77.0% | 80.3% | 83.6% | 86.9% | 90.1% | 93.4% |
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 69.7% | 73.5% | 77.3% | 81.1% | 84.9% | 88.6% | 92.4% |
| White | 81.3% | 83.6% | 86.0% | 88.3% | 90.7% | 93.0% | 95.3% |
| Two Or More Races | 77.3% | 80.1% | 83.0% | 85.8% | 88.7% | 91.5% | 94.3% |

~~* Data for the minority subgroup will be further disaggregated for the purpose of reporting for American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White, and Hispanic or Latino.~~

~~1.~~2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (3) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

The long-term goals for the extended graduation rate will be developed and reported for all high schools after Idaho establishes the business rules necessary to calculate extended cohort graduation rate.

~~2.~~3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
Interim progress goals are in Appendix A.

Table ~~6~~ 5above provides the interim progress goals towards meeting the state's long-term goals for graduation rate.

~~3.~~4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

As with goals for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, by reducing the

number of non-graduating students by 75% over six years, student groups with lower rates of graduating students will be required to increase the number of graduates at a faster rate in order to meet the state's goals.

~~d.~~c. **English Language Proficiency.** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))*

Idaho determines a student's eligibility as an English Learner in a multi-step process, beginning with an initial home language survey, completed at registration. If the home language survey indicates a language other than English is the primary language spoken at home, the student is then screened using the ~~English language proficiency level using~~ WIDA~~'s~~ ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT). The student's results ~~on~~ from this screener determine eligibility and inform the students plan for developing English language skills. ~~the level of English language proficiency. The date of the screener provides a baseline to track this information over time.~~

Eligible students are then assessed annually for English Language proficiency using the WIDA Access 2.0. This assessment provides an overall composite score and scores in the domains of Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening.
A student is considered proficient when they receive a 5 composite score.

After analysis of the limited data from the WIDA Access 2.0 assessment, Idaho's measure of expected progress will be a student growth to proficiency calculation for using a trajectory of 7 years. This growth to proficiency trajectory model mirrors that of ELA/Math, and takes a student's initial scale score and determines the growth a student will need to reach the proficiency scale score 7 years in the future. That total growth needed is divided by the number of years in the target.

The student growth measure captures students that may make tremendous improvement in a single year, but are unable to increase one performance level. Teachers will also be able to use the growth to proficiency target as a tool to inform student goals in their language develop plan and measure the outcomes, a more empowering and student centered method that engages students in their learning outcomes. This methodology also encourages schools and districts to look at critical transition periods for English learners and identify strategies to close instructional gaps that negatively affect student growth when moving from elementary to middle school and middle to high school.

~~**Table 8: Expect progress for English learners**~~

| ~~Entry year performance~~ | ~~Year 2 performance~~ | ~~Year 3 performance~~ | ~~Year 4 performance~~ | ~~Year 5 performance~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~1~~ | ~~2~~ | ~~3~~ | ~~4~~ | ~~Proficient~~ |
| ~~2~~ | ~~3~~ | ~~4~~ | ~~Proficient~~ | ~~--~~ |
| ~~3~~ | ~~4~~ | ~~Proficient~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ |
| ~~4~~ | ~~Proficient~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ |
| ~~5 (Proficient)~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ |
| ~~6 (Proficient)~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ | ~~--~~ |

1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment, including: (1) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

   Idaho will reduce the number of English learners who are not making expected progress to~~ward~~ English proficiency, as defined above by ~~33~~1/3~~% in~~ over ~~-~~five years. This five-year long-term goal, ending in 2022, aligns with the long-term goals in academic achievement and graduation rate, with 2017 serving as the baseline. Because this goal is based on ~~just~~ one available year of historical data, it may be revised once additional data are available.

   **Table ~~6~~7: Percent of Students Making Expected Progress Toward English proficiency ~~-~~ 2017 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2018-2021 interim targets**

| 2017 Baseline | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 Goal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~33.2%~~48% | ~~36.9%~~ 51.46% | ~~40.6%~~54.92% | ~~44.3%~~58.38% | ~~48.1%~~61.84% | ~~51.8%~~65.30% |

   ~~Idaho's measure of expected progress is an increase of one performance level per year, up to Level 5. A student who starts at Level 1 is expected to reach Level 2 in his or her 2nd year, Level 3 in his or her 3rd year, and so on. Once a student reaches Level 5, he or she is considered proficient for the purposes of this calculation (which is not the state's exit criteria). Expected progress for a student at Level 5 or 6 is to maintain that level. Idaho's definition of expected progress is illustrated in Table 8 below.~~

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency in Appendix A.

   Interim progress goals are in Appendix A.

   Table ~~7~~ 6 above provides the interim progress goals towards meeting the state's long-term goals for English Language proficiency.

iv. **Indicators** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))*

   Idaho will annually and publicly report progress on all measures in the state's Accountability Framework (Appendix B), approved by the Idaho State Board of Education and the Idaho Legislature in 2017. These measures were agreed upon by Idaho's stakeholders as the next step forward in education accountability in the state to ensure that all students are college and career ready. Idaho believes defining success requires going beyond statewide test

scores and should illustrate multiple measures reflecting the many facets of our students. All measures in the Accountability Framework reflect Idaho's ~~state~~ values and will further empower educators and parents to engage in educational decisions about their children.

The Accountability Framework will be used to meet both state and federal school accountability requirements and will be broken up by school categories.

A subset of the measures in the Accountability Framework will be used as the accountability indicators required by ESSA, and described in this section. Idaho will use these indicators every three years to determine schools for comprehensive support and improvement, and each year to determine schools for targeted support and improvement, using the methodology described in sections A(4)(v) and A(4)(vi) of this plan.

~~The indicators that Idaho will use for school identification as required by ESSA are as follows:~~
It should be noted that the state accountability framework groups schools into three categories so meaningful differentiation can be made between like schools. The following school categories are outlined in the state accountability framework:

**School Categor~~y~~ies**

- Kindergarten through grade eight (K-8): Schools in this category include elementary and middle schools as defined in IDAPA Rule 08.02.03~~Subsection~~ .112.05.f.
- High Schools, not designated as alternative high schools, as defined in Subsection 112.05.f.
- Alternative High Schools

The indicators Idaho will use for school identification as required by ESSA are listed by school category.

**Academic Measures by School Category**
**K-8:**

- Achievement on Idaho Standards Assessments in English Language Arts and Math ~~Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) Proficiency and Growth.~~
- Growth – as determined by the percentage of ~~S~~students on track to be proficient within three years.
- English Learners making progress towards English language proficiency.

**High School:**

- Achievement on Idaho Standards Assessments in English Language Arts and Math ~~ISAT proficiency.~~
- English Learners ~~achieving~~ making progress towards English language proficiency.
- Four (4) year cohort graduation rate

**Alternative High School:**

- Achievement on Idaho Standards Assessments in English Language Arts and Math~~.~~

- English learners making progress towards English language proficiency.
- Four (4) year cohort graduation rate

**School Quality Measures by School Category**
**K-8:**
- Satisfaction and Engagement survey administered to students in grades K-8.

**High School:**
- College and Career Readiness indicators, determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs.

**Alternative High School:**
- College and Career Readiness indicators, determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs.

a. **Academic Achievement Indicator**. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State's discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

Idaho's Academic Achievement Indicator is achievement on the statewide tests in Mathematics and English Language Arts/Literacy ~~as listed below~~ and meets the criteria for academic indicators as described in section A(4)(iv)(a) of this plan.

**Academic achievement indicator measures:**
- K-8 Schools
  - Idaho Student Achievement Test (ISAT) ~~3–8~~ Mathematics grades 3-8
  - ISAT ~~3–8~~ English Language arts (ELA)/Literacy grades 3-8
- High Schools
  - ISAT ~~High School~~ Mathematics – High School
  - ISAT ELA/Literacy – High School/
  - ~~ISAT High School ELA/Literacy - High School~~
- Alternative High School
  - ISAT Mathematics – High School
  - ISAT ELA/Literacy – High School

The academic achievement indicator represents the proficiency on statewide mathematics and ELA/Literacy tests. In the school identification system, academic achievement is the actual, non- averaged achievement in that school year. The state administers the grade

level assessments to all students annually and provides comparative data across subgroups.

*Used for all schools in state:* Both academic indicators in this section are used for all schools in the state according to the school categories as outlined in Idaho's Accountability Framework.

*Same calculation for all schools:* The same calculation is used for all schools in the state for the academic indicators. This is further described in the process of annual meaningful differentiation methods later in this section.

*Validity and reliability:* The academic indicators are calculated using statewide test scores in Mathematics and English Language Arts. The Idaho Standard Achievement Tests, developed by Smarter Balanced, have met validity and reliability criteria as outlined in the Federal Assessment Peer Review.

*Based on long-term goals:* Both academic indicators are aligned directly to Idaho's long-term goals.

*Proficiency on statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments:* The academic indicators are based on the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced on these assessments. Results from both content areas will be weighted equally. Please see annual meaningful differentiation of schools methodology for further explanation.

*Disaggregation:* Each academic indicator can be disaggregated for each student group.

*95% participation:* Both academic indicators measure the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each student group~~, unless an LEA fails to meet the 95% required participation rate as described in section A(4)(vii) of this plan~~.

b. **Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator).** Describe the Other Academic Indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. If the Other Academic Indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

Idaho's Other Academic Indicator is Academic Growth as defined below and meets the criteria for academic indicators as described in section A(4)(iv)(a) of this plan. ~~Separate growth measurements are also a component of the indicators discussed in sections c, d, and e. These measures are discussed in more detail in their individual sections and in our summary of the school identification process.~~

**Other Academic indicator measures:**

- Student Growth to proficiency in English Language Arts/Literacy using a 3 year trajectory model
- Student Growth to proficiency in Mathematics using a 3 year trajectory model

- ~~ISAT High School Mathematics~~
- ~~ISAT High School ELA/Literacy~~

The state will determine the gap between a student's most recent scale score and the scale score necessary to reach proficiency in 3 years. From there, a linear path is created and the minimum score needed to be proficient in three years. A student will be considered 'on-track' if they meet their annual target on the path to proficiency. For example, a fourth grade student scored 2420 in 3rd grade mathematics and requires 120 scale score points to reach proficiency in mathematics by sixth grade. The student must increase his or her scale score by at least 40 points in the current year to be on track. Student growth targets will be calculated annually.

The percentage of students 'on track' to be proficient in three years will be calculated for English Language Arts/Literacy and Mathematics separately and weighted equally.

*Disaggregation:* The other academic indicator can be disaggregated for each student group. Student growth can be disaggregated for each student group.

*Validity and reliability:* Student growth calculations are a valid and reliable measure and have been used by the U.S. Department of Education to understand and measure the growth of schools and districts.

*95% participation:* The growth rate indicator measures the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each student group.~~, unless an LEA fails to meet the 95% required participation rate as described in section A(4)(vii) of this plan.~~

c. **Graduation Rate.** Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

Table ~~9~~7 below describes Idaho's graduation rate indicators. Idaho uses the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the graduation rate indicator, which follows federal guidelines. See section A(4)(v) for how the graduation rate indicator will be used for meaningful differentiation of schools. Idaho does not award a state-defined alternate diploma. Based on stakeholder feedback, Idaho is developing a five-year cohort graduation rate calculation.

**Table 7~~9~~: Graduation rate indicators**

| Indicator | Measure | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Graduation Rate | The four-year cohort graduation rate | The percent of students graduating using the four-year graduation cohort rate calculation within a school reported[4] in the current school year. In the school identification system, graduation rate is the actual, non-averaged of the graduation rate in that school year. ~~Schools are identified for comprehensive support every three years.~~ |
| ~~Graduation Rate Growth~~ | ~~The four-year cohort graduation rate~~ | ~~The difference between the percent of students reported graduating in the current year and the prior year (for schools with only two years of data), or the percent reporting graduating two years in the past (for schools with three years of data or more).~~ |

*Used for all high schools in state:* The graduation rate indicator is used for all high schools in the state.

*Same calculation for all high schools:* The same calculation is used for all schools in the state for the graduation rate indicator.

*Based on long-term goals:* The graduation rate indicator is aligned directly to Idaho's long-term goals.

*Disaggregation:* The graduation rate indicator can be disaggregated for each student group. The graduation rate indicator can be disaggregated for each student group.

*Validity and reliability:* The federally-required four-year cohort graduation rate has been shown to be valid and reliable.

~~*95% participation:* The graduation rate indicator measures the performance of at least 95% of all students and 95% of all students in each student group, unless an LEA fails to meet the 95% required participation rate as described in section A(4)(vii) of this plan.~~

d. **Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator.** Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State's definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

Idaho ~~will~~administers the Access 2.0 developed by WIDA as our English Language Proficiency Assessment. Idaho will ~~-~~use data from the 2017 Access 2.0 administration to

[4] *Graduation rate lags by one school year.*

serve as our baseline in defining~~e~~ student ~~the~~ progress in ~~for~~ achieving English Language Proficiency.

~~The state has defined the English Language Proficiency as~~ receiving a ~~5.0 composite~~ score ~~and minimum~~ proficiency level with ~~of~~ 4.0 or higher ~~in the domain scores for~~ on listening, ~~speaking, reading, and writing. Idaho will use data from the 2017 Access 2.0 administration to define the progress for achieving English Language Proficiency.~~ Idaho's measure of progress in achieving English proficiency will be the calculated as a percentage of English Learners that are on track to reach proficiency in 7 years, as measured by reaching the scale score necessary to score~~ing~~ a 5 or higher on the ACCESS 2.0 overall composite score. Student targets will be calculated annually.

e. **School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s).** Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any school quality or indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

**Table 8~~10~~: School Quality Indicators**

| School Category | Measure |
|---|---|
| K-8 | Satisfaction and Engagement survey administered to students in grades ~~K~~3-8. |
| High School | College and Career Readiness indicators, determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs. |
| Alternative High School | College and Career Readiness indicators, determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs. |

~~**Table 11: School Quality Growth**~~

| ~~School Category~~ | ~~Measure~~ |
|---|---|
| ~~K-8~~ | ~~Difference in results from satisfaction and engagement survey administered to students in grades K-8 in comparative years of the school identification cycle.~~ |
| ~~High School~~ | ~~Difference between percent of College and Career Ready students, determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs, in comparative years of the school identification cycle.~~ |

| ~~School Category~~ | ~~Measure~~ |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Alternative High School~~ | ~~Difference between percent of College and Career Ready students, determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs, in comparative years of the school identification cycle.~~ |

*Disaggregation:* Each school quality indicator can be disaggregated for each student group.

~~*95% participation:* Because the school climate survey will be delivered through Idaho's assessment vendor during the statewide assessment, we expect at least 95% participation unless an LEA fails to meet the 95% required participation rate as described in section A(4)(vii) of this plan. All graduating students will be counted in the denominator for the college and career readiness indicator, meaning all students will be included in the results.~~

*Validity and reliability:* ~~Administering the school climate survey through Idaho's assessment vendor will enable the collection of valid and reliable data~~The school climate survey will be administered through AdvancED's online platform to students in grades 3-8~~12~~ (students in grades 9-12 will be surveyed beginning in 2018/19). Schools will be expected to ensure that all student groups are adequately represented in the results by maintaining a 90% participation rate or above. The survey is designed to provide quick access to meaningful and actionable data at the school and district level to improve teaching and learning practices, while also providing valid and reliable results at the state level for purposes of statewide reporting and accountability. Please refer to Appendix E for more information.

The college and career readiness indicator will be calculated for every student using data collected by the ISDE, State Board of Education, or the Idaho Division of Career and Technical Education (ICTE).

Idaho's high school students have equitable access to Advanced Opportunities. Idaho requires that all high schools offer Advanced Opportunities. Idaho rule 08.02.03.106.01 states: "All high schools in Idaho shall be required to provide Advanced Opportunities, as defined in Section 007, or provide opportunities for students to take courses at the postsecondary campus."

In addition, each student in Idaho has $4,125 available to them to cover costs associated with Advanced Opportunities. These funds may be used to pay for dual credits, overload courses, or certificate exams.

v. **Annual Meaningful Differentiation** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))*

a. Describe the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State's accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each state must

comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.

Idaho will annually and publicly report progress on all measures in the state's Accountability Framework (Appendix B), approved by the Idaho State Board of Education and the Idaho Legislature in 2017. These measures were agreed upon by Idaho's stakeholders as the next step forward in education accountability in the state to ensure that all students are college and career ready. Idaho believes defining success requires going beyond statewide test scores and should illustrate multiple measures reflecting the many facets of our students.

All measures in the Accountability Framework reflect Idaho's state values and will further empower educators and parents to engage in educational decisions about student achievement. Idaho will report results for each indicator disaggregated by all student subgroups for all schools. Idaho's stakeholders were outspoken in their opposition to a summative rating for each school. It was felt that the complex calculations required to produce a summative score are not transparent, sometimes misleading, and result in a system that is not useful for parents and educators. In order to produce a meaningful report card, Idaho is developing a user-friendly report card that allows for data to be summarized and visualized in ways most useful to parents and community members. The state also plans to incorporate tools for comparing schools to each other. This will allow all education stakeholders to use the multiple measures in the Accountability Framework to differentiate schools.

If the State uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in section 4(v)(a) above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), describe the different methodology, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the student who previously attended that feeder school. IDAPA 08.02.03.112.05.f.v specifies that, "The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the students who previously attended that feeder school." Schools with this unique configuration would be reported with K-8 schools.
~~A subset of the measures in the Accountability Framework will be used as accountability indicators as required by ESSA, described in section A(4)(iv) of this plan. Idaho will use these indicators every three years to determine schools for comprehensive support and improvement, and each year to determine schools for targeted support and improvement, using the methodology described in this section and section A(4)(vi) of this plan.~~

~~Idaho's philosophy is to create a system of school identification that allows ISDE to identify schools for improvement only if they are both the lowest performing in the state and not improving. To lay the foundation for this approach, the system for annual meaningful differentiation will allow schools to be recognized for either achievement, growth in achievement, or both. Using the methodology in this plan, ISDE avoid two common challenges associated with school accountability:~~

~~*Growth Ceiling Issue:* Using Idaho's previous rating system, it was possible for very high-performing schools to receive low ratings due to lack of growth, despite there being little room available for progress.~~

~~*Low Baseline Issue:* Previously, even if schools were growing at a fast rate, they could receive poor ratings due to low baseline performance.~~
~~This system will incorporate achievement and growth for the five federally required indicators, all of which included in Idaho's Accountability Framework:~~
~~Mathematics (statewide test)~~
~~English Language Arts/Literacy (statewide test)~~
~~Graduation Rate~~
~~English Language Proficiency~~
~~School Quality~~

~~ISDE will group schools by K-8, high school, and alternative high schools for comparison.~~

~~In Idaho rule, alternative high schools are defined as, "Alternative secondary programs are those that provide special instructional courses and offer special services to eligible at-risk youth to enable them to earn a high school diploma. Designated differences must be established between the alternative high school programs and the regular secondary school programs. Alternative secondary school programs will include course offerings, teacher/pupil ratios and evidence of teaching strategies that are clearly designed to serve at-risk youth as defined in this section. Alternative high school programs conducted during the regular school year will be located on a separate site from the regular high school facility or be scheduled at a time different from the regular school hours."~~

~~Stakeholder feedback on school category approach has been positive. Representatives from alternative high schools felt strongly that alternative high schools and high schools should be treated the same in Idaho's accountability system – that the indicators used for school identification for high schools and alternative should be identical. Feedback also included a proposal to group schools using concentration of low-income students; however, ISDE will use the K-8, high school, and alternative high school groupings because Title I school identification itself applies to schools with a high concentration of low-income students.~~

~~The steps below describe how hypothetical School X's performance results in annual meaningful differentiation in Idaho's school report card. The report card will note whether a school has been identified for improvement or not identified.~~

~~*Step 1:* For the first indicator, identify *Achievement* and *Growth* for School X.~~

**~~School X math performance~~**

| ~~Prior year(s) Proficient/Advanced~~ | ~~Current year Proficient/Advanced~~ |
|---|---|
| ~~55%~~ | ~~75%~~ |

~~*Achievement* is the percentage of students proficient or advanced.~~

~~School X's math *achievement* is 75.~~

~~*Growth* is the difference between the percent proficient or above in either the prior year (for schools with only two years of data) or two years in the past (for schools with three years of data or more).~~

~~School X's math *Growth* is 75 minus 55, or 20.~~

~~*Step 2:* Determine rank of *Achievement* and *Growth* relative to all other public schools in the state.~~

| ~~School~~ | ~~Achievement~~ | ~~Rank~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~P~~ | ~~99~~ | ~~1~~ |
| ~~F~~ | ~~98~~ | ~~2~~ |
| ~~AA~~ | ~~96~~ | ~~3~~ |
| ~~S~~ | ~~94~~ | ~~4~~ |
| | ~~•~~<br>~~•~~ | ~~•~~<br>~~•~~ |
| ~~**X**~~ | ~~**75**~~ | ~~**197**~~ |
| | ~~•~~<br>~~•~~ | ~~•~~<br>~~•~~ |
| ~~G~~ | ~~32~~ | ~~378~~ |

~~School X's math Achievement was about in the middle relative to other schools in the state, ranking 197 of 378 schools.~~

~~There are 181 schools with lower Achievement than School X and 196 that have higher Achievement than School X.~~

| ~~School~~ | ~~Growth~~ | ~~Rank~~ |
|---|---|---|
| ~~T~~ | ~~22~~ | ~~1~~ |
| ~~X~~ | ~~20~~ | ~~2~~ |
| ~~C~~ | ~~12~~ | ~~3~~ |
| ~~L~~ | ~~11~~ | ~~4~~ |
| | ~~•~~<br>~~•~~ | ~~•~~<br>~~•~~ |
| ~~**P**~~ | ~~0~~ | ~~375~~ |

~~School X's math Growth was higher than all schools but one in the state, ranking second in Growth.~~

~~There are 376 schools with lower Growth than School X.~~

~~*Step 3:* Calculate percentile rank for *Achievement* and *Growth*.~~

~~The percentile rank is a simple calculation: divide the number of schools below School X by the total number of public schools in the state. This number is then multiplied by 100. This calculation reveals the percent of schools in the state that fall below School X in *Achievement* and *Growth*.~~

~~**Achievement Percentile Rank**~~

~~Number of schools below School X (181)~~ ~~Total Number of schools (378)~~

~~* 100 = 48~~

~~48 percent of schools in the state fall below School X in *Achievement*.~~

~~**Growth Percentile Rank**~~

$$\frac{\text{Number of schools below School X (376)}}{\text{Total Number of schools (378)}} * 100 = 99$$

~~99 percent of schools in the state fall below School X in *Growth*.~~

~~This calculation will be repeated for all indicators and for all student subgroups. The results of these percentile rank calculations will be displayed in the school report card, allowing viewers to see both achievement and growth for each indicator at each school.~~

~~a. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.~~

~~For the purposes of annual meaningful differentiation on the school report card, each indicator will be reported on its own and without weighting or combining to allow for maximum transparency.~~

~~When identifying comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools as described below, ISDE will apply equal weights the indicators used, with the exception of the school quality indicator. The school quality indicator will be weighted at 10% for all schools, with the remaining indicators weighted evenly across the remaining 90%. See Table 12 below for an outline of indicator weights for Idaho's most common school configurations. Stakeholder feedback indicated a desire to avoid assigning artificial weights to each indicator because the weights may appear arbitrary. However, because the school quality indicators are new to Idaho, ISDE has determined that weighting this indicator at 10% is appropriate during the first years of implementation.~~

~~**Table 12: Indicator weights for Idaho's most common Title I school configurations (percent)**~~

| ~~School Type (Title 1 Schools)~~ | ~~Math~~ | ~~ELA/ Literacy~~ | | | ~~English Learner Proficiency~~ | ~~Graduation Rate~~ | ~~School Quality~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~K-8 (190)~~ | ~~30~~ | ~~30~~ | | | ~~30~~ | | ~~10~~ |
| ~~K-8 (no ELs) (161)~~ | ~~45~~ | ~~45~~ | | | | | ~~10~~ |
| ~~High school (19)~~ | ~~22.5~~ | ~~22.5~~ | | | ~~22.5~~ | ~~22.5~~ | ~~10~~ |
| ~~High school (no ELs) (48)~~ | ~~30~~ | ~~30~~ | | | | ~~30~~ | ~~10~~ |

| ~~School Type (Title 1 Schools)~~ | ~~Math~~ | ~~ELA/ Literacy~~ | | | ~~English Learner Proficiency~~ | ~~Graduation Rate~~ | ~~School Quality~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~Alternative high school (7)~~ | ~~22.5~~ | ~~22.5~~ | | | ~~22.5~~ | ~~22.5~~ | ~~10~~ |
| ~~Alternative high school (no ELs) (12)~~ | ~~30~~ | ~~30~~ | | | | ~~30~~ | ~~10~~ |

~~If the State uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in section 4(v)(a) above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), describe the different methodology, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.~~

~~Not applicable. The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the student who previously attended that feeder school. IDAPA 08.02.03.112.05.f.v specifies that, "The accountability of public schools without grades assessed by this system (i.e., K-2 schools) will be based on the third grade test scores of the students who previously attended that feeder school."~~

vi. **Identification of Schools** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))*

a. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe the State's methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement.

Idaho will identify schools in the beginning of the 2018-19 school year~~,~~ using data from 2015-16, 2016-17, and 2017-18. In the case of the new school climate survey, only data from the end of the 2017-18 school year will be used. Idaho will then identify schools every three years thereafter, using the same review of three prior years' data. Feedback from stakeholders strongly emphasized a three-year identification cycle in order to build a system that supports the development of sustainable school improvement strategies. School leaders will be able to dedicate time to planning and early implementation in the first year of identification and will have an additional two full years to implement their school improvement strategies, with the intent of generating sustainable change at the school.

ISDE will review identification data annually to determine whether schools would be identified during an off-cycle year. If schools are found that are not currently identified but would have been identified if the current year were on-cycle will be notified and offered support and thought partnership from staff. Those schools will be added to a watch list and this will be noted on the school report card.

A subset of the measures in the Accountability Framework will be used as accountability indicators as required by ESSA, described in section A(4)(iv) of this plan. Idaho will use these indicators every three years to identify schools for comprehensive support and

improvement, and each year to determine schools for targeted support and improvement, using the methodology described in this section and section A(4)(vi) of this plan.

Idaho's philosophy is to create a system of school identification that allows ISDE to identify schools for improvement if they are both the lowest performing in the state and not improving student outcomes as measured by the student growth to proficiency trajectory model. ISDE desires to avoid two common challenges associated with school accountability:

*Growth Ceiling Issue:* Using Idaho's previous rating system, it was possible for very high-performing schools to receive low ratings due to lack of growth, despite there being little room available for progress.

*Low Baseline Issue:* Previously, even if schools were improving at a fast rate, they could receive poor ratings due to low baseline performance.

The steps below describe the calculation steps the state will use in identifying the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds.

***Step 1:*** Select a school and identify the value of the first indicator (among the academic and school quality indicators described in section iv.)

As an example, the academic achievement indicator for Math, which is the percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced. Let us assume this value is 75% for a hypothetical school – School X.

**School X math performance**

| Current year Proficient/Advanced |
|---|
| 75% |

***Step 2:*** Determine the school's rank on that indicator relative to all other public schools in the state in the same school category.

| School | Achievement | Rank |
|---|---|---|
| P | 99% | 1 |
| F | 98% | 2 |
| AA | 96% | 3 |
| S | 94% | 4 |
| | ●<br>● | ●<br>● |
| **X** | **75%** | **197** |
| | ●<br>● | ●<br>● |
| G | 32% | 378 |

To continue our example, assume School X's math achievement was about in the middle relative to other schools in the state, ranking 197 of 378 schools.

There are 181 schools with lower Achievement than School X and 196 that have higher Achievement than School X.

***Step 3:*** Calculate the school's percentile rank for the indicator. The percentile rank is a simple calculation: divide the number of schools below the school in question by the total number of public schools in the state in the same school category. This number is then multiplied by 100. This calculation provides the percent of schools in the state that fall below the target school in that indicator.

For our hypothetical school X, the calculation would be as follows:

**Math Achievement Percentile Rank**

$$\frac{\text{Number of schools below School X (181)}}{\text{Total Number of schools (378)}} \times 100 = 48$$

Using this calculation, we determine that 48 percent of schools in the state fall below School X in the math academic achievement indicator.

***Step 4:*** Repeat steps 1-3 for all indicators.

***Step 5:*** Calculate a composite value for the school based on the available indicators. The composite value is calculated by applying the weights described in section b (below) to the percentile ranks for each indicator (determined at the end of step 3) and summing these values.

***Step 6:*** Repeat steps 1-5 for all schools in the state.

***Step 7***: Rank schools from highest to lowest within their school category based on their composite value.

***Step 8:*** Identify the composite value that would capture the bottom 5% of Title I schools within the K-8, high school, and alternative high school categories.

Idaho will designate both Title I and Non-Title I schools with composite scores at or below the relevant 5% threshold value as comprehensive schools.

***Step 9:*** Idaho will also celebrate schools for their work to meet the needs of their students by recognizing:

- Schools that meet or exceed the interim progress goals for each indicator.
- Schools that fall into the 90th percentile rank or above using the school identification methodology for each of the indicators in the framework.

Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the

aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

When identifying comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools as described above, the school quality indicator will be weighted at 10% for all schools, with the remaining indicators weighted evenly across the remaining 90%.

See Table 9 below for an outline of indicator weights for Idaho's most common school configurations. Stakeholder feedback indicated a desire to avoid assigning artificial weights to each indicator because the weights may appear arbitrary. However, because the school quality indicators are new to Idaho, ISDE has determined that weighting this indicator at 10% is appropriate during the first years of implementation. With this weighting, the academic indicators receive substantial weight both individually and in aggregate, much greater than the weight of the School Quality/Student Success indicator.

**Table 9~~12~~: Indicator weights for Idaho's most common Title I school configurations (percent)**

| School Type (Title 1 Schools) | Math | ELA/ Literacy | Student Growth – Math | Student Growth – ELA/Literacy | English Learner Proficiency | Graduation Rate | School Quality |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| K-8 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | NA | 10 |
| K-8 (no ELs) | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | 22.5 | NA | NA | 10 |
| High school | 22.5 | 22.5 | NA | NA | 22.5 | 22.5 | 10 |
| High school (no ELs) | 30 | 30 | NA | NA | NA | 30 | 10 |
| Alternative high school | 22.5 | 22.5 | NA | NA | 22.5 | 22.5 | 10 |
| Alternative high school (no ELs) | 30 | 30 | NA | NA | NA | 30 | 10 |

~~Using the percentile rank calculations described in section A(4)(v)(a) of this plan as the foundation, ISDE will use additional, simple calculations to identify the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools for comprehensive support and improvement.~~

~~Academic achievement is the actual, non-averaged achievement in that school year. Schools are identified for comprehensive support every three years.~~

~~Non-Title I schools will be designated as comprehensive schools if the results of their calculation fall within the performance range of the 5% of designated Title I schools.~~

~~The following steps pick up from the sequence left off at the conclusion of the previous section of this plan. They show how the state's system of annual meaningful differentiation will build to school identification.~~

~~*Step 4:* Take the higher of *Achievement* or *Growth* for each indicator.~~

~~In the example in section A(4)(v)(a), because 99 is higher than 48, 99 will represent the score for School X's math indicator. Forty-eight will *not* be used to determine whether the school will receive comprehensive support.~~

~~*Step 5:* Repeat for all indicators, and take the average.~~
~~*Step 6.*~~

~~**School X's Indicator Results**~~

| ~~Math~~ | ~~Math Growth~~ | ~~ELA/Literacy~~ | ~~ELA Growth~~ | ~~Graduation Rate~~ | ~~English Learner Proficiency~~ | ~~School Quality (always 10% weight)~~ | ~~Average~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~Achievement percentile rank99~~ | ~~Growth percentile rank~~ | ~~Higher of either *Growth* or *Achievement* percentile rank~~ | ~~Growth Percentile rank~~ | ~~Higher of either *Growth* or *Achievement* percentile rank~~ | ~~Percent of students making expected progress toward proficiency Higher of either *Growth* or *Achievement* percentile rank~~ | ~~Higher of either *Growth* or *Achieve ment* in sSchool climate survey absenteeism (K-8) or college and career readiness (high school)~~ | ~~Average of all indicator scores other than school quality (always 10%)~~ |

~~Table 12 above indicates the weights for each indicator used in school identification.~~

~~*Step 6:* Repeat for all Title I schools in the state and rank schools from highest to lowest.~~

b. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe the State's methodology for identifying all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement.

Beginning in 2018, Idaho will identify all public high schools in the state with a four-year cohort graduation rate less than 67% as averaged over three years for comprehensive support and improvement. Graduation rates will be reported annually.

c. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe the methodology by which the State identifies public schools in the State receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (based on identification as a school in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)) and that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years.

If a Title 1 school is identified for additional targeted support under section A(4)(vi)(f) of this plan for three consecutive years (i.e., the school has not met the statewide exit criteria for two consecutive years immediately after the year in which it was identified for additional targeted support), that school will be identified as a comprehensive support and improvement school.

d. **Year of Identification**. Provide, for each type of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

Idaho will begin identifying comprehensive support and improvement schools for the 2018-19 school year and every three years thereafter.

e. **Targeted Support and Improvement**. Describe the State's methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii))*

Idaho will identify targeted support and improvement schools based on student group achievement gaps. The percent proficient/advanced for each student group will be compared to the percent proficient/advanced for all students not in that group for English/Language Arts and Mathematics. This will be done for each school and each student group that meets Idaho's n-size requirement.

A consistently underperforming student group in Idaho is any student group that has an achievement gap, relative to~~with~~ its non-group peers, of 35 percentage points or more in English/Language Arts or Mathematics~~, averaged over three years~~ for three consecutive years~~ in any of the indicators~~. A school with a consistently underperforming student group will be identified for targeted support and improvement.

For example, a school with a tested Hispanic population that meets or exceeds Idaho's n-size requirement will have the percent of Hispanic students who are proficient/advanced in English/Language Arts and Mathematics compared with the percent of non-Hispanic students who are proficient/advanced in English/Language Arts and Mathematics. If this achievement gap is 35 percentage points or more in Mathematics for three consecutive years, the school would be identified for targeted support and improvement. The same

would be the case if the calculation revealed a 35 percentage point achievement gap in English/Language Arts for three consecutive years.

Targeted support and improvement schools will first be identified in the 2018-19 school year and each year thereafter.

The definition of the historically underperforming student groups used to determine targeted support and improvement schools are:

1. Economically disadvantaged are students with a free or reduced-price lunch status.
2. English learners are those who have not yet tested as English proficient.
3. Minority students include American Indian or Alaskan Native, ~~Asian,~~ Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, ~~White,~~ Hispanic or Latino.
4. Students with disabilities are students that meet eligibility criteria as outlined in the Idaho Special Education Manual according to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Each targeted support and improvement school will be required to develop and implement an improvement plan that is aligned to the long-term goals for the state, and approved by their ~~-~~LEA.

f. **Additional Targeted Support.** Describe the State's methodology for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State's methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. *(ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))*

While the lowest-performing five percent of schools will be identified as comprehensive support and improvement schools every three years, ~~T~~the methodology for identifying ~~comprehensive support and improvement~~these schools will be ~~applied to student subgroups~~calculated annually for the purpose of identifying schools for additional targeted support~~, in comparison to the all-students group of comprehensive schools~~.

The comprehensive support and improvement calculations will be run for all students to identify the lowest-performing five percent of schools. The same calculations will then be run for schools using each of the historically underperforming student groups (when meeting the n size requirements). The final, weighted composite value for each student group will be compared with that for schools that are (or would be) identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

If the composite value for any of the historically underperforming student groups is below that for the highest performing school in the bottom 5% of the comprehensive identification schools, the school will be identified for targeted support and improvement ~~If any student group in any school's that meets Idaho's n-size requirement student subgroup performance is demonstrates the same or lower performance in English/Language Arts or Mathematics than the highest performing all-students group that would be identified as described aboveamongst CSI schools, that school would will be identified for additional targeted support. In~~

~~other words, if results for any student group, on its own, would have resulted in the school being identified for comprehensive support, that school will be identified for additional targeted support. This calculation will be run every three years, beginning with the 2018-19 school year, to mirror comprehensive support and improvement identification as described in section A(4)(vi)(a) of this plan~~.

To exit additional targeted support, a school must not be identified using the methodology described above.

g. **Additional Statewide Categories of Schools**. If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, describe those categories.

The state does not identify additional statewide categories of schools.

vii. **Annual Measurement of Achievement** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))*: Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95% student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

Idaho understands that in order to provide a fair and accurate picture of school success, and to help parents, teachers, school leaders, and state officials understand where students are struggling and how to support them, the state must ensure high participation in statewide assessments.

According to current Idaho Administrative Code (IDAPA 08.02.03.112(e)), "failure to include ninety-five percent (95%) of all students and ninety-five percent (95%) of students in designated subgroups automatically identifies the school as not having achieved measurable progress in ISAT proficiency." For the purposes of this plan, "measureable progress on ISAT proficiency" is defined as not having met the school's interim progress measure toward its long-term goals in any group where 95% participation is not attained.

Additionally, "If a school district does not meet the ninety-five percent (95%) participation target for the current year, the participation rate can be calculated by the most current three (3) year average of participation."

Should a school or LEA not meet the 95% participation minimum standard, the local school board will be notified by the State Board of Education that the school or district has failed to meet the minimum standard of reporting and that this will be reflected on the state report card. The ISDE will support the school or LEA to write a parent outreach plan that addresses how it will engage parents and community members in order to meet the 95% participation minimum standard. In addition, ISDE will develop policies requiring the LEA to use a portion of its funds pursuant to 33-320, Idaho Code (Continuous Improvement Plans) for local school board and superintendent training on data-driven decision-making and assessment literacy.

If a school has at least 95% participation in any year, the school will not be required to submit a parent outreach plan for the following year.

viii. **Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement** *(ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A))*

a. **Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

**Lowest performing 5% of schools:**
To exit comprehensive support and improvement a school identified in the lowest performing 5% of schools must:

- ~~The school n~~No longer meet~~s~~ the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support and improvement (~~is~~ no longer be in the lowest 5%), and
- ~~The school has shown a consistent growth trajectory compared with the data in the year during which the school was identified,~~Achieve ELA and Math results above the 20th percentile within each school category for the all student group, and
- ~~The school has a~~Articulate~~d~~ in writing a plan for sustaining improved student achievement. The plan will be submitted to and approved by the State Technical Assistance Team (STAT). This plan will articulate measurable goals, aligned strategies, and a robust monitoring plan. This sustainability plan must explain how the school will maintain a strong rate of growth and change for students while addressing how the school intends to ensure sustainability without additional improvement funds.

~~In addition, if a school meets its second-year interim goals after the second year of identification (i.e., is on track to hit its three-year goals), the school may elect to exit comprehensive support and improvement status and forfeit any school improvement funds available in the final year in the improvement cycle.~~

**Schools with graduation rate below 67%:**
Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement by failing to graduate two-thirds of its graduating cohort in any year may exit from comprehensive status if:

- The school's average graduation rate over the previous 3 years exceeds 67%, or
- The school's graduation rate for two consecutive years exceeds 67%.

b. **Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support**. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

Schools identified for additional targeted support will be assigned school improvement goals with a three-year timeline for the student group for which the school was identified for additional targeted support. These goals will be aligned with a long-term goal for that student group to reduce the gap to 100% proficiency in each indicator by half over 6 years with 2016 as the baseline year. To exit, a school must:

- ~~The school n~~No longer meet~~s~~ the eligibility criteria for additional targeted support, and
- ~~The school has shown a consistent growth trajectory compared with the data in the year during which the school was identified for the student group for which it was identified~~Achieve ELA and Math results above the 20th percentile within each school

category, for all subgroups for which the school was identified for targeted support and improvement.

~~In addition, if a school meets its second-year interim goals for each student group for which it was identified after the second year of identification (i.e., is on track to hit its three-year goals), the school may elect to exit additional support and improvement status.~~

c. **More Rigorous Interventions**. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

More rigorous interventions in a school failing to meet Idaho's exit criteria after three years will be led by the State Technical Assistance Team (or STAT, see section A(4)(viii)(e) for a complete description), who will facilitate the completion of a Comprehensive and Integrated Field Review (CIFR) that will lead to next steps for the school. Below is a description of the steps the STAT will complete to determine more rigorous interventions.

**Notification of insufficient progress from the Superintendent of Public Instruction will go to:**

- The Idaho State Board of Education
- The local school board
- The superintendent of the LEA with the building principal copied
- The public via the School Accountability Report Card

**Next steps include:**

- The ISDE conducts a Comprehensive and Integrated Field Review (CIFR) during the fall following the third year of identification (see below for membership and protocol).
- The State Board of Education may direct the use of some of the LEA's continuous improvement funds pursuant to 33-320, Idaho Code for local school board training in school improvement.
- A leadership coach may be assigned to the local school board and LEA leader to inform school improvement at the local level.

**Membership of the Comprehensive and Integrated Field Review Team may include:**

- ISDE representatives
- LEA/school administrators and teachers from the region with similar demographics, which may include a school librarian
- Persons nominated by Idaho School Boards Association, Idaho Association of School Administrators, Idaho Association of Special Education Directors, Idaho Education Association
- Administration/faculty applicants from high achieving schools chosen by the State Department of Education

**Comprehensive and Integrated Field Review protocol:**

- Observe a stratified sample of faculty including teachers of special populations, using a standard protocol. The protocol will include a subset of the indicators that align with the state's current teacher evaluation system.
- Interview focus groups with teachers, parents, students, and noncertified staff (e.g. food service, custodians and paraprofessional.
- Interview LEA and school administrators.
- Collect and interpret data.
- Recommend additional school interventions to school, LEA, and state leadership.
- School, LEA, and state leaders agree upon and implement new interventions for the school.

d. **Resource Allocation Review**. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Idaho will identify all LEAs with 50% or more of comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools every year.

For LEAs with 50% or more comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools the state will annually review ESSA Federal program resource allocations from the LEA to the school through the Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA). Budget and expenditure information, supports and resources, and student performance will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of those supports.

ISDE has access to a wide variety of resources, including funding, expertise, math and ELA coaches, leadership training, and assessment development. The allocation of these resources will first be applied to those comprehensive and targeted schools, especially the LEAs that have more than 50% of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support.

e. **Technical Assistance**. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Idaho is committed to a robust statewide system of support. Our system of support is designed to pair local issues with local solutions and draws from a variety of resources and programs to build the capacity of schools and LEAs for continuous and sustainable improvement. The statewide system of support is managed and coordinated by the State Technical Assistance Team (STAT). This team is responsible for overseeing all school improvement grants for comprehensive and targeted schools. The STAT works with LEAs to ensure that improvement plans are evidence-based and managed for high performance.

The STAT will provide a network approach to improving instruction and achievement for each school identified as comprehensive support and improvement. The STAT will include members of the executive team, federal programs director, associate deputy of federal programs, director of special education, director of Title III, director of curriculum and

instruction, director of assessment, school improvement coordinator, a Career and Technical Education (CTE) representative, a state board of education representative, and members of the local LEA and school leadership teams. Depending upon the needs of the schools identified for comprehensive or targeted assistance, other specialists will be asked to provide input, such as school library or charter school representatives.

Plan implementation and management support may be provided by the STAT if specifically requested by the LEA or school. The assistance may be in the form of conducting a comprehensive needs assessment, drafting a comprehensive plan, defining evidenced-based interventions, defining key indicators to measure and monitor, conducting periodic data collection, evaluating the data, and making necessary corrections in the interventions.

As shown in Table 10~~3~~ below, the statewide system of support includes strategies and activities that LEAs and schools can select based on need. Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement will likely need to draw on multiple strategies, whereas schools identified for targeted support and improvement may apply focused resources on meeting the needs of particular groups of students. This could include drawing on the English Learner Program to support EL students or providing extended learning time to help accelerate learning for specific groups of students. All funded activities and programs are evaluated regularly for evidence of effective implementation and to assess the degree to which services and activities are evidence-based. Programs draw on guidance from the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse and expertise from the Northwest Comprehensive Center and Regional Education Lab Northwest.

The STAT will ensure that school improvement plans meet evidence-based requirements under ESSA, and that the state interventions being applied to schools are evaluated to ensure that they are high quality and resulting in improved outcomes for students.

State-led school improvement activities are funded through the state administrative set-aside for 1003(a) funds. Services are provided directly to schools identified for improvement, when requested by the LEA as an optional part of the 1003(a) funding formula.

**Table 10~~13~~: Strategies used in the Idaho statewide system of support**

| Strategy | Activity | Provider/program | Funding source |
|---|---|---|---|
| Creating/implementing comprehensive and targeted school improvement | Diagnostic evaluation/needs assessment to determine key challenges and root causes | ISDE or approved provider | Title I-A<br><br>School Improvement funds |
| Creating/implementing comprehensive and targeted school improvement | Comprehensive school improvement and leadership coaching | Idaho Capacity Builders | Title I-A<br><br>School Improvement funds |

| Strategy | Activity | Provider/program | Funding source |
|---|---|---|---|
| Improving leadership effectiveness | Training/Mentoring for School Board Members | ISDE, Idaho School Boards Association, Idaho Building Capacity Project | School Improvement funds |
| Improving leadership effectiveness | Leadership coaching | Idaho Building Capacity Project | School improvement funds |
| Improving leadership effectiveness | Mentoring and support for principals | Idaho Principals Network<br>Idaho Principal Mentoring Project | School improvement funds<br><br>Title II-A |
| Improving leadership effectiveness | Mentoring and support for superintendents | Idaho Superintendents Network | School improvement grant |
| Improving leadership effectiveness | School improvement training for local school boards and superintendents | ISDE or contract vendor | State funds pursuant to 33-320, Idaho Code |
| Improving leadership effectiveness | Mentoring, training, and support for emerging CTE leaders and prospective CTE administrators | Leadership Institute | State funds (CTE) |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Professional development and technical assistance in curriculum and standards development and alignment and research-based instructional improvement | Approved providers; state regional mathematics or ELA specialists | State funds |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Idaho Content Standards/Literacy coaching | Idaho Coaching Network, ELA/Literacy | State funds |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Training on the Idaho Content Standards and technical assistance with how to align | Idaho Coaching Network/ELA/ Literacy Coaches, Idaho Math Centers | State funds |

| Strategy | Activity | Provider/program | Funding source |
|---|---|---|---|
| | curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices | | |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Educator evaluation training and coaching | ISDE and SBOE Educator Effectiveness Coordinators | State funds |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Opportunities to implement STEM curriculum | STEM Action Center | State and federal funds |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Training on Assessment and Data Literacy | ISDE | State funds (CTE) |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Training on the Idaho Career Technical Content Standards and technical assistance with how to align programs and assessments. | ICTE Reach Professional Development Conference; Program Quality Managers | State funds |
| Aligning curriculum and improving instruction | Participating in the Idaho Mastery Education Network | ISDE | State funds |
| Supporting English learners | Technical assistance with EL program design | Idaho English Learner Program | State and federal funds |
| Supporting English learners | Training on WIDA standards and technical assistance on aligning WIDA standards with Response to Intervention (RTI) practices | Idaho English Learner Program | State and federal funds |
| Supporting Special Education students | Multi-tiered instructional training and coaching | SESTA team of Special Education<br><br>Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development | State funds, special education funds |

| Strategy | Activity | Provider/program | Funding source |
|---|---|---|---|
| Supporting Special Education students | Training on intensive interventions, assessments and strategies related to special education | SESTA team of Special Education<br><br>Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development | Special education funds |
| Extended learning time | Technical assistance on how to redesign the school day using extended learning and/or other opportunities (e.g., 21st Century Community Learning Centers and school or public libraries) | ISDE and/or Idaho Universities | Title IV |
| Family and community engagement | Technical assistance in the inclusion of families and the community in the school improvement planning and implementation process | ISDE-Family Engagement Coordinator | State funds |
| Family and community engagement | Access to and support with the Family Engagement Tool (FET) | ISDE-Family Engagement Coordinator | State funds |
| Family and community engagement | Career and Technical Student Organizations (CTSOs) provide student leadership opportunities and community engagement | ICTE | |
| Family and community engagement | Career and Technical Program Advisory Committees provide community | ICTE | State funds (CTE) |

| Strategy | Activity | Provider/program | Funding source |
|---|---|---|---|
| | partnerships and industry input for CTE programs | | |

The following describes each of these strategies and activities in greater detail:

**Management of Comprehensive and Targeted School Improvement**
LEAs and schools need guidance and support in conducting needs assessments, prioritizing goals and needs, and developing improvement plans that are actionable and effective. ISDE partners with local and regional organizations to provide this assistance.

*Comprehensive needs assessment and action plan:* As part of the state's support, all comprehensive support and improvement schools will conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. The needs assessment may include an examination of four key components of each school: climate and culture, student engagement, leadership, and stakeholder perspectives and experiences. Data will be collected and analyzed using key performance and improvement indicators for school quality and learner outcomes. Areas of improvement will include a root-cause analysis to determine appropriate solutions. Improvement areas will be prioritized, and this information will help guide LEAs in writing their comprehensive support and improvement plans and will help the STAT provide ongoing support assistance. If the LEA would like assistance from ISDE in either conducting the diagnostic evaluation or recommending an external provider, the school improvement coordinator will provide the information and resources.

Action plans from the diagnostic evaluation will address the why, who, what, when, and resource allocation for making improvement changes. A vision for the school will be developed and the school's strategic direction—setting short-term (one year) and long-term (three to five years) goals—will be identified. An important component of the plan will include external stakeholder involvement in the development process and during the implementation of the plan. External stakeholders will include, at a minimum, the principal and other school leaders, teachers, and parents. The LEA will address in the plan how it will monitor and oversee the plan's implementation, as well as how the effectiveness of the plan will be evaluated. Title I-A school improvement funds may be used to fund a comprehensive needs assessment if the LEA chooses to use an external provider. Additionally, grant funds will be available for all Title I schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement for the purpose of implementing system changes, strategies, and interventions as identified in the school's improvement plan based on the results of the comprehensive needs assessment.

The STAT will meet regularly either in person or via web conference (depending on where team members are located). The state school improvement coordinator will develop the agenda with input from STAT member stakeholders and will facilitate the meetings. One of the key responsibilities of this group will be to review data to inform strategies for improvement. Data from each of the stakeholders will be provided to the STAT members ahead of the meeting time. The purpose of the meeting will be to review progress from the

last meeting and identify action plan supports and next steps for the following meeting. All stakeholder members are mutually responsible for the improvement of the school.

Given that the STAT will have members who are part of ISDE's executive team, ISDE will have an internal system of control with regular feedback provided to the superintendent and cabinet. The STAT members will also be responsible for continuing to convene regular meetings of a core team, which will include representatives from ISDE, CTE, and OSBE leadership. ISDE, the STAT, and the core team will have access to technical assistance from external providers and will reach out to staff from other state education agencies to brainstorm challenges.

The STAT will use the LEA and school improvement plans as a component of analysis of school progress. This team will work with LEAs to examine school data in an iterative process that includes an initial benchmark of student achievement levels, delivery of the prescribed intervention, a second assessment of progress, continued intervention, and a third assessment of progress.

If the monitoring of data demonstrates *no improvement in student progress* toward desired outcome(s) after two cycles within one year of the initial grant, the STAT, in collaboration with the LEA, should determine modification to the intervention(s) or a redefinition of the intervention. The new or modified intervention should be implemented and the monitoring process should begin again.

If the school no longer falls in the category of comprehensive support due to the *significant increase in achievement and/or growth* or it is the conclusion of the STAT that the school's processes and procedures will result in higher levels of student outcomes, ISDE and the LEA will discuss termination of designation and a plan for interim measures of progress, student data, and scaffolded support. The school will be considered exited, but the additional funding allocated for support will no longer be distributed.

*Idaho Building Capacity Project:* Central to the strategy of providing assistance with the management of school improvement is the Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project. The project began in 2008 and is now a cornerstone of ISDE's statewide system of support and its approach to school improvement. Idaho Capacity Builders are experienced educators who have in-depth knowledge of school improvement processes and demonstrated experience implementing change processes. All schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support will receive support from a Capacity Builder. Capacity Builders coach leaders and leadership teams through the tasks of improvement with monthly training and assist in promoting alignment among the various parts within the school or LEA system. Capacity Builders are provided with a toolkit of evidence-based school improvement resources and, in partnership with school and LEA leaders, help create and implement a customized school improvement plan. The Capacity Builders are managed by regional school improvement coordinators at Boise State University, Idaho State University, and University of Idaho.

**Improving Leadership Effectiveness**

The statewide system of support includes several activities to increase the effectiveness of LEA and school leadership. The following activities draw on the strengths and assets of

Idaho's educators while providing focused support to leaders of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

*Idaho Principals' Network (IPN):* The IPN brings school principals together in a professional learning community that is singularly focused on improving outcomes for all students by improving the quality of instruction in all schools. Through the IPN, principals participate in a balance of content, professional conversation, and collegial instructional rounds related directly to instructional leadership, managing change, and improving the overall effectiveness of the instructional core. For example, the network has worked on improving classroom observations, building turnaround leadership competencies, and instructional rounds. For schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the IPN is required and provides coaching and support unique to the leadership needs of each principal. Data collected in July 2017 indicated that IPN participants overwhelmingly indicated satisfaction with the program. Over 95% of participants would either recommend or strongly recommend the program and indicated that the workshops are useful and directly impact their work.

*Idaho Superintendents' Network (ISN):* The ISN was developed by ISDE in partnership with Boise State University's Center for School Improvement and Policy Studies. The purpose of this project is to support the work of LEA leaders in improving outcomes for all students by focusing on the quality of instruction. The network comprises committed superintendents who work together to develop a cohesive and dedicated leadership community focused on teaching and learning. The superintendents support each other as they bring about change and collectively brainstorm obstacles that may prevent improvement in the quality of the instruction in their LEAs. ISDE acts as a resource and provides the necessary research, experts, and planning to bring superintendents from across the state together to discuss self-identified issues. The ISN is a key resource for superintendents in LEAs with schools that are in comprehensive and targeted designation in order to support and build their capacity in specific aspects of leadership. Areas of support provided by the ISN include transforming district central offices for learning improvements, using data to improve teacher effectiveness and instruction, and creating strong stakeholder relationships. The ISN is required for district superintendents with one or more schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

*The Idaho Principal Mentoring Project (IPMP):* The IPMP is designed for early career principals in Idaho. This project is voluntary and will provide new to position principals multiple levels of support. The program hires highly distinguished principals and/or superintendents trained by the state to mentor school leaders. Principal mentors are assigned to principal mentees based on need and experience. Mentors coach leaders through the tasks of improvement with regular high-performance phone calls. Principal mentors are provided with a toolkit of mentoring resources and work with mentees to create a customized mentoring plan that focuses on developing the skills and dispositions in four critical areas of school level leadership: interpersonal and facilitation skills, teacher observation and feedback, effective school-level practices and classroom-level practices, and using data to improve instruction. Data collected in July 2017 showed that 100% of IPMP participants indicated satisfaction with the program and that ~~the~~ it directly impacts

their work. Moving forward, IPMP participation will be required for new principals serving in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement.

*Idaho Career & Technical Education (CTE) Leadership Institute:* Leadership Institute was developed to foster professional development and provide leadership training and opportunities for Idaho professionals in career and technical education. The goal is to train individuals to become local, district, or state-level administrators of career and technical programs. CTE programs in Idaho exist at the middle, secondary, and postsecondary levels, and workforce training exists in noncredit settings such as community colleges and correctional facilities. Each year applicants for Leadership Institute are nominated by a peer, supervisor, or other CTE administrator who recognize the leadership potential of the nominee. New selected members are placed into a cohort to join other cohorts in a rolling 27-month professional development journey that includes training on state and national policy, CTE funding and governance, administration of CTE programs and schools, introduction to national CTE professional associations and advocacy, and personal leadership discovery and growth. Professional staff at ICTE lead the cohorts and act as mentors for the Leadership Institute participants throughout their time in the cohort and beyond.

**Aligning Curriculum and Improving Instruction**

*Professional development and technical assistance from state content specialists:* Idaho has a network of local teacher leaders and content specialists who provide high-quality professional development across the state. The Idaho Regional Mathematics Centers are housed within the colleges of education at each of Idaho's four-year institutions of higher education: Boise State University, Lewis Clark State College, Idaho State University and University of Idaho. The staff of each Regional Mathematics Center provides both regional, district and school-specific support in mathematics education. Each center has developed and utilizes a systematic method to gauge regional, district or school needs and readiness in order to provide equal opportunity to services. To ensure a lasting change in Idaho educators' instructional practice, center programs are of sufficient quality, duration and frequency.

The Idaho Content Literacy Coaches are a group of more than 600 teacher leaders who provide professional development on the Idaho Content Standards, along with lessons, units, and assessments aligned to the Idaho Content Standards. For schools identified as in need of comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, regional mathematics and literacy specialists provide job-embedded coaching.

For schools that are implementing mastery education, expertise from the Idaho Mastery Education Network will be a critical resource for implementing this important but challenging shift in how students learn and are assessed. In addition, mastery education may be used as a strategy for school improvement in schools that are not yet implementing mastery education.

*Educator effectiveness coordinator:* Educator effectiveness is a program that provides LEAs with standards, tools, resources, and support to increase teacher and principal effectiveness and consequently increase student achievement. ISDE's and OSBE's educator effectiveness coordinators integrate educator effectiveness policies and resources within Idaho's statewide system of support. Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and

improvement may utilize the educator effectiveness program for the following: integrating observation and evaluation into continuous school and LEA improvement; technical assistance and professional development on effective instructional strategies and interventions; and creating school and LEA improvement plans that integrate educator observation and evaluation practices with resources, strategies, assessments, and evaluation procedures that will adequately address the needs of all learners.

**Supporting English Learner Students**

Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement may serve disproportionately high percentages of EL students compared with other schools in the state. ISDE is part of the WIDA Consortium and provides the following supports:

*Technical assistance with EL program design and implementation*: The Idaho English Learner Program assists school districts with federal and state requirements of ELs. Program staff works with LEAs to create, implement, and maintain language development programs that provide equitable learning opportunities for ELs. The Idaho EL and Title III Program also provides support for all Idaho educators of EL students through professional learning opportunities that are intentionally designed based on evidence about student and teacher needs.

*Training on WIDA standards and technical assistance on aligning WIDA standards with RTI practices*: The Idaho State EL and Title III Program partners with the WIDA consortium to provide training and technical assistance in implementing the WIDA standards and assessments for English language development and in using data to design and manage instruction and support for EL students.

**Extended Learning Time**

Adjusting the frequency and intensity of interventions can be facilitated by the provision of extended learning time for students and educators. The state encourages LEAs to review school schedules for efficient use of available time and to ensure that available time is effectively used for instruction and academic intervention. LEAs are encouraged to determine how—within existing frameworks and resources—schools can provide interventions and supports beyond scheduled instructional time and how they might use school improvement funds to extend learning time beyond the school day. In particular, schools may leverage school or public libraries in order for students to access additional education resources outside of regular class time during the regular school day. Additionally, LEAs are encouraged to evaluate and determine how extended professional learning time can be made available for educators within schools identified for comprehensive improvement.

**Family and Community Engagement**

ISDE provides resources to support LEAs and schools in taking an evidence-based approach to involving families and the community in improving student outcomes.

*Family and community engagement coordinator:* ISDE has built a system to engage parents within the improvement process. The family and community engagement coordinator identifies, plans, and implements methods that would support LEA leaders and their schools

in engaging families and the community at large in the discussion of continuous school improvement.

*Family engagement tool*: Idaho has collaborated with the Academic Development Institute, the parent organization for the Center on Innovation and Improvement, to provide the Family Engagement Tool (FET) as a resource to all Idaho schools. The FET guides school leaders through an assessment of indicators related to family engagement policies and practices. The resulting outcome is a set of recommendations that can be embedded in the school's improvement plan. As described on the FET website (www.families-schools.org/FETindex.htm), the tool provides: a structured process for school teams working to strengthen family engagement through the school improvement plan; rubrics for improving LEA and school family engagement policies, the home-school compact, and other policies connected to family engagement; documentation of the school's work for the LEA and state; and a reservoir of family engagement resource for use by the school.

*Career & Technical Student Organizations (CTSOs):* CTSOs are an integral, co-curricular part of all CTE programs. They provide opportunities for students to learn and practice leadership skills in the classroom, the school, the community, and within their organization. CTSO members perform community service projects. They may also engage with business and industry community leaders during board meetings, fundraising, and CTSO conferences where the community leaders attend to act as judges for competitive events. CTSOs are, in effect, the part of CTE programs that is visible to the community.

*Technical Advisory Committees (TACs):* TACs support CTE programs by providing input on curriculum and projects, collaborating on and/or securing equipment and other program needs, and supporting the educators and schools where CTE programs are housed, as practical and appropriate. TAC members become involved not only for CTE programs but also the school and the community to advocate for program improvement and student success.

**Fiscal Management**
Idaho's Public School Finance Department provides technical support to LEAs. Finance department staff also prepares reports about revenues, expenditures, budgets, attendance and enrollment, staffing, and school property taxes with information provided by LEAs. For LEAs seeking support on fiscal management and budgetary issues, the State Assistance Team will help coordinate support from the finance department.

ICTE provides technical assistance and oversight to administrators, managers, and teachers regarding the funding distributed through its office. This funding includes, but is not limited to, CTE added-cost funds, career technical school funds, and Idaho Quality Program Standards (IQPS) grants for secondary programs, postsecondary program funding, and Perkins funding for middle, secondary, and postsecondary programs.

f. **Additional Optional Action**. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

Not applicable.

5. **Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators** (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)):* Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such description.[5]

   ISDE created a cross-agency workgroup in 2015 to ~~study~~ measure the equitable distribution of educators across the state. ISDE work~~ed~~s to analyze educator experience, credentials, and need. The data analysis ~~did~~ does not point to disparities in terms of the distribution of personnel who are working with low-income or minority students. The data analysis did identify a shortage of personnel and a higher than desired amount of inexperienced teachers across all areas. The findings became part of Idaho's Equity Plan submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on June 1, 2015, and sparked a statewide effort to study recruitment and retention. This workgroup continues to meet monthly to address various needs around teacher workforce strategies to recruit, retain, and equitably distribute teachers.

   As illustrated in the approved Equity Plan, Idaho has found that there is little to no correlation between student group and educator quality in the state. Instead, Idaho is working to address a general challenge with teacher recruitment and retention statewide, especially in Idaho's rural and remote school districts. Recruitment and retention of effective educators is a cornerstone focus in both school improvement (using state funds, supplemented by Title I-A school improvement funds) and Effective Educators (Title II-A state activities and set-aside funds). The goal is to support educators at every level of the system.

   In addition, the State Board of Education convened an educator pipeline workgroup in 2016, which is working to release recommendations for addressing Idaho's teacher recruitment and retention challenge this year (2017). This workgroup has representation from diverse stakeholder groups, including ISDE, teachers, school administrators, school board members, parents, and the business community.

   In 2017, the ISDE ran the data for inexperienced, out-of-field, and unqualified teachers in relation to minority and low-income students in Title I-A and non-Title I-A schools to determine to what extent, if any, there may be gaps. The results of this data for the 2016-2017 school year are included below. While this updated data shows some disparity in the distribution of teachers, the gaps are small and will be monitored annually.

[5] *Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.*


Average Percentage of Teachers with Listed Characteristics among Title I and Non-Title I Schools, by Quartile for Percent of Students Receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch, SY 2016-2017
Average percent of teachers
20%
15%
10%
5%
0%
9.2%
4.2%
1.4%
8.1%
2.9%
0.9%
7.4%
3.8%
1.5%
9.4%
2.3%
2.9%
5.7%
1.9%
0.9%
6.4%
2.0%
0.9%
6.7%
3.3%
2.3%
7.4%
5.0%
1.7%
1st Quartile
2nd Quartile
3rd Quartile
4th Quartile
1st Quartile
2nd Quartile
3rd Quartile
4th Quartile
Title I Schools
Non Title I Schools
Inexperienced
OutOfField
Ineffective


Average Percentage of Teachers with Listed Characteristics among Title I and Non-Title I Schools, by Quartile for Percent of Minority Student, SY 2016-2017
Average percent of teachers
20%
15%
10%
5%
0%
8.5%
2.8%
1.7%
8.9%
3.9%
1.2%
8.2%
4.0%
1.3%
8.5%
2.4%
2.5%
7.7%
3.9%
1.4%
6.5%
2.7%
0.7%
5.0%
1.9%
1.3%
7.1%
3.6%
2.5%
1st Quartile
2nd Quartile
3rd Quartile
4th Quartile
1st Quartile
2nd Quartile
3rd Quartile
4th Quartile
Title I Schools
Non Title I Schools
Inexperienced
Out of Field
Ineffective

For the purpose of regularly analyzing the rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and/or inexperienced teachers, the following definitions are used:

- Ineffective teacher:
  - Majority (50% +1 student) of his/her students have NOT met their measurable student achievement targets (pursuant to 33-1001, Idaho Code), or
  - Has a summative evaluation rating of unsatisfactory.
- Out-of-field teacher: not appropriately certificated or endorsed for the area in which he/she is teaching
- Inexperienced teacher: in his/her first year of practice
- Low-income student: from economically disadvantaged families
- Minority student: identified as a member of a minority race or ethnicity

Note that Idaho's ineffective teacher definition is in alignment with the requirements in the state's salary apportionment law (Career Ladder) found in 33-1001, Idaho Code for educators to advance on the compensation table. The ineffective teacher definition went into effect July 1, 2017 so this data will not be officially in place until after the 2017-2018 school year.

Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, ISDE will annually run data to analyze these rates and to assess whether or not low income and minority students are taught at a higher rate by teachers deemed to be ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced. If gaps arise or are identified, the ISDE will provide specific support and assistance to the building, LEA, and/or region where the disparity exists. Each LEA will identify and address any disparities that result in low-income students and minority students being taught at higher rates than other students by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers. Progress will be evaluated annually, as described in Idaho's Educator Equity Plan.

~~Information~~ Progress on rates at which low-income and minority students in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and/or inexperienced teachers will be publicly reported when published annually on the ISDE website at: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/ed-equity/index.html.

6. **School Conditions** (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(C)):* Describe how the SEA will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning, including through reducing: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment; (ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

   Existing state supports will be leveraged to increase the impact of Title IV-A funds. After multiple years of stakeholder organizing and working with the Idaho Legislature, a law was passed during the 2015 session that increased the requirements of LEAs to address bullying and harassment including: ongoing professional development for all staff at the school building level, the expectation that all staff intervene when bullying/harassment occurs, the implementation of a graduated series of consequence for policy violators, and annual reporting of bullying incidents to ISDE.

The Idaho Legislature has also appropriated $4 million ongoing in formula funds to establish safe and drug free schools. These funds can be leveraged to establish optimal conditions for learning, improve school climate, implement special programs, and explore alternatives to suspension and expulsion. In an effort to maximize these resources and assist LEAs in implementing best practices, ISDE hosts an annual conference focused on the prevention of risk behaviors, out of school time programs, and family/community engagement called the *Idaho Prevention and Support Conference.* Approximately 700 school counselors, teachers, administrators (including charter and alternative), school resource officers, juvenile probation officers, judiciary representatives, school psychologists, and other stakeholders attend every year. Recent conference themes include addressing bullying/harassment and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). ISDE has focused heavily on ACEs as this research makes a strong case for trauma-informed disciplinary policy and practice.

Additionally, ISDE won a Garret Lee Smith grant focused on youth suicide prevention from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and implemented Sources of Strength (an evidence-based youth suicide prevention program) in select schools from 2014 through 2016. One outcome of this work was the Idaho Legislature's establishment of the state's first Office of Suicide Prevention in the Department of Health and Welfare with an appropriation of $1 million and four new full-time staff positions to continue implementing the Sources of Strength program in schools. This program has demonstrated efficacy not only in preventing suicide but also a wide range of risk behaviors, as it focuses on developing internal strengths such as grit, resilience, hope, and connectedness.

These supports will be used to increase the impact of Title IV-A funds appropriated for LEA and ISDE efforts to address bullying and harassment. The strategies in Table 114 below already have a presence and existing supports in Idaho, and ISDE will encourage LEAs to use Title IV-A funds for these purposes if local data merits the need.

**Table 114: Strategies for addressing behavior, discipline, and bullying/harassment**

| Strategy | Timeline | Funding sources |
|---|---|---|
| Idaho Prevention and Support Conference | Spring annually | Title IV-A |
| • Support LEAs with existing initiatives:<br>• Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (school-wide, systemic approach to improved culture and supports based on data)<br>• Restorative justice practices<br>• Mentoring programs such as Big Brothers, Big Sisters<br>• Alternatives to suspension/expulsion (special programs)<br>• Sources of Strength (secondary level)<br>• Good Behavior Game (primary level)<br>• Suicide Prevention Gatekeeper Training | Ongoing | Title IV-A |

| Strategy | Timeline | Funding sources |
|---|---|---|
| • Youth Mental Health First Aid<br>• Mental Health assessment and referral<br>• Crisis response/de-escalation training for school staff<br>• School nurse position with student health room<br>• Wellness programs (Coordinated School Health)<br>• Multi-tiered systems of support<br>• Development of risk assessment protocols and policies<br>• Parenting programs such as Nurturing Parenting<br>• Child sexual abuse prevention initiatives such as Stewards of Children | | |

The ISDE will also access—and encourage LEAs to access—the expertise of the regional Equity Assistance Center funded by the U.S. Department of Education to promote greater understanding of equity and to ensure equal access to educational opportunities for all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or national origin.

7. **School Transitions** *(ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D))*: Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

   The ISDE was deliberate in including a wide range of stakeholders in informing this Consolidated State Plan, in particular, the Title IV part A section includes feedback from representatives focused on suicide prevention, foster youth, homeless youth, families living in poverty, drop-out prevention, children of military families, rights of disabled students, Native American advocacy, neglected youth, migratory families and English learners.

   **Increasing Opportunities and Outcomes for College and Career**: Idaho has a single State Board of Education that oversees its entire P–20 education system. This structure promotes consistency and allows for strategic planning across the entire P–20 education continuum, from kindergarten through college or career attainment. The SBOE sets benchmarks for the percentage of Idaho students graduating from high school, attending postsecondary institutions, and completing college and/or being ready to assume careers. Examples of the implementation of these goals include the support for advanced opportunities (with specific goals for the percentages of students completing advanced opportunities), Next Steps Idaho, which provides web-based guidance through the admissions process and funding streams, as well as efforts at the high school level, such as Idaho College Application Week.

   Several committees and taskforces is Idaho are also working to create a seamless transition from high school to college and career. The Governor's Higher Education Taskforce and Workforce Development Taskforce, convened by the SBOE, which include representatives from diverse stakeholder groups, are working to generate recommendations to further

improve Idaho's effort. The SBOE also adopted a statewide definition of college and career readiness in June 2017, which will be operationalized with college and career readiness standards for high school students that are now in development.

**Transition to School:** Idaho does not currently offer state-sponsored prekindergarten, although some LEAs use their Title I and local funds to support this effort. Transitions from prekindergarten to kindergarten are clearly articulated in the State Special Education ~~Manual for~~Manual for students with disabilities. This guidance also addresses student progress through the grade continuum.

Idaho assesses all K–3 students on foundational literacy skills at least twice per year. Any student who is identified as "at risk" must receive a minimum of 30 hours (if slightly below grade level) or 60 hours (if below grade level) of additional intervention. The intervention must meet the evidence-based standard, and LEAs must write plans and identify progress annually to the state. During the 2016 session of the Idaho Legislature, funding for the intervention was increased from approximately $2 million to $9.3 million. During the 2017 legislative session, funding was increased again to $11.4 million.

**Middle Level**: Idaho recognizes that decisions about college and career are often made prior to high school. To this end, the Middle-Level Credit System was instituted in May 2007 with the purpose of improving rigor, relevance, and relationships in the middle grades; identifying pockets of success throughout Idaho to develop best practices for all middle schools; and ensuring every Idaho student is prepared to be successful in high school and beyond. The Middle-Level Credit System focuses on five key areas: student accountability, middle-level curriculum, academic intervention, leadership among staff at the middle level, and student transitions between the middle and high school grades. This system provides the flexibility for LEAs to meet the unique needs of their students while maintaining quality.

In addition, 8$^{th}$ graders are required to complete learning plans for high school and beyond before transitioning to 9$^{th}$ grade. The state has developed a career information system for middle school and high school students that enables a student to learn about the skills and dispositions required in a wide range of jobs and professional fields. Eighth grade students also have access to college and career advisors, in which Idaho has invested heavily in recent years.

**High School**: ISDE supervises K–12 education and has identified priorities that are aligned with the vision of SBOE. The first goal of ISDE's plan is ensure that all Idaho students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers. Every high school student is required to take a set of required courses, and every junior has the opportunity to take a nationally recognized college admission assessment, currently the Scholastic Aptitude Test, which is paid for by the state.

The legislature has appropriated state funds for students to offset costs associated with college entrance exams, dual credit, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and overload courses. Each student is eligible for $4,125.00 to use beginning in 8$^{th}$ grade. Idaho's dual credit participation has increased dramatically in recent years, with more

students entering a two- or four-year university with transferable credits toward major or general education requirements. Thirty-two percent of high school students participated in Advanced Opportunities during the 2015-16 school year, which grew to 47% of high school students in 2016-17.

**Career Technical School (CTS):** ICTE oversees special CTE schools, referred to Career Technical Schools. These schools are designed to provide high-end, state-of-the-art technical programs and also meet certain other requirements in addition to the requirements of CTE programs in comprehensive high schools, such as field experiences and enrollment from multiple high schools. Career Technical Schools must also provide postsecondary alignment for all of their programs, giving students the opportunity to earn technical competency credits at Idaho postsecondary institutions with similar CTE programs.

**Alternative Schools**: Idaho's alternative schools help students find success through a personalized approach. The supports and flexibility provided to alternative schools emphasize the specific needs of at-risk students. The alternative schools specifically work with students in grades 6-12 who are transitioning from elementary to middle/junior high and middle/junior high to high school in order to help them be successful at the next level.

Students enrolled in alternative schools in Idaho receive additional support not always found in traditional secondary schools. This may include assigning fewer classes per day and tailoring instruction to students' individual needs. Students are provided the opportunity to attend summer school in order to make up credits or to get a head start on the coming school year. In addition to the academic requirements, alternative schools are required to provide services based on student needs, including daycare centers for students who are parents and direct social services such as social workers and specialized counselors and psychologists.

ISDE provides specific support for alternative schools, in addition to what is provided to traditional secondary schools. In order to provide specialized instruction and additional supports, alternative schools are provided more funding per student than a traditional secondary school. Alternative schools are also reimbursed for the cost of providing summer school. Alternative schools are invited to participate in the Idaho Prevention and Support Conference and are encouraged to participate in a strand of workshops specifically focused on alternative school best practices and needs. They have also been specifically targeted to participate in programs that provide innovative instructional practices, such as the Idaho Mastery Education Network.

**English Learners**: ISDE supports the efforts of LEAs to help English learner students (ELs) gain English proficiency while simultaneously meeting challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards. The Idaho English Learner Program assists LEAs with federal and state requirements related to ELs. The program helps LEAs create, implement, and maintain language development programs that provide equal learning opportunities for ELs. The goal is to develop curricula and teaching strategies that embrace each learner's unique identity to help break down barriers that prevent ELs from succeeding

in school.

The Idaho State EL and Title III Program provides support for all Idaho educators of ELs through professional learning opportunities that are intentionally designed based on the timely needs of EL educators. We recognize that as the number of ELs grows, all educators must be mutually responsible for the language development and academic success of ELs and, therefore, all teachers are language teachers. Partnerships with Idaho's institutes of higher education are essential for incorporating components of EL education into preservice teacher education in an effort to prepare teachers with appropriate instructional strategies for the ELs in their classrooms.

**Students with Disabilities**: The ISDE Special Education Department works collaboratively with LEAs, agencies, and parents to ensure students with disabilities receive quality, meaningful, and needed services. The department has program coordinators for dispute resolution, funding, program monitoring, results-driven accountability, special populations, secondary transition, and data management. The department also works collaboratively with the Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) project through Boise State University. SESTA provides statewide professional development, training, and support to LEA leaders, teachers, and paraprofessionals who support students with disabilities.

**Next Steps**: Despite the significant steps taken to create purposeful alignment from preschool to college, the state recognizes the need for additional supports at critical transitions, such as elementary to middle school and middle school to high school. During the 2017–18 school year a task force comprising LEA leaders with transition plans in place, SBOE staff, and ISDE program coordinators will be convened to provide guidance to all LEAs, schools, and families on creating systems of support for students.

The State Board of Education has set a goal that 60% of Idahoans ages 25-34 will have some sort postsecondary degree or certificate. While there is much work to be done to meet or exceed this goal, the state is committed to providing high quality educational opportunities and outcomes for all Idahoans.

## B. Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children

1. **Supporting Needs of Migratory Children** *(ESEA section 1304(b)(1))*: Describe how, in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs and projects assisted under Title I, Part C, the State and its local operating agencies will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:

**Planning**

*State Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process:* As part of the continuous improvement cycle, Idaho completed a new Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) spring 2016, based on the Office of Migrant Education Comprehensive Needs Assessment Toolkit. This process included stakeholders, appropriate ISDE and LEA staff, and parents. Results of the needs assessment surveys for staff, parents, and secondary students provided a snapshot of perceived needs from the stakeholders most directly involved in the education of migrant children and from the children themselves. Intensive analysis of student performance data also informed the process. Finally, Parent Advisory Council (PAC) feedback throughout the process provided ongoing parent insight into student and family needs, especially those of preschool students and out-of-school youth. The CNA is the foundation of the Service Delivery Plan (SDP) and its measurable program outcomes and objectives.

*LEA Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process and Toolkit:* ISDE provides tools to the LEAs for performing local needs assessments. The Idaho needs assessment surveys, suggestions for conducting a local CNA, and strategies for collecting and reporting needs data are found in the Idaho LEA Migrant Education Program (MEP) Comprehensive Needs Assessment Toolkit. The toolkit can be found on the Migrant webpage under Resource File in Migrant Services http://www.sde.idaho.gov/el-migrant/migrant/index.html. LEAs are provided with technical assistance in performing the CNA process and are monitored to ensure that local needs assessments are taking place.

*State Service Delivery Plan:* Idaho completed a new Service Delivery Plan in the spring of 2017 based on concerns raised in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment that included migrant stakeholders. All migrant funded LEAs have received new Measurable Program Objectives (MPOs) and have provided assurances to the Idaho MEP through the consolidated grant application process that they will work to implement the strategies and evaluate the results as measured by the MPOs. Data is collected at the end of the performance period from every project LEA, showing their self-evaluation of their progress at meeting the MPOs. The Idaho MEP will aggregate this data to evaluate the progress of the Idaho MEP at serving the unique needs of migrant students.

**Implementation**

The State Department of Education implements the Service Delivery Plan through the Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application completed by LEAs each year, which includes the MPOs from the state Service Delivery Plan. In Idaho, one-third of LEAs have small migrant programs and receive minimal funding, therefore MPOs that are more appropriate to larger programs are optional for smaller programs. LEAs select which of the optional MPOs they will implement for the coming year. Required MPOs are pre-selected

for all LEAs. LEAs then briefly describe their plan for implementing each MPO selected in the grant application.

**Evaluation**

Idaho has a Migrant Student Information System, created by in-house developers. In this system, each LEA reports whether or not it has achieved the selected MPO from the submitted consolidated plan. They also report supporting information for each MPO. LEAs are required to submit this information in the fall so services delivered in the summer may be included. ISDE uses this data to evaluate the overall program success at meeting MPOs and for analyzing the Service Delivery Plan and data collection methods for needed revisions.

In addition, Idaho has a three-year cycle of monitoring that includes a site visit, interviews with parents, secondary students, teachers, the family liaison, administrators, the local migrant director and business manager. Monitoring occurs as a consolidated process with all federal programs represented. The migrant program also conducts informal monitoring of migrant summer school programs through site visits. Each LEA that offers a summer program is visited at least once every three years.

i. The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;

It is critical that migrant students in Idaho have equal access to all appropriate local State, and Federal programs in addition to supplemental MEP services designed to meet the Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) identified in the Service Delivery Plan (SDP).

In order to ensure that this takes place, the Idaho MEP has a two-pronged approach. First, ISDE MEP staff has provided, and continues to provide, intensive training and technical assistance to LEAs to ensure that they do not use migrant funds to provide services to migrant students that they would normally be eligible to receive, regardless of migrant status (supplanting). By ensuring that LEAs understand that migrant funds must be used after other programs provide services, we ensure that migrant students receive every service that they are entitled to under other programs, in addition to migrant services. Second, collaboration by migrant and other program staff at both a state and local level is a clear expectation shared with local migrant directors in training and is part of the ISDE monitoring process. State monitoring includes an indicator that requires proof that LEA migrant staff are in collaboration with other local, State and Federal educational programs, including Title I-A, III-A, McKinney-Vento and others. Indeed, many Idaho LEA migrant programs are small enough that the family liaison is the only migrant staff person. He or she often provides services through advocacy (support services) both within the school and in the community, ensuring that the children receive the services they need from school, health and other social services in the community (referred services). This collaboration ensures that migrant students' needs are addressed in schools by multiple programs.

Services provided to preschool-aged students are included in three MPOs in the category of School Readiness. Since Idaho does not have state-funded preschool, LEAs generally do not serve these students through local, State and other Federal programs. In Idaho, Migrant

funds may be used to pay fees for migrant students to attend developmental preschool programs as peer models, who would not otherwise be able to attend. Some LEAs with larger migrant populations provide preschool as a site-based migrant preschool. Other LEAs offer programs including home visits with materials and training provided to parents. Many LEAs offer preschool services through summer programming.

**Out of School Youth (OSY)**

Idaho uses materials developed by the Office of Migrant Education's Consortium Incentive Grant (CIG) "Solutions for Out of School Youth" (SOSY), including the OSY Profile adapted for Idaho. LEAs fill out this profile gathering data on the needs of the out of school youth and dropouts and provide referrals to other agencies, such as the High School Equivalency Program (HEP), agencies that can provide training opportunities, and social and health services to these youth. These profiles are submitted to the ISDE. In addition, the state provides MP3 players with intensive English curriculum for LEAs to use with out of school youth and dropouts who need help with learning English.

**Drop-outs**

Idaho's MEP strives for all migrant students to graduate. Our approach is to provide services and activities to keep students on track for graduation. For all migrant secondary students, including those who are at-risk for dropping out, we implement the services and activities mentioned above for out of school youth. In addition, ten of our Migrant-funded districts employee Migrant graduation specialists to prevent students from dropping out of school. Migrant graduation specialists have access to the Portable Assisted Support Sequence (PASS) courses for their students. They also connect students with local and state funded credit accrual and credit recovery opportunities. If a Migrant funded district does not have a migrant graduation specialist, the Migrant family liaison coordinates with the districts' counseling staff to ensure migrant students receive the necessary supports for academic success. Lastly, Idaho's State MEP hosts a Migrant Student Leadership Institute for migrant sophomores and juniors every July. Migrant students who are considered at-risk of dropping out are encouraged to apply for the Institute. The Institute is housed at Boise State University with a focus on college, career, and leadership skills. Services provided to secondary migrant students are focused at keeping students in school until they graduate.

If our efforts to keep students in school are unsuccessful, district migrant personnel attempt to contact the student to identify reasons for dropping out. Each situation is unique, thus assistance and support will vary with each student. At times, migrant staff are able to help students re-enroll in school. Other times, staff are able to help students by referring them to High School Equivalency (HEP) programs or other local GED programs, referrals to vocational training, and other health and social services if applicable. While dropouts are not mentioned specifically in all of Idaho's MPOs, all our strategies are geared towards preventing our migrant students from dropping out.

ii. Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;

The state models collaboration with joint planning of Title I-C and Title III. Title III, Title I-C, and State EL are part of one department at the ISDE. Starting fall of 2017-2018 the working group that collaborated on the recent Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Service Delivery Plan will continue as an advisory panel to the Idaho MEP. This group will be combined with the EL advisory panel as many of the members of each group work with overlapping populations. We will establish a method of rotating members over time and will include State and LEA federal programs staff, family liaisons, K-12 teachers, migrant preschool teachers, parents, and representatives from other agencies who work with migrant families, including the High School Equivalency program (HEP), College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) and Migrant Seasonal Head Start (MSHS). Other possible members include representatives from the Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs, Institutes of Higher Education, and the State Board of Education. This collaborative group will address concerns and provide advice to continue program development.

LEAs are trained to coordinate Title I-C with Title III in parent outreach, parent advisory councils (PACs), and afterschool programming. For example, LEAs are trained to include migrant program staff in planning and implementing of non-migrant programs to ensure that migrant students are a priority and that those programs meet migrant students' needs. Since many migrant families also use a language other than English in the home and have children who are designated as English learners, these families provide planning, implementing and evaluative feedback to LEAs for both programs.

iii. The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and

After identifying the needs of migrant students, migrant staff also assesses the availability of non-migrant programming to meet those needs and use migrant funds to provide supplemental programs that meet unmet needs. For example, Idaho does not provide state-funded preschool, so migrant LEAs have implemented a variety of preschool programs, including summer programs, to meet the school readiness needs of our migrant children. In cases where other programs offer services, the migrant programs in LEAs support migrant families by enhancing home school communication and by advocating for migrant students and families to participate in all other programs.

iv. Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

This section outlines how Idaho's Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) will produce statewide results through specific educational or educationally-related services. The MPOs will allow the Migrant Education Program (MEP) to determine whether, and to what degree, the program has met the unique educational needs of migrant children and youth as identified through the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). It should be noted that some MPOs are required of all project LEAs, while others are optional. This determination is

made by the ISDE staff in order to accommodate funded LEAs that serve very few students through mainly providing non-instructional support and referred services.

**School Readiness**

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant parents attending parent involvement activities will report on a pre/post survey that they have an increased ability to support school readiness activities in the home. | 1.1) Provide migrant parents with ideas, activities, and materials for use at home with their children to promote first language development and school readiness through site-based or home- based family literacy opportunities (e.g., language acquisition, packets with school supplies, books, and activities). | Required |
| 1.2) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 90% of students attending at least 40 hours of migrant preschool will show a gain on a pre/post-test of school readiness skills. | 1.2) Provide migrant funded site-based preschool services to migrant children ages 3- 5 (e.g., during the regular school day, as an evening program, or as part of a summer school program). | Optional |
| 1.3) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 30% of all identified migrant-eligible preschool-aged children will be served. | 1.3) Participate in the activities of the Preschool Initiative Consortium Incentive Grants (CIG) and share materials, strategies, and resources with migrant families. | Optional |

**English Language Arts Achievement**

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| 2.1) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant K-2 students will receive resources to promote early literacy as measured by resource distribution logs. | 2.1) Provide resources through migrant funds to promote early literacy (e.g., extended day kindergarten, backpacks and school supplies, family literacy nights and opportunities, individual libraries, migrant summer school expeditionary | Optional |

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| | opportunities, tutoring, after school programs)., | |
| 2.2a) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant students who participate in an extended school service taught by qualified migrant staff will show gains of at least 20% or grade level proficiency on a pre/post assessment of grade-level ELA skills for students in grades 3-12.<br><br>2.2b) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant students who participate in an extended school service taught by qualified migrant staff will earn at least one secondary English credit for students in grades 7-12. | 2.2 Use qualified staff to provide supplemental ELA extended school services aligned with state standards and proficiencies (e.g., summer school for ELA, IDLA-advancement, Plato, dual enrollment, community colleges, academies offered by Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs), Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS), after school tutoring, home-based instruction). | Optional |
| 2.3) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of teachers participating in migrant-sponsored ELA professional development will report on a survey that they successfully applied the research-based instructional strategies on supplemental literacy instruction. | 2.3) Provide opportunities for migrant staff to attend LEA, regional, state, and/or national level ELA professional development (e.g., migrant funds are used to send staff to PD events). | Optional |
| 2.4) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant parents attending parent involvement activities (one-on-one or in groups) will report on a pre/post survey that the resources they received have increased their ability to provide ELA academic support at home. | 2.4) Provide ongoing (year-round) access and training on specific resources (e.g., school supplies, educational materials, books and multicultural literature) needed by migrant parents and students. | Required |

**Mathematics Achievement**

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant K-2 students will receive resources to promote early numeracy as measured by resource distribution logs. | 3.1) Provide resources through migrant funds to promote early numeracy (e.g., extended day kindergarten, backpacks and school supplies, family math nights and opportunities, mathematics manipulatives, migrant summer school, expeditionary opportunities, tutoring, after school programs). | Optional |
| 3.2a) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant students who participate in an extended school service taught by qualified migrant staff will show gains of at least 20% or grade level proficiency on a pre/post assessment of grade-level math skills for students in grades 3-12. | 3.2) Use qualified staff to provide supplemental math extended school services aligned with state standards and proficiencies (e.g., summer school for math, IDLA-advancement, Plato, dual enrollment, community colleges, Idaho National Lab, math camps, academies offered by IHEs). | Optional |
| 3.2a) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant students who participate in an extended school service taught by qualified migrant staff will earn at least one secondary math credit for students in grades 7-12. | | Optional |
| 3.3) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant staff participating in migrant-sponsored math professional development will report on a survey that they successfully applied the research-based instructional strategies during supplemental math instruction. | 3.3) Provide opportunities for migrant staff to attend LEA, regional, state, or national level math professional development (e.g., migrant funds are used to send staff to PD events). | Optional |
| 3.4) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant parents attending parent involvement activities will report on a pre/post | 3.4.a) Identify organizations, experts, and resources to provide family math engagement opportunities and share | Required |

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| survey that they have an increased ability to support math education at home. | information with parents (e.g., Parent Math Night, manipulatives, guest speakers, community and job outings focused on math in their world).<br>3.4.b) Provide opportunities for migrant parents to attend local, regional, state, and national math family engagement events and activities. | |

**High School Graduation and Dropout Prevention**

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1) By the end of 201~~7~~9-20~~18~~20 program year, the ~~migrants~~migrants' graduation rate will increase by 3%. ~~100% of migrant secondary students will be monitored using a student tracking system.~~ | 4.1a) Develop and implement a student monitoring system to follow migrant secondary students' progress toward grade promotion and graduation.<br>4.1b) Implement an individual plan for any migrant secondary student, who is at-risk for dropping out as demonstrated by lost credits.<br>4.1c) Provide a secondary migrant graduation specialist or other migrant staff to support migrant students towards grade promotion and graduation for 7th – 12th grades. | Optional |
| 4.2) By the end of the program year 2017-2018, the percentage of secondary migrant students receiving an instructional and/or support service will increase by 20% (or 80% served overall if already serving most of their students). | 4.2.a) Provide instructional services during the school day, before or after school, or during summer school for credit accrual for secondary migrant students (e.g., tutoring, study skills elective classes, PASS, credit recovery classes, internships). | Required |

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| | 4.2.b) Provide support services (e.g., supplemental supplies and fees, advocacy etc.). | |
| ~~4.3) By the end of program year 2017-2018, a secondary migrant graduation specialist or other migrant staff will be in place in all funded MEPs to support migrant student promotion and graduation.~~ | ~~4.3) Provide a secondary migrant graduation specialist or other migrant staff to support migrant students toward grade promotion and graduation for 7th – 12th grades.~~ | ~~Optional~~ |
| 4.~~4~~3) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant students or parents participating, will report on a pre/post survey that the information gained was useful in promoting the goal of high school graduation and/or college and career readiness. | 4.4) Provide parents and students with information and supportive events related to high school graduation and/or college and career readiness at a minimum of twice per year (e.g., Migrant Summer Leadership Institute, college visits, presentations at Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings, College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) collaborations, leadership institutes, career fairs/speakers, Career Information System (CIS) software training). | Required |
| 4.4) By the end of the program year 2019-2020, 90% of migrant dropouts who can be located will receive educational, support, or referral services. | 4.4a) Make every effort to contact every student who has not enrolled in school as expected (e.g. multiple attempts using all available resources, such as school records, MSIX Missed Enrollment Report, MSIS Discrepancy Report, etc.).<br><br>4.4b) For any student who has dropped out of school in grades 7-12, conduct an exit interview with the student and the parents | Required |

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| | to determine and alleviate barriers to re-enrollment.<br><br>4.4c) Providing educational counseling support services to provide students with multiple options for continuing their education (e.g. alternative schools, online opportunities, GED programs, job-training programs). | |

**Non-instructional Support Services**

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| 5.1) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant staff participating will report an increase in student engagement based on staff surveys. | 5.1) Provide professional development (PD) on migratory lifestyle and unique needs of migrant students (e.g., program and cultural awareness presentation, field or home visits for teachers and administrators, training on mobility /academic/social gaps). | Required |
| 5.2) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant parents participating will report an increase in student engagement based on parent surveys. | 5.2) Provide workshops, meetings, and resources to parents and the community on ways to support and involve migrant students (e.g., extra-curricular activities, parenting classes, parent literacy workshops, instructional home visits). | Required |
| 5.3) By the end of program year 2017-2018, at least two local partnerships and/or agreements among the school LEA and community healthcare providers | 5.3) Establish partnerships and/or agreements among the school LEA and community healthcare providers (such as Lions Club and the regional health district) and | Required |

| Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs) | Key Strategies | LEA Options |
|---|---|---|
| and public health agencies will be established to provide health services to migrant families. | public health agencies to provide health services to migrant families, such as Memoranda of Understanding. | |
| 5.4) By the end of program year 2017-2018, 80% of migrant parents participating in parent involvement activities will report on a pre/post survey that they have an increased understanding of how to access community health services. | 5.4) Provide information on, and referrals to, individualized health advocacy services to benefit migrant families needing health services (e.g., glasses, dental, immunizations). | Required |

**Promote Coordination of Services** (*ESEA section 1304(b)(3))*: Describe how the State will use Title I, Part C funds received under this part to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.

ISDE continues to participate in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) Data Quality Initiative. Idaho ensures that accurate and complete records are being uploaded to MSIX in order to give liaisons access to up-to-date information on students' academic risk and progress. Further, training has been provided and will continue to be provided in using MSIX information to better serve migrant students. LEAs also receive training in accessing data from Idaho's Migrant Student Information System (MSIS), which provides extensive information on Idaho migrant students, facilitating intrastate transfer of records.

**Table 125: Migrant Student Information Exchange agreements**

| Intrastate Coordination and Records Transfer | Interstate Coordination and Records Transfer |
|---|---|
| • Idaho's MSIS includes individual immunization records with dates and health alerts<br>• MSIS includes historical information on all Idaho assessments including the Idaho Reading Indicator, Idaho Standards Achievement Tests of English language arts and math and English language proficiency assessment (ACCESS) | • MSIX Consolidated Records report for assessments, course history, and move history<br>• MSIX for Move Notifications<br>• MSIX for Data Requests |

| Intrastate Coordination and Records Transfer | Interstate Coordination and Records Transfer |
|---|---|
| • MSIX Consolidated Records includes course history | |

As part of its consolidated plan, each LEA must complete the following question: "Describe the LEA's coordination efforts with other agencies, including the timely transfer of student records." As part of this question, LEAs must describe "How does the LEA ensure that students who move are served right away in their new LEA (i.e., MSIX, phone calls)?" Acceptable responses must include both MSIX notifications and direct communications with receiving LEAs.

In the event that an MSIX Data Request is received at a time of year when the family liaison and regional ID&R coordinator are not available (school breaks), the request will escalate to the Idaho MEP and data will be provided directly to the requestor by state migrant staff.

Idaho's MEP promotes intrastate and interstate coordination by participating in the following:

- ISDE collaborates with the Community Council of Idaho, Idaho's Migrant Seasonal Head Start provider to create a Memorandum of Understanding completed by LEAs with the local Head Start every two years to promote recruiting and services provided to preschool students.
- ISDE MEP staff and many LEA staff participate in the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) conference annually.
- ISDE MEP Director attends NASDME General Membership meetings to collaborate with other State MEP Directors.
- ISDE MEP Director and staff attend Migrant Annual Director's Meeting (ADM) to learn and collaborate from Office of Migrant Education (OME) and other State MEP Directors.
- The state provides statewide Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings six times per year in the fall and spring in three locations across the state.
- Idaho's MEP director is the northwest regional representative to the Collaboration Work Group (CWG) with the Office of Migrant Education. Although new to this role, she will share information from the CWG with MEP Directors in the northwest region and serve as an advocate for the needs of these states.
- The Idaho MEP provides training/collaboration meetings to migrant directors across the state three times per year.
- The ISDE organizes a biannual Federal Programs Conference that provides information, training, and opportunities for collaboration among LEA and ISDE staff regarding all federal programs and special education.
- The state participates in the Bi-National program and contracts with an experienced person to administer the program. LEAs use the Mexican Transfer Document to ensure that students leaving the United States to Mexico will be able to register their students in school.

1. **Use of Funds** (ESEA section 1304(b)(4)): Describe the State's priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds, and how such priorities relate to the State's assessment of needs for services in the State.
   Title I, Part C Funds are used to implement the strategies identified in our service delivery plan in order to meet the Measureable Performance Outcomes. Funding is also used to support parent advisory councils and other parent involvement activities at both the state and local level. Finally, funds are used for statewide efforts in identification and recruitment of migrant children and youth.

   The State's Comprehensive Needs Assessment completed in 2016-2017 defines concerns and proposed solutions. The Service Delivery Plan responded to the concerns and incorporated proposed solutions to create appropriate strategies and Measurable Performance Outcomes.

## C. Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk

1. **Transitions Between Correctional Facilities and Local Programs** *(ESEA section 1414(a)(1)(B)):* Provide a plan for assisting in the transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs.

   Transitional services to support students transitioning from the LEA to the correctional facility enables students to continue their education. Transitional services to support the transition of students from correctional facilities to LEAs ensure a planned and smooth transition for students returning to school.

   Participating schools coordinate with facilities working with delinquent children and youth to ensure that each student is participating in an education program comparable to the one operating in the student's school. Schools make every effort to ensure the correctional facility working with students are aware of a student's existing individualized education program.

   Procedures based on the needs of the student, including the transfer of credits that such student earns during placement; and opportunities for such students to participate in credit-bearing coursework while in secondary school, postsecondary education, or career and technical education programming for each of the two types of programs Title I-D Subpart 1 and 2 are outlined below. The state will place a priority for such children to attain a regular high school diploma, to the extent feasible. The ISDE has established the following procedures to ensure the timely re-enrollment of each student who has been placed in the juvenile justice system in secondary school or in a re-entry program

   Idaho has two state agency programs under Title I, Part D Subpart 1. The Idaho Adult Correctional Program and the Idaho Juvenile Correctional Program and both are required to annually identify in Idaho's yearly application (Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application, or CFSGA) transition activities that take place at their respective programs and meet the 15 to 30 percent reservation of funds for re-entry or transition services as required by law. Both programs are required to provide a detailed explanation on how the facility will coordinate with counselors, school districts, and/or postsecondary educational institutions or vocational/technical training programs in assisting students' transition.

   Under Title I, Part D Subpart 2 Idaho has twenty-four local programs, serving either neglected or delinquent students. Subpart 2 programs are required to provide transitional services (although no specific funding percentage like is described in Subpart 1 programs is required since it is not outlined in the law) to assist students in returning to locally operated schools and to promote positive academic and vocational outcomes for youth who are neglected and/or delinquent. These Subpart 2 programs are also required to annually identify in Idaho's CFSGA their transition services.

   In the fall of 2017, ISDE will add information on best practices and tools on the state web site for youth returning from correctional facilities or institutions for neglected or delinquent children and youth. The tools and professional development for facilities to

implement a support system to ensure their continued education and the involvement of their families and communities will be conducted and completed by April 2018.

A new coordinator for the Neglected, Delinquent, and At-Risk program was hired January 16, 2018 and is in the process of reviewing transitional plans for facilities participating in Subpart 1 and Subpart 2 to determine the effectiveness of these plans and provide resources and tools on the ISDE website and onsite- training.

Upon a student's entry into the Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk facility, the staff will work with the youth's family members and the local educational agency that most recently provided services to the student (if applicable). This process will include ensuring that the relevant and appropriate academic records and plans regarding the continuation of educational services for such child or youth are shared jointly between the facility and LEA in order to facilitate the transition of such children and youth between the LEA and the correctional facility. The facility will consult with the LEA for a period jointly determined necessary by the facility and LEA upon discharge from that facility, to coordinate educational services so as to minimize disruption to the child's or youth's achievement.

2. **Program Objectives and Outcomes** *(ESEA section 1414(a)(2)(A)):* Describe the program objectives and outcomes established by the State that will be used to assess the effectiveness of the Title I, Part D program in improving the academic, career, and technical skills of children in the program.

   **Objective 1**: Title I, Part D programs will provide for individualization of instructional experience beginning with an intake process that includes an identification of each student's academic strengths and weaknesses in reading and math. Outcome: Each Title I, Part D program will provide educational services for children and youth who are neglected or delinquent to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet challenging State academic content and achievement standards.

   **Objective 2**: Title I, Part D programs will ensure that all neglected and delinquent students accrue school credits that meet state requirements for grade promotion and secondary school graduation. Outcome: Each Title I, Part D program will pre and post-test each student using a standards-based test to determine academic growth during the student's placement in the academic program.

   **Objective 3**: Title I, Part D programs will ensure that all neglected and delinquent students have the opportunity to transition to a regular community school or other education program operated by an LEA, complete secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements), and/or obtain employment after leaving the facility. Outcome: Title I, Part D programs will annually report on the types of transitional services and the number of students that have transitioned from the facilities to the regular community schools or other education programs, completed secondary school (or secondary school equivalency requirements), and/or obtained employment after leaving the facility.

**Objective 4**: Title I, Part D programs will ensure (when applicable) that neglected and delinquent students have the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs. Outcome: Title I, Part D programs will annually report on the number of neglected and delinquent students who were given the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs.

## D. Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction

1. **Use of Funds** *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(A) and (D))*: Describe how the State educational agency will use Title II, Part A funds received under Title II, Part A for State-level activities described in section 2101(c), including how the activities are expected to improve student achievement.

**State Level Activities – Administrators and Libraries**

*Idaho Principal Mentoring Project:* According to the 2012 Rand Corporation (Burkauser, et. al, 2012) study on first year principals, "improving the principal placement process to ensure that individuals are truly ready for and supported in their new roles could have important implications for student achievement—particularly in low-performing schools." The Idaho Principal Mentoring Project seeks to provide this support with the ultimate goal of principal retention and increased student achievement.

Title II-A funds are used to implement the Idaho Principal Mentoring Project (`), which was a new program in 2016-2017 and designed for early career principals. See section A(4)(viii)(e) of the plan for a complete description of the IMPM. The project provides another level of support to those entering a leadership position. While participation has been voluntary, new principals serving in schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement will be required to take advantage of the program. In 2016-17, 20 principals participated, and approximately 30 principals will participate in 2017-18.

Whereas the Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) project (see section A(4)(viii)(e) of this plan) is designed to build local capacity at a systems level, IPMP is designed to provide one-on-one mentoring to new leaders. The mentors are highly distinguished principals or superintendents, selected and trained by the state to mentor new school leaders. A needs assessment administered to mentees and principal mentors determines the assignment of principal mentors to mentees based on need and experience. Mentors coach new leaders through the tasks of improvement with regular structured virtual or in-person check-ins. Each mentor/mentee team creates a customized mentoring plan that focuses on developing the skills and dispositions in four critical areas of school level leadership: interpersonal and facilitation techniques, teacher observation and feedback, effective school-level and classroom-level practices, and the use of data to improve instruction. The program has two main objectives: to increase the rate of effectiveness of new administrators and to decrease turnover among rural and struggling schools.

*Support for School Libraries:* Title II-A funds are used to partner with the Idaho Commission for Libraries to expand the annual Idaho School Libraries professional development. In schools where full-time school librarians are properly trained and supported, students achieve at significantly higher levels than students in schools with no full-time librarian (see: School Libraries Work! A Compendium of Research Supporting the Effectiveness of School Libraries). Title II-A funds will ensure more librarians are able to benefit from this valuable training, and more students will have access to a trained school librarian.

**State Level Activities – Educators**

The Idaho State Board of Education established an Educator Pipeline Work Group in 2016 to explore teacher pipeline issues across the state. Some of the early recommendations are aligned to allowable Title II-A projects. The Talent Development Systems graphic below, produced by American Institutes for Research (AIR), illustrates a three-pronged approach to addressing teacher shortages that guides Idaho's work.




In order to address teacher retention the Work Group first recommends increased professional development opportunities and support for teachers across the continuum, including induction programs, evaluation feedback for the purpose of professional growth and learning, and teacher leadership pathways. The following state level activities are aligned with these goals:

*Continued Support for the Idaho Instructional Framework:* Title II-A funds are used to support training and deepen understanding of Idaho's Instructional Framework through in-person workshops delivered around the state. A new approach under the flexibility of ESSA will be to deliver more of this training directly to LEAs in rural parts of the state. Workshops may include but not be limited to the following:

- Advanced Instructional Coaching Using the Framework for Teaching
- Calibration and Collaborative Self-Assessment of Observation Skills
- Data Literacy Using Assessment in Instruction
- Designing a Quality Teacher Evaluation Model
- Engagement for Student Learning
- Exploring Domains 1 and 4 of the Framework for Teaching
- Introduction to the Framework for Teaching and Deeper Understanding
- Instructional Coaching Using the Framework for Teaching
- Instructional Rounds
- Learning-Focused Conversations
- Mentoring Using the Framework for Teaching

- Observation Skills Using the Framework for Teaching
- Special Education: Introduction to the Framework for Teaching
- Special Education: Observation Skills Using the Framework for Teaching
- State of Idaho Framework Facilitators, Level 1
- Talk About Teaching: Clustering the Components

Facilitated conversations around the state's instructional framework – dialogue among teachers, instructional coaches, mentors, peer coaches, consulting teachers, preservice teachers, cooperating teachers, administrators, higher education faculty, teacher leaders, superintendents, and other district leaders – creates opportunities for deeper collaboration in and across the education system, impacting teacher growth and ultimately student achievement.

*Mentoring and Coaching:* In 2013 the Governor's Task Force for Improving Education made 21 Recommendations creating a strategic plan for education systems across the state. One of these recommendations was that each district develop a mentoring and induction program for the support of new teachers based on the Idaho Mentor Program Standards. Recommendations put forth in 2017 from the Educator Pipeline Work Group echoed the call, and outlined an even greater need since moving to a certification system in which new teachers have three years to move from Residency to Professional status.

Comprehensive induction and mentoring programs have been associated with first-year teachers showing student performance gains equivalent to those of fourth-year teachers who did not have this support (Strong, 2006). Though Title II-A funds alone will not be sufficient to establish robust mentoring and induction programs statewide, ISDE and the State Board of Education will investigate how we may use Title II-A funds to support and expand upon the foundation that is in place with the goal of increased student learning. See Appendix D for additional research supporting a focus on educator mentoring.

An AIR policy brief published in May 2014 (Potemski & Matlach, 2014) noted that effective state induction policies include program standards to establish consistent expectations for mentoring and induction activities across the state. In 2009 the State Board of Education, in conjunction with ISDE, established and published such standards. Using these standards to provide a vision and guidelines for local planners to use in the design and implementation of a high-quality mentoring program for beginning teachers, the state hopes to increase the number of effective induction programs in every region of Idaho. Partnering with higher education institutions, Title II-A funds would allow university partners to facilitate induction support for new teachers in high need LEAs across the state of Idaho. Faculty from higher education institutions in Idaho (public and private, four-year and two-year) are interested in the performance of their graduates in their early years of teaching. Investigating new teacher performance serves two main goals: continuous improvement for educator preparation programs and the identification of key supports for new teachers in terms of induction communities, practice, strategies, and outcomes. This project would study how the structures of one induction program in identified high need LEAs influences teacher performance and PK-12 student learning to inform future programs.

Additionally, the state strongly encourages and supports LEAs using Title II-A funds to recruit and train mentors within those LEAs identified for comprehensive and targeted support.

**LEA Optional Use of Funds Aligned with State Level Activities**
The uses of funds described below are not required of LEAs but are encouraged as we work to attract and certify more teachers for Idaho's classrooms. The Educator Pipeline Work Group has supported the development of alternative paths to certification that will not sacrificing rigor.

*Grow Your Own:* Idaho is experiencing teacher shortages in various content areas and geographic areas, and especially in rural parts of the state. To ensure that LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support are fully staffed by effective educators, ISDE encourages LEAs use of Title II-A funds to embrace Grow Your Own programs. LEAs can actively recruit current classified staff (paraprofessionals) into the teaching profession, using Title II-A funds to support them in their attainment of full certification. In addition, the state recognizes the need for more teachers and leaders of color, and is committed to increasing the number of American Indian and Hispanic/Latino teachers and recommends that LEAs support the full certification of teachers of color through available routes.

Idaho currently provides financial support for concurrent high school and college credit but, at present, no courses are offered that fulfill requirements for an education degree. While Idaho explores increasing the opportunities for high school students in this area, ISDE is investigating scholarship opportunities for high school students who commit to teaching in high-need areas for a designated amount of time.

**Partnership Supports**
Idaho Division of Career and Technical Education (ICTE) offers a program to recruit and retain career and technical education (CTE) teachers who have qualified for endorsements in a CTE area based on their professional work experience. These occupational teaching certifications begin as a Limited Occupational Specialist (LOS), then after completion of coursework and/or teacher training, advance to a Standard Occupational Specialist, and finally to an Advanced Occupational Specialist. The LOS certification is a three-year interim certificate, and during that time, ICTE provides statewide and regional training for the LOS teachers through the Inspire Cohort. The goal of the Inspire Cohort program is to not only recruit and train new occupationally endorsed teachers but also to assimilate them into the teaching profession with connections to other LOS colleagues and a fully supported first-year experience and beyond. Inspire faculty, personal mentors, and state-level program managers provide the foundation for these new teachers at no out-of-pocket expense to the teacher. Oversight of the Inspire Cohort is maintained by ICTE, thus ensuring consistent training and mentoring, with a goal to produce a greater impact on student achievement sooner in their teaching careers. The Inspire Cohort is open to all LOS teachers employed in a CTE program and is funded with state funds for the purpose of encouraging completion of the program.

2. **Use of Funds to Improve Equitable Access to Teachers in Title I, Part A Schools** *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(E))*: If an SEA plans to use Title II, Part A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), describe how such

funds will be used for this purpose.

Idaho does plan to use some Title II-A funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers, as described above. Idaho will target Title II-A funds to schools in comprehensive support and improvement through the IPMP, in addition to the Title I-A funds used for the Idaho Superintendents Network and Idaho Principals Network (as described in section A(4)(viii)(e) of this plan). Title II-A funds will also be used to train teachers in Idaho's instructional framework and address educator mentoring. These strategies will help to ensure that all students have access to effective teachers.

ISDE created a cross-agency workgroup in 2015 to study the equitable distribution of educators across the state. ISDE worked with REL Northwest to analyze educator preparedness (inexperienced), content knowledge (teaching outside of field), and need (grade spans or content area). While the data analysis did not point to disparities in terms of the distribution of personnel who are working with low-income or minority students, it did identify a shortage of personnel across all areas, including areas not previously identified. The findings became part of Idaho's Equity Plan submitted to the U.S. Department of Education on June 1, 2015, and they sparked a statewide effort to study recruitment and retention.

ISDE again partnered with REL Northwest to conduct surveys and interviews of a sampling of Idaho LEAs. The process was completed in June 2016. The salient challenge reported by the superintendents interviewed was recruitment and retention of staff. Many of the superintendents are taking short-term measures (e.g., Teach for America, Idaho Digital Learning Academy for secondary coursework, multi-grade classrooms) to meet their needs but expressed concern that the issue was larger than any one LEA could tackle. One superintendent remarked, "*We are one teacher away from losing several programs."* LEAs expressed concern that the issue was not limited to teachers, but also affected administrative personnel.

**Table 13~~6~~: Proposed programs for supporting educators**

*Timeline: July 2017 to September 2022*

| Strategy | Funding sources |
|---|---|
| Idaho Building Capacity Network | Title I: School improvement |
| Idaho Superintendents Network | Title I: School improvement |
| Idaho Principals Network | Title I: School improvement |
| Idaho Principal Mentoring Project | Title II-A |
| Mentoring and Coaching | Title II-A |
| School Libraries | Title II-A |
| Instructional Framework | Title II-A |

3. **System of Certification and Licensing** *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(B))*: Describe the State's system of certification and licensing of teachers, principals, or other school leaders.

Educator certification in the state of Idaho is clearly defined within Idaho Administrative Code (IDAPA). This code puts forth rigorous expectations for teachers, pupil personnel, principals, directors of special education, and superintendents who are prepared by both Idaho and out-of-state institutions of higher education. IDAPA ensures that educators are prepared not only with the necessary knowledge gained through course work, but through clinical field experiences as well. Alternative routes to certification are also clearly defined and available to those who wish to enter the education profession through non-traditional means. IDAPA specifically outlines alternative routes to ensure all educators within Idaho, regardless of certification route, are prepared to the fullest extent. In addition, twenty percent (20%) of Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel are reviewed annually by the Idaho Professional Standards Commission in an effort to continuously maintain rigor and improve upon current practice. Specifics within IDAPA detailing specific requirements for educator certification are described in the following paragraphs:

**A Standard Instructional Certificate** requires: A minimum of 20 semester credit hours, or 30 quarter credit hours, in the philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations, instructional technology, and in the professional subject matter which shall include at least three semester credit hours or four quarter credit hours in reading and its application to the content area. [IDAPA 08.02.02.015.01.a.i] The certificate must include an endorsement area as well. Some endorsement requirements are as follows:

**An All Subjects Endorsement** requires: Twenty (20) semester credit hours, or 30 quarter credit hours, in the philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations, instructional technology, and professional subject matter must be ~~in elementary~~in elementary education including at least 6 semester credit hours, or 9 quarter credit hours, in developmental reading. This endorsement must be accompanied by at a minimum of one additional subject area endorsement allowing teaching of that subject through grade nine or kindergarten through grade 12. [IDAPA 08.02.02.022.03]

**A Blended Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education Endorsement** requires: A minimum of 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours, in the philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations, in instructional technology, and in the professional subject matter of early childhood and early childhood-special education. The professional subject matter shall include course work specific to the child from birth through grade three in the areas of child development and learning; curriculum development and implementation; family and community relationships; assessment and evaluation; professionalism; and application of technologies. [IDAPA 08.02.02.022.07]

**An Exceptional Child Generalist Endorsement** requires: Thirty (30) semester credit hours in special education, or closely related areas, as part of an approved special education program. [IDAPA 08.02.02.023.07]

**A Secondary Content Area Endorsement** requires: Preparation in at least two fields of teaching. One of the teaching fields must consist of at least 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours and a second field of teaching consisting of at least 20 semester credit hours, or 30 quarter credit hours. Preparation of not less than 45 semester credit hours, or 67 quarter credit hours, in a single subject area may be used in lieu of the two teaching field requirements. [IDAPA 08.02.02.015.01.c]

**Clinical Requirements** Idaho Administrative Code articulates clinical requirements for teacher candidates. There are no specific state requirements with regard to preservice teaching experience in diverse settings or with special student populations. For the Standard Instructional Certificate, which includes all instructional endorsements, at least six semester credit hours, or nine quarter credit hours, of student teaching in the grade range and subject areas as applicable to the endorsement are required. [IDAPA 08.02.02.015.01.a.ii]

**Administrator Certification** requires at least 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours of graduate study in school administration based on the specific administrator area (school principal, director of special education, or superintendent). The program must include the competencies of the Idaho Foundation Standards for School Administrators. [IDAPA 08.02.02.015.03]

**Alternative Routes to Certification** When a professional position cannot be filled by an LEA with someone who has the correct endorsement/certification, the LEA may request an alternative authorization for certification. An alternative authorization is valid for one year, and may be renewed for two additional years. Prior to application, a candidate must hold a Bachelor's degree. The LEA must provide supportive information attesting to the ability of the candidate to fill the position. [IDAPA 08.02.02.042]

**Alternative Authorization – Teacher to New Certification/Endorsement** Candidates will work toward completion of the alternative route preparation program in conjunction with the employing LEA and the participating educator preparation program (college/university or non-traditional route). Candidates must complete a minimum of nine semester credits annually or make adequate progress to be eligible for extension of up to a total of three years. The participating educator preparation program shall provide procedures to assess and credit equivalent knowledge, dispositions, and relevant life/work experiences. Additionally, the alternative authorization allows teachers to use the National Board Certification process to gain an endorsement in a corresponding subject area or by obtaining a graduate degree in a content specific area.

Two pathways are also available to some teachers, depending upon endorsement(s) already held.

- Pathway 1 - Endorsements may be added through state-approved testing and a mentoring component. The appropriate test must be successfully completed within the first year of certification in an area closely compatible with an endorsement for which the candidate already qualifies and is experienced. This pathway requires the successful completion of a one-year state-approved mentoring component.

- Pathway 2 – Endorsements may be added through state-approved testing in an area less closely compatible with an endorsement for which the candidate already qualifies and is experienced. The appropriate test must be successfully completed within the first year of the certification along with the successful completion of a robust one-year state-approved mentoring component. [IDAPA 08.02.02.042.01]

**Alternative Authorization – Content Specialist** The purpose of this alternative authorization is to offer an expedited route to certification for individuals who are highly and uniquely qualified in a subject area to teach in an LEA with an identified need for teachers in that area. Alternative authorization in this area is valid for one year and renewable for up to two additional years. Prior to application, a candidate must hold a bachelor's degree. The candidate shall meet enrollment qualifications of the alternative route preparation program. A consortium comprised of a designee from the educator preparation program, a representative from the LEA, and the candidate shall determine preparation needed to meet the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. This preparation must include mentoring and a minimum of one classroom observation per month until certified. [IDAPA 08.02.02.042.02]

**Alternative Authorization – CTE Occupational Specialist** The purpose of the occupational specialist certification is to permit individuals with several years of experience and often industry certification in a CTE-related occupation to teach secondary and postsecondary CTE students. These occupational teaching certifications begin as a Limited Occupational Specialist (LOS) for individuals with 6,000 to 16,000 hours of full-time, recent, successful, and gainful employment. After completion of coursework and/or teacher training at each level, teachers advance to a Standard Occupational Specialist, and finally to an Advanced Occupational Specialist. All occupationally certified teachers must meet the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. [IDAPA 08.02.036]

**Content Knowledge, Pedagogy, and Performance** As per IDAPA 08.02.02.018, all certification and endorsement areas require the candidate to demonstrate content knowledge, pedagogy, and performance. The state approved assessment for demonstration of content knowledge is the Praxis II assessment. Candidates must have a passing score on the Praxis II assessment for the content area they are seeking certification and endorsement.

**Teacher Standards** All Idaho teacher preparation programs are guided by the *Idaho Core Teacher Standards* (see Table 14~~7~~ below). These standards provide guidelines for what all Idaho teachers must know and be able to do.

**Foundation and Enhancement Standards** Foundation and Enhancement Standards refer to additional knowledge and performances a teacher must know in order to teach a certain content area. The Foundation and Enhancement Standards, therefore, further "enhance" the standard. In this way, the Idaho Core Teacher Standards, Foundation Standards and Enhancement Standards are "layered" to describe what a teacher in the content area must know and be able to do in order to be recommended to the state for initial certification.

**Pupil Personnel and Administrator Certification Standards** There are several certification standards for pupil personnel professionals and school administrators that are also addressed through the Idaho teacher certification processes. These include School Administrators, School Counselors, School Nurses, School Psychologists, School Social Workers: Because of the unique role of these professionals, their standards are independent of the Idaho Core Teaching Standards but are still written in the same performance-based format: Knowledge and Performances.

**Table 14~~7~~: Idaho Content Teaching Standards**

*The Learner and Learning*

| Standard number and title | Standard description |
|---|---|
| Standard 1: Learner Development. | The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. |
| Standard 2: Learning Differences. | The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards. |
| Standard 3: Learning Environments. | The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. |

*Content Knowledge*

| Standard number and title | Standard description |
|---|---|
| Standard 4: Content Knowledge. | The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. |
| Standard 5: Application of Content | The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. |

*Instructional Practice*

| Standard number and title | Standard description |
|---|---|
| Standard 6: Assessment. | The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. |
| Standard 7: Planning for Instruction | The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. |
| Standard 8: Instructional Strategies. | The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. |

*Professional Responsibility*

| Standard number and title | Standard description |
|---|---|
| Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. | The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. |
| Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration. | The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession. |

**Current Work Regarding Certification of Educators**

The Professional Standards Commission (PSC) annually reviews 20 percent of the preparation standards to align with national standards and best practices. This process allows Idaho to keep up to date with standards and best practices. In addition, the Office of the State Board of Education has convened a Teacher Certification Workgroup to look at the current certification requirements. The purpose of the workgroup is to maintain high standards to assure that all students have access to highly effective, learner-ready teachers and other LEA staff to ensure academic achievement for all students. The identified areas of focus for the workgroup are:

- Bring current certification practices in alignment with Idaho statute and administrative code.
- In those areas where current practice is best practice, amend administrative code to align with practice.
- Areas where current practice is not aligned with state law:
  - Individuals teaching outside of grade ranges authorized by certificate (certificate limits the grade level range individuals can teach, regardless of the endorsement)
  - Active certificates with attached endorsements that are not authorized in IDAPA
  - Positions reported as pupil service staff for which no corresponding endorsement exists
- Review alternate routes to certification to determine whether Idaho's existing routes offer adequate flexibility for aspiring educators while also assuring qualified individuals capable of advancing student learning are in the classroom.
- Review the mechanism for individuals with specialized skills, or from industry, to teach one or two classes.

In addition, the State Board of Education's Teacher Pipeline Workgroup will make recommendations which may include rule or statute changes to remove barriers for effective teachers to enter and stay in Idaho's classrooms.

4. **Improving Skills of Educators** *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(J))*: Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in order to enable them to identify students with specific learning needs, particularly students with disabilities, English learners, students who are gifted and talented, and students with low literacy levels, and provide instruction based on the needs of such students.

   Idaho addresses the identification of high need students through a variety of supports.

   The Special Education Department in partnership with the Special Education Support and Technical Assistance team, provides professional development to teachers and administrators in meeting the needs of students with disabilities. This professional development includes identifying and qualifying students for services under the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA).

   Idaho has standardized procedures for identifying English (EL) students. Idaho recognizes that all educators are responsible for the language development and academic success of ELs, therefore, the ISDE Title III Department, provides professional development support for all educators in the area of language development through content instruction. Additional information is available at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/el-migrant/el/index.html.

   Idaho law requires LEA's to identify and serve gifted students. The state provides funds to support the professional development in the area of identification. The funds also support services provided to students once identified. Under IDAPA 08.02.03.999, districts are required to write a three-year plan for each student identified as gifted and talented in the areas of academics, visual/performing arts, creativity, and leadership. Teachers of these students receive annual training through the Edufest summer conference featuring nationally recognized experts in the field of gifted and talented education. Additional

information is available at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/academic/gifted-talented.

Commissioned in December 2012 by Governor C.L. "Butch" Otter, the Task Force for Education recognized reading proficiency is a major benchmark in a student's education and that students must learn to read before they can read to learn content in other subject areas. The task force was assembled to study and collaborate on how Idaho's education system could better prepare its children for success. One focus of the Task Force was the recommendation that students demonstrate mastery of literacy before moving on to significant content learning. The task force also recommended a better tool for identifying students with low literacy levels.

To support these recommendations, the legislature has appropriated more than $11 million dollars to support research based intervention strategies to improve outcomes for students. Funds can be used in a variety ways, including professional development for educators to identify students with literacy deficiencies. The new assessment to identify struggling readers includes a screener, diagnostic and progress monitoring system to provide teachers with rich data that focuses on specific deficiencies in literacy skills for students in Kindergarten through third grade. Fifty-seven schools across the state are implementing the new reading assessment in a pilot administration in the 2017-2018 school year. A statewide implementation is scheduled for the 2018-2019 school year.

5. **Data and Consultation** *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(K))*: Describe how the State will use data and ongoing consultation as described in ESEA section 2102(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

   Data are collected on all state-led professional development activities to assess the quality and efficacy of those experiences. For example, the IPMP and Idaho Instructional Framework components of section A(4)(viii)(e) of this plan include survey data collected from participants of these programs in 2017.

   Meaningful consultation was conducted with stakeholders, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders, parents, community partners, and other organizations or partners with relevant and demonstrated expertise in the development of this program plan. ISDE will seek advice, based on statewide data review, regarding equity data and student achievement data, and consult with this group of stakeholders at least annually on how to best improve the activities to meet the purpose of this program. Additionally, LEAs annually submit a Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA) for Title II-A, which includes listing professional development program activities, describing how each is expected to improve academic achievement, and identifying the evidence level of criteria each activity meets. The application is reviewed and then approved after all application criteria are met. During monitoring visits, each LEA provides documentation evidencing how the professional development activities improved academic achievement. As evident in the plan, activities under this part are coordinated with other related strategies, programs, and activities being conducted by ISDE.

6. **Teacher Preparation** *(ESEA section 2101(d)(2)(M))*: Describe the actions the State may take to improve preparation programs and strengthen support for teachers, principals, or other school leaders based on the needs of the State, as identified by the SEA.

   Idaho is currently focusing its Title II-A funds toward supporting educators in rural, high-poverty, and high-minority schools. However, as stated above in section D(1), ISDE and the State Board of Education will investigate how we may use Title II-A funds to support teacher preparation and mentoring.

## E. Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

1. **Entrance and Exit Procedures** *(ESEA section 3113(b)(2)):* Describe how the SEA will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide entrance and exit procedures, including an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.

   Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) has always implemented standardized procedures for identifying and exiting English (EL) students. However, ESSA provided the ISDE with an opportunity to revise the state's procedures for entrance and exiting students from EL services to comply with revisions to the law with the support and assistance of the ESSA EL Workgroup. The workgroup was comprised of district EL coordinators, principals, teachers, EL coaches, paraprofessionals, and higher education faculty from all educational regions in the state. LEAs with high to low incidence EL populations were also targeted for this work. The EL Workgroup began this work on September 16, 2016 with a face-to-face meeting and continued to meet during the 2016-2017 school year for a total of 6 meetings to establish standardized entrance and exit procedures that were appropriate and implementable by all districts and charter schools in Idaho. The Workgroup created a statewide Home Language Survey (HLS) and a "Decision to Assess" Matrix as well as guidance documents to assist all LEAs with this process. These documents can be accessed via the EL Department webpage: http://www.sde.idaho.gov/el-migrant/el/index.html under Resources Files, Program Information.

   In addition, the LEA must sign an annual assurance with their consolidated application for federal funds stating that they will identify and assess potential English Learners within 30 days as outlined in the statewide standardized procedures. In addition, LEAs must also describe how they will serve identified English Learners.

   In spring 2017 the ISDE Title III staff traveled to 15 locations around the state to provide training to all LEAs on the newly revised statewide entrance and exiting procedures. This major undertaking was necessary to ensure a successful statewide implementation beginning in August 2017. ISDE also updated Title III monitoring protocols to ensure LEAs are implementing the statewide entrance and exiting procedures.

   All of this work has been well received by Idaho's LEAs, motivating the ESSA EL Workgroup members to continue serving as an EL advisory panel to the State EL/Title III department at the ISDE. This panel will collaborate with the Migrant Advisory Panel and will consist of some of the same members.

   **Entrance Procedures:** Idaho's ESSA EL Workgroup has established the following EL Program Entrance Procedures and Criteria:

   *Step 1:* All LEAs administer the Statewide Home Language Survey (HLS) to all newly enrolling students in the district/charter. They then use the "Decision to Assess" Matrix to determine whether the student is a potential EL. Original HLSs are filed in students' cumulative files.

   Statewide Home Language Survey Questions:

   1. What language(s) are spoken in the home?

2. What language(s) does your student speak most often?
3. What language(s) did your student first learn?
4. Which language does your child speak with you?
5. Which language do you use when speaking with your child?
6. Which language do you want phone calls and letters?
7. What is your relationship to the child?
8. Is there any additional information you would like the school to know about your child?

The Home Language Survey is currently available in Spanish and is being translated in additional languages represented in the state. English and translated HLS forms are available on the Idaho State EL and Title III Programs website for all LEAs to download.

*Step 2:* If a student is identified as a potential EL, LEAs use additional resources and data to determine whether the student has already been identified as an EL in another LEA. If the following resources indicate that the student either has screened out of EL eligibility or has previously exited from EL programming, then the student does not qualify for EL program placement.

- Idaho's English Learner Management System (ELMS)
- Cumulative file review for WIDA assessments
- Cumulative file review for English Learner Plans
- Cumulative file review for EL exit forms
- Communication with previous district (if necessary)

*Step 3:* LEAs proceed with English Language Proficiency (ELP) Screener Assessment, either WIDA Kindergarten W-APT or WIDA Screener, depending on the student's grade level and time of year of enrollment. They use the following Statewide EL Entrance Criteria to determine whether a student qualifies for EL or whether they screen out of EL eligibility.

**Table 158: Idaho's Statewide EL Entrance Criteria**

| Grade | First semester | Second semester |
|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | Kindergarten W-APT Listening/Speaking must = 29 or 30 points "Exceptional"<br>Reading must be 6+ points<br>Writing must be 5+ points | Kindergarten W-APT Listening/Speaking must = 29 or 30 points "Exceptional"<br>Reading must be 11+ points<br>Writing must be 14+ points |
| 1st Grade | Kindergarten W-APT Listening/Speaking must = 29 or 30 points "Exceptional"<br>Reading must be 14+ points | (Same as 2nd-12th grade) |

| Grade | First semester | Second semester |
|---|---|---|
| | Writing must be 17+ points | |
| 2nd – 12th Grade | ACCESS Screener Assessment<br>5.0 Composite Proficiency Level + at least 4.0 in each domain of listening speaking, reading, and writing. | ACCESS Screener Assessment<br>5.0 Composite Proficiency Level + at least 4.0 in each domain of listening speaking, reading, and writing. |

Screener assessment and program placement must occur within 30 days of the student's enrollment in the LEA. In order to ensure that potential ELs with special needs are correctly identified, the EL advisory panel will collaborate with special education stakeholders to establish alternate entrance criteria and processes for identifying ELs with special needs.

The ESSA EL Workgroup created a statewide process for identifying students whose parents may have indicated "English Only" on their Home Language Survey but who have exhibited characteristics of second language learners necessitating a need to amend the original HLS. In addition, the workgroup developed a statewide process to remove the EL designation from a student who was erroneously identified. Lastly, the workgroup has assisted the ISDE with revising the parental notification form including an option to waive ELD services.

**Exit Procedures:** Idaho's ESSA EL Workgroup has established the following EL Program Exit Procedures and Criteria:

*Step 1:* LEAs review annual EL proficiency assessment data to determine which students have met Idaho's EL Exit Criteria. Idaho administers the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 or Alternate ACCESS to annually assess for EL proficiency.

| ACCESS 2.0 exit criteria |
|---|
| 5.0 Composite Proficiency Level + at least a 4.0 in each domain of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. |

*Step 2:* When students meet the exit criteria on the English language proficiency assessment, LEA staff members re-designate students to "exited year 1 monitoring" status in their school information systems. LEAs are required to complete the exiting process for eligible students before the end of the school year in which the student met the exit criteria. In other words, LEAs must use the results from the spring ACCESS 2.0 and Alternate ACCESS assessment to update students' EL status in their school information system and inform parents by the end of the school year.

*Step 3:* LEAs will use a statewide exit form that is shared and explained to parents/families in a language they can understand to inform them of their child's program exit. In addition LEAs inform parents/families of the child's transition into a monitoring status for two years.

In order to ensure that ELs with special needs are correctly exited, the EL advisory panel will collaborate with special education stakeholders to establish criteria and processes for exiting ELs with special needs as well as Alternate ACCESS exit criteria.

2. **SEA Support for English Learner Progress** *(ESEA section 3113(b)(6))*: Describe how the SEA will assist eligible entities in meeting:

i. The State-designed long-term goals established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goals, based on the State's English language proficiency assessments under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G); and

ii. The challenging State academic standards.

**Assistance to LEAs for Long-Term Language Proficiency and Academic Goals**

The State EL/Title III Department exists to assist LEAs with creating, implementing, and improving language instruction educational programs that provide equal learning opportunities for ELs. In order to achieve this, the State EL/Title III Department will analyze the long-term goals and interim progress for English language proficiency and academic standards established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii). This ongoing and annual analysis will assist the department in determining statewide and individualized support needed for LEAs.

Moreover, with EL accountability now housed under Title I, the State EL/Title III Department staff are critical members on the previously mentioned State Technical Assistant Team (STAT). This group will be responsible for tracking progress, discussing data, and identifying needs and resources.

Additionally, the department will continue to review and monitor LEAs' annual EL plan within the Consolidated Federal and State Grants Application (CFSGA). LEAs must describe their Language Instruction Educational Program(s) (LIEP) to serve their ELs. These plans also include an opportunity for the LEA to describe linguistic and academic goal(s) for their English learners. Furthermore, LEAs describe within their State EL Plans their methods for meeting these linguistic and academic goals by describing coordination of services with other supporting programs, method for incorporating WIDA English Language Development Standards within instruction, and professional learning opportunities provided to all staff in the LEA on best practices in teaching English learners. The State EL/Title III Department will review the LEAs linguistic and academic goals for alignment to the long-term goals and interim progress for English language proficiency and academic standards established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii). Additionally, the department uses this information to support LEAs in their individualized efforts. For example, if neighboring LEAs have similar goals, ISDE can target support regionally.

Currently, the ISDE has the following supports in place for schools and LEAs that can be tailored to address the specific linguistic and academic needs of their ELs:

**Cross Collaboration**
The EL/Title III Department engages in state-level collaboration with other ISDE programs such as Special Education, Migrant, Title I, and others to address the needs of English Learners. Examples of state-level collaboration include professional learning opportunities for administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals of English Learners as well as a consolidated grant application and program monitoring for LEAs. The STAT team is another example of cross collaboration.

**Ongoing Technical Assistance**
Ongoing technical assistance for all LEAs is provided in a variety of ways listed below. However, individualized technical assistance can be requested by an LEA at any time and may be delivered through a variety of methods:

1. Phone, email, and individual site visits
2. The EL Department webpage http://sde.idaho.gov/el-migrant/el/index.html
3. Quarterly webinars
4. Biweekly newsletters
5. Regional trainings

**Idaho Legislature**
The Idaho Legislature provides funding to LEAs for ELs. House Bill 287 appropriates $450,000 for three-year grants to assist LEAs with meeting the academic needs of English Learners. House Bill 289 provides over 1 million dollars for research-based programs for ELs.

**State Title III Consortium**
State Title III Consortium employs two (2) EL coaches who travel to LEAs around the state to support them and provide onsite technical assistance personalized to their needs.

**EL Advisory Panel**
The EL advisory panel assists the ISDE with state-wide planning and support on EL-related topics such as creating state-wide identification and exiting criteria for all LEAs.

**Professional Development/Training**
The Idaho State EL/Title III Department provides support for all Idaho educators of ELs through professional learning opportunities that are intentionally designed based on the timely needs of EL educators. ISDE recognizes that as the number of ELs grows, all educators must be mutually responsible for the language development and academic success of ELs and, therefore, all teachers are language teachers. In fall 2017 the ISDE EL/Title III Department will provide regional intensive professional learning workshops on classroom instructional strategies for classroom teachers K-12 to support language development through content instruction.

**State and National Partnerships**
The State/Title III Department staff participates in and collaborates with multiple national partners and other state agencies for support in trending EL topics: Teaching English to

Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), WIDA, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research (W-CER), Regional Educational Laboratory (REL), Chief Counsel of State School Officers (CCSSO), EL State Collaborative on Assessment Student Standards (SCASS), Title I National Organization, and National Association of State Title III Directors. Lastly, additional partnerships with Idaho's institutes of higher education provide components of EL education in preservice teacher education in an effort to prepare teachers with appropriate instructional strategies for the ELs in their classrooms.

The ISDE will continue to adapt, create, and implement additional supports for ELs in Idaho's schools based on need as identified through data.

3. **Monitoring and Technical Assistance** (ESEA section 3113(b)(8)): Describe:

i. How the SEA will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A sub-grant in helping English learners achieve English proficiency; and

ii. The steps the SEA will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as providing technical assistance and modifying such strategies.

Monitoring the implementation of Federal programs and the use of funds is a requirement of each of the Federal programs and an essential function of the ISDE. The ISDE monitors all LEAs thoroughly and in a variety of ways to ensure that all children have a fair, equitable, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education. Moreover, the ISDE provides leadership and guidance to LEAs through technical assistance for the purpose of assisting LEAs with implementing highly effective educational programs to increase student achievement in Idaho. ISDE implements the following processes for monitoring federal programs including Title III-A:

**Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA)**

The Idaho Consolidated Federal & State Grant Application serves as an LEA's application for federal program funds. A consolidated approach, instead of separate applications for each of the individual programs, allows the programs to be cooperatively planned and implemented, and also helps to reduce the administrative burden. In addition, the CFSGA allows the EL/Title III Coordinator to monitor/review annual applications for Title III compliance, linguistic and academic goals, and use of funds. If an LEA's plan does not meet the criteria for approval, she coaches the LEA until the plan meets all the requirements. This approach is proactive in that it provides assistance before the LEA receives funding.

**Selection Process for Onsite and Desk Monitoring of LEAs**

In determining the list of LEAs to be monitored for the upcoming school year, the ISDE reviews several considerations:

1. The list of LEAs considered for monitoring in the upcoming year are derived from the ISDE's Ongoing LEA Master List, which identifies the year each LEA was last monitored.
2. Each federal program identifies risk factors for the LEAs identified for potential monitoring. Risk factors may be determined using data including the following:
   - State assessment performance data
   - Date/Year the LEA was previously monitored

- Number and type of findings from the previous monitoring visit (such as programmatic, fiscal, policy, repeat findings)
- Results of previous findings
- Personnel turnover – new or inexperienced federal programs director or new superintendent
- Audit Findings (such as incomplete audits or type of audit findings)
- Significant carryover balances
- Non-participation in state offered trainings
- Other "high-risk" factors identified by ISDE program coordinators (such as sudden and/or significant increase in English Learners, formal compliance complaint filed with the ISDE, SBOE, and/or U.S. Department of Education - Office for Civil Rights)

3. Approximately 25 LEAs are identified for monitoring annually. Monitoring is conducted by ISDE program staff either through on-site or desk monitoring.

**Monitoring Process for Title III –A**
During the monitoring visit, the EL/Title III Coordinator conducts classroom observations, interviews with staff, principals, students, and parents to determine if the LEA is addressing the linguistic and academic needs of their ELs. Additionally, the coordinator seeks evidence of support for the linguistic and academic goals described in the CFSGA.

**Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR)**
Annual CSPR data submitted by the LEA for federal reporting is another opportunity for monitoring and possible technical assistance. LEA data is reviewed for accuracy as well as for state and local level trends.

**Participation in STAT Team**
As mentioned before, the State EL/Title III department will work with the STAT team to monitor the progress of LEAs and provide technical assistance based on the recommendations of this team.

The above mentioned activities and processes will assist the ISDE in identifying LEAs that may need more specific and individualized support in identifying effective strategies for their ELs. If an LEA continues to struggle with implementing effective strategies for EL English proficiency, the ISDE will convene with the STAT team to determine additional resources needed to provide intensive support. Resources could include, but not limited to, in-depth professional development, recommendations for Title III program revisions and opportunities for peer observations with successful Title III districts.

## F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

1. **Use of Funds** *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(A)):* Describe how the SEA will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for State-level activities.

**State Level Activities**

Four percent of Idaho's Title IV-A allocation targeted for state activities total $77,600, of that, approximately $20,000 will be directed toward required activities including training LEAs on applying for Title IV-A funds through the ISDE's Consolidated State and Federal Grant Application and compliance monitoring. The remaining $57,600 will be prioritized to expand professional development surrounding STEM in concert with the STEM Action Center.

**LEA Optional Use of Funds Aligned with State Level Activities**

ISDE will leverage and expand the resources and support of the Governor's STEM Action Center by assuring LEAs are aware of the Center and the training and tools it offers to engage more students in STEM related coursework and activities. The primary function of the STEM Action Center is to support a well-rounded STEM education for all Idahoans, K – career. This is accomplished by creating partnerships with other state agencies, out of school entities, non-profits, educators, administrators, communities, businesses, and industries to support the development of Idaho's STEM talent pipeline, ensuring continued growth of Idaho's STEM-based economy. The STEM Action Center will continue to focus on opportunities for educators, students, and communities by supporting professional development for educators, grants for resources and communities, STEM awareness events, and opportunities for students to participate in STEM competitions, camps, internships, mentorships, and apprenticeships. Targeted support, leveraging both federal and state funding, will help to ensure equitable access to and awareness of STEM for all students throughout Idaho.

The ISDE and STEM Action Center will work collaboratively to inform districts and to provide guidance in implementation regarding the wide range of activities that are permissible under Title IV-A to improve STEM instruction and learning. Examples of how state funds will be used to increase STEM activity in LEAs include:

- Expansion of high-quality STEM courses.
- Increased access to STEM for underserved and at-risk student populations.
- Support for student participation in nonprofit STEM competitions.
- Increased opportunities for hands-on learning in STEM.
- Integration of other academic subjects, including the arts, into STEM subject programs.
- Creation or enhancement of STEM specialty schools.
- Integration of classroom-based, afterschool, and informal STEM instruction.

Idahoans understand that a well-rounded, community-oriented, student-focused education provides the knowledge and skills to live, learn, work, create, and contribute to society. STEM experiences enhance 21st century workforce skills such as collaboration, innovation, problem-solving, critical and creative thinking, and teamwork. These experiences should be integrated across disciplines and should focus on project-based learning, inquiry, and discovery. All students should have the opportunity to learn these critical 21st century workforce skills. Therefore, the Idaho STEM Action Center will work collaboratively with

Idaho state educational agencies to transform how Idaho educates our children in order to enhance their life prospects, empower their communities, and build an inclusive, sustainable, innovation-based economy where our citizens can thrive.

Title IV-A state funds will also support ISDE staff in providing technical assistance for LEAs in the creation of local Title IV-A plans and applying for funding as well as monitoring for compliance with federal rules and regulations. While compliance monitoring visits focus on adherence to the rules and regulations, the ISDE aims to use these visits as opportunities to provide technical assistance in addressing deficiencies and offering best practices in supporting students.

The ISDE will support LEAs in directing their Title IVA allocations to provide equitable access to a well-rounded education and rigorous coursework in subjects in which female students, minority students, English learners, students with disabilities, or low-income students are underrepresented. Such subjects could include English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, world languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, or physical education.

Existing state supports will be leveraged to increase the impact of LEA Title IV-A funds around strengthening the instructional core and increasing access to a broad range of educational opportunities. Idaho currently has robust supports in place focused on a well-rounded education that includes professional development for teachers, instructional coaches and mastery education funded by state dollars.

Additionally, the ISDE plans on leveraging state and local resources to imbed music, the arts, foreign languages, environmental education and civics to expand offerings for students. Partners include the Idaho Commission for Libraries, the Idaho Commission on the Arts, and the Wassmuth Center for Human Rights. Resources from these entities will be compiled and provided to LEAs seeking to expand their course offerings and supplemental materials.

Regarding supporting safe and healthy students, LEA Title IV-A funds may increase existing efforts to equip LEA personnel with best practices around crisis intervention, school violence prevention, suicide prevention and alternatives to suspensions and expulsions through existing statewide trainings and resources.

**Table 169: Title IV-A use of funds**

| Strategy | Timeline | Funding sources |
|---|---|---|
| Provide specialized STEM professional development to LEAs. | Ongoing and on demand | Federal Title IVA funds |

2. **Awarding Subgrants** *(ESEA section 4103(c)(2)(B))*: Describe how the SEA will ensure that awards made to LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 are in amounts that are consistent with ESEA section 4105(a)(2).

~~The ISDE established an estimate for each LEA based on the prior year Title I-A allocation and a hold harmless amount of $10,000. As such, the calculations for LEA awards are a combination of $10,000 and a proportional amount based on Title I-A.~~

In order to ensure that the requirement was accurately interpreted, the SDE used a manual which was compiled and released by the US Department of Education on June 30, 2017. A link to the manual can be found below:

https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/sites/default/files/Subgranting_FY_2017_Title_IV_A_LEAs_QA.pdf

An excel template was created consistent with the scenario 1 from the manual (p 2). The template includes built in formulas which include the following steps:

4. Determine initial formula allocations based on LEA shares of Title I, Part A funds for the preceding fiscal year.
5. Adjust upward allocations for LEAs whose initial allocation is below $10,000.
6. Adjust downward, on a proportional basis, the initial formula allocations for all LEAs receiving more than $10,000.
7. Repeat steps (iterations) as many times as necessary until there is no grant award with less than $10,000.

The initial calculation is performed by the Federal Programs Department at the same time Title I, Part A allocations are calculated. Calculations and formulas are reviewed by the Student Engagement, Career & Technical Readiness Department for checks and balances.

Once finalized, the allocations are populated into the Idaho State Departments online mechanism for LEA to submit plans and request funds for all title programs (Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application- CFSGA). Once populated LEAs are not able to request less than the populated amount, thereby assuring all LEAs receive no less than $10,000 in Title IVA funds.

## G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers

1. **Use of Funds** *(ESEA section 4203(a)(2)):* Describe how the SEA will use funds received under the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, including funds reserved for State-level activities.

   ISDE reserves 2 percent of the appropriated amount for administration (approx. $110,000), which supports 1.08 FTE: partial salaries for a director, state coordinator, program specialist, and administrative assistant. The administration funds for Title IV-B are used to support eligible LEAs, Community-Based Organizations, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, and other public/private entities. Each year the ISDE provides regional trainings for interested organizations in applying for Title IV-B grant funds. The ISDE also use administrative funds for costs associated with the peer review process and required USED meetings.

   ISDE reserves 3 percent of the appropriated amount for state activity (approx. $270,000), which supports 0.9 FTE: partial salaries for a director, state coordinator, program specialist, and administrative assistant. The state activity funds for Title IV-B are used to support current grantees in providing monitoring and technical assistance. The ISDE partners with the Idaho Afterschool Network and Idaho STARS in developing and implementing school age quality standards, which state activity funds support regional coordinators to provide all areas of Idaho in-depth coaching and technical assistance. The ISDE also uses state activity funds to perform a statewide evaluation to assess the program's effectiveness in meeting performance measures.

   **Table 17~~20~~: Title IV-B use of funds**

| Strategy | Timeline | Funding sources |
|---|---|---|
| New Grantee Training | Summer 2017 | Title IV-B State Administrative Funds |
| 21st CCLC Directors Meeting | Fall 2017 | Title IV-B State Activity Funds |
| Regional Bidder's Workshops | Fall 2017 | Title IV-B State Administrative Funds |
| Peer Review Process Meeting | Spring 2018 | Title IV-B State Administrative Funds |
| 21st CCLC Directors Meeting | Spring 2018 | Title IV-B State Activity Funds |
| 21st CCLC Summer Institute | Summer 2018 | Title IV-B State Administrative Funds |
| Grantee Monitoring & Technical Assistance | Ongoing | Title IV-B State Activity Funds |

2. **Awarding Subgrants** *(ESEA section 4203(a)(4)):* Describe the procedures and criteria the SEA will use for reviewing applications and awarding 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds to eligible entities on a competitive basis, which shall include procedures and criteria that take into consideration the likelihood that a proposed community learning center will help participating students meet the challenging State academic standards and any local academic standards.

   ISDE reserves not less than 93 percent of the appropriated amount for LEA subgrants (approx. $5.2 million). Each year the ISDE hosts a grant competition (as unallocated funds allow) to applicants according to ESEA Sec. 4201(b)(3). The ISDE awards 5-year grants with a minimum of $50,000 per award. Award amounts are based on the ~~applicants~~applicant's needs and services provided to students; however, the ISDE provides guidance to applicants on typical award amounts based on per-pupil expenditures.

   The ISDE awards subgrants through a competitive process based on the merit of an applicant's grant application: needs assessment for before and after-school programs, project design, measures of effectiveness, budget, and other assurances as outlined in ESEA Sec. 4204. The ISDE awards additional points for entities that target students: (1) attending schools that are implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under ESEA Sec. 1111(d); and (2) who may be at risk for academic failure, dropping out of school, involvement in criminal or delinquent activities, or who lack strong positive role models.

   The ISDE provides technical assistance and facilitates the grant application process; however, does not participate in the decision making of the awards to applicants. The ISDE recruits a variety of peer reviewers (via email, newsletter, website, press release), which consists of individuals with diverse expertise, organization representation, geographic location, gender, racial and ethnic representation. The ISDE trains all reviewers and hosts a 1-day in-person meeting to discuss submitted applications. Ultimately, the peer reviewers make the decision of awarded applications based on the applicant's grant application and established scoring rubric.

   **Table 18~~21~~: Title IV-B awarding subgrants timeline**

| Strategy | Timeline | Funding sources |
|---|---|---|
| Regional Bidder's Workshops | Fall 2017 | Title IV-B State Administrative Funds |
| Grant Application Opens | Fall 2017 | |
| Grant Application Closes | January 2018 | |
| Peer Review | Spring 2018 | |
| Peer Review Process Meeting | Spring 2018 | Title IV-B State Administrative Funds |
| Grant Awards Announced | April 2018 | |
| Funding to Grantees Begins | July 1 | Title IV-B LEA Subgrants |

## H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program

1. **Outcomes and Objectives** *(ESEA section 5223(b)(1))*: Provide information on program objectives and outcomes for activities under Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, including how the SEA will use funds to help all students meet the challenging State academic standards.

   74% (113 of 153) of Idaho's LEAs and schools meet the state's definition of rural. The goal for students in rural schools is the same for all students—to achieve at the same level of proficiency and have access to higher education resources to be successful after high school. In order to achieve equity for rural students, the state has designated staff to support rural and low-income school programs and has created a working state plan for these programs http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/rural/index.html. The plan was created in consultation with LEAs. The process for grant applications includes the Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA) online reporting system for LEAs to submit an application that includes budget, selected activates for use of funds, and measurable goals. The state also has an electronic evaluation report that is due in June each year.

   **Table 19~~22~~: Title V-B objectives and outcomes**

| Objective | Outcome |
|---|---|
| Objective 1: Rural school students achieve at the same level of proficiency as all other students, and have access to higher education resources to be successful after high school. | Outcomes: Each Rural Low Income School (RLIS) grantee program will provide educational services for children and youth as described in the CFSGA to ensure that they have the opportunity to meet challenging State academic content and achievement standards. |
| Objective 2: ISDE has a method and annual timeline for providing annual technical assistance to RLIS eligible LEAs. | Outcomes: All RLIS LEA Federal Program directors and business managers attend training on RLIS requirements and eligibly at annual regional meeting. |

2. **Technical Assistance** *(ESEA section 5223(b)(3))*: Describe how the SEA will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to help such agencies implement the activities described in ESEA section 5222.

   The state coordinator collaborates with Title I, Title II, Title III, and family and community coordinators; the charter school coordinator; and 21st Century Learning Center division to ensure program alignment and access to resources as well as in-person training at least twice per year with LEA technical assistance as needed. In addition, Idaho rural LEAs have the opportunity to be part of Northwest Rural Innovation and Student Engagement (NW RISE), a multi-state project that creates learning communities among schools in the rural northwest. Educators from Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington participate in NW RISE.

   The project is part of the Northwest Comprehensive Center and includes two face-to-face meetings per year as well as monthly opportunities for members to collaborate through video conference and a dedicated social media account through Schoology. In addition,

consultation and technical assistance is provided through the state's system of support which includes both on-site support through projects like Idaho Building Capacity, Math Centers, Idaho Content ELA Coaches, and opportunities to network with peers through the Idaho Superintendents Network and Idaho Principals Network.

## I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title IX, Subtitle B

1. **Student Identification** *(722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs.

   All LEAs are required to have a local board-approved homeless policy that describes how the LEA will implement the following: definitions, identification, school selection, enrollment, transportation, services, disputes, free meals, eligibility for Title I services, training, coordination, and preschool. To assist in the identification of children and youth without housing, public notice of the education rights of homeless children and youth are to be disseminated and posted where such children and youth receive services. ISDE provides free brochures and posters. The state coordinator and Local Liaison contact information is listed on each poster to provide technical assistance regarding enrollment, identification, and other issues affecting students in homeless situations. Liaisons are also provided from the National Center for Homeless Education toll-free help line. ISDE requires a Student Residency Questionnaire in which the nighttime living status of every student is assessed by enrollment documentation. This living status form is disseminated twice per year. Each LEA has an identified liaison responsible for conducting the assessment and verification of homeless children and youth. Once the liaison verifies eligibility of the child or youth they are reported in the LEA student management system that uploads to the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) K–12 longitudinal data management system. Samples are available at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/homeless/index.html

   Identification of children and youth experiencing homelessness and assessing their needs is primarily the responsibility of the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). The ISDE supports identification and needs assessment by:

   1. Providing annual regional training to local liaisons on the implementation of policies and regular processes for identification of homeless students and assessment of their needs and tracking liaison training;
   2. Regularly notifying LEAs of training opportunities through the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE);
   3. Annually monitoring the needs assessment process for LEAs through onsite monitoring visits and the completion of a self-assessment application;
   4. Providing a best practice needs assessment worksheet and summary tool from NCHE on the ISDE website at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/homeless/index.html; and
   5. Assuring that the ISDE State Coordinator is a participating member of the Idaho Continuum of Care and Idaho HUD Homeless Advisory Council so that identification and needs assessment issues that merge in non-school contexts are appropriately addressed.

   Additionally, a new State Coordinator has been hired for Idaho and begins January 16, 2018. Part of this position's 2018 goal will be to reconvene the Idaho Homeless Education Advisory Team (IHEAT), which includes the State Coordinator and LEA liaison representation from around the State. The major focus of this group's efforts will be to analyze state-wide

data resulting in state-level action plans to better assist LEAs in recognizing and addressing needs.

2. **Dispute Resolution** *(722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth.

   All LEA liaisons are familiar with the ISDE dispute resolution policy posted on the ISDE website (www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/homeless/index.html) through annual trainings provided by the state coordinator. All LEAs must have a written dispute resolution ~~policy~~ process that aligns with the state policy. This requirement is checked during onsite federal program monitoring visits, and LEAs submit assurances when they submit their annual application for funding through the CFSGA process. All LEAs must have a written notice of decision, also part of our monitoring process. Sample letters are provided on the ISDE website. Homeless children and youth are provided all services during the dispute resolution process. A new state coordinator has been hired at the ISDE and begins work January 16, 2018. Reviewing and revising all forms and verbiage on the website to reflect the Every Student Succeeds Act will be a priority.

3. **Support for School Personnel** *(722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway and homeless children and youth.

   ISDE provides staff development to ~~Homeless~~ LEA ~~L~~liaisons, including: provisions of the McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth program; related state laws; the special needs of students experiencing homelessness; resource materials; and strategies for training teachers, counselors, support staff, administrators, homeless service providers, advocates, and others.

   All liaisons are required to attend ~~an~~ annual ~~face to face meeting for up-to-date~~ training on McKinney-Vento and Homeless Education to heighten the awareness of the specific needs of children and youth experiencing homelessness, including runaway and other unaccompanied homeless youth. Webinars and regional trainings are offered by the state and liaisons are regularly notified of trainings through the National Center for Homeless Education throughout the year. Local designated liaisons are required to have annual training for all staff including transportation, nutrition, custodial, and secretarial on their role and specific needs of homeless children and youth, including runaway youth and unaccompanied youth.

   Idaho is beginning a partnership with Edify who has developed an online training and professional development model for the credentialing of Homeless Education Liaisons. The model consists of Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced levels of specific topics, units, and lessons. Liaisons who pass assessments for each level's lessons receive a certificate of

achievement. This technology will allow the State Coordinator to assess Liaison learning outcomes in real time to target technical assistance and resources. This program will be required of LEA liaisons and will include a specialized module and assessment on runaway and unaccompanied youth as well as a unit on human trafficking. This technology will also enable the State coordinator to assure that local liaisons are aware of the specific needs of runaway and other unaccompanied homeless youth.

The new state coordinator, in place effective January 16, 2018, will have as a goal for 2018 to update the ISDE webpage at http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/homeless/index.html to include information and resources on the needs of runaways to support training for all appropriate school personnel and community. Although ISDE's current monitoring tool requires evidence of an LEA level policy that ensures equitable access to services for runaway youth, the 2018-2019 monitoring tool will be updated to include evidence of school personnel training to heighten the awareness of the specific needs of runaway children and youth as identified in 722(g)(1)(D).

4. **Access to Services** (*722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Describe procedures that ensure that:

i. Homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children in the State;

ii. Homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies; and

iii. Homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels.

a. **Public preschool programs:** Idaho Code 33-201 identifies school-aged children as between the ages of five and twenty-one. Idaho does not fund pre-school programs. ISDE's Student Residency Questionnaire (nighttime living status of every student) includes questions about siblings in the family and assists with students eligible for secondary education who may not be currently identified. LEA liaisons collaborate with various agencies and service providers who work with homeless youth and youth separated from the public schools, such as the Idaho Department of Health & Welfare, Salvation Army, area shelters, and Community Action Partnership Association of Idaho to make them aware of protections available to homeless, unaccompanied youth. LEA liaisons collaborate with service providers to advocate on behalf of these children and youth to ensure that the students have the opportunity to return to school and participate in these programs. ISDE has established collaboration with Head Start, and the ISDE state coordinator has been appointed to the Idaho Infant and Toddler Council.

b. **Equal Access to Appropriate Secondary Education and Support Services:** The state coordinator provides training with LEA liaisons pertaining to the critical element of

identification of youth who are separated from public schools with equal access, without barriers to full or partial credit. Training and resources specifically ~~are being developed~~ for school counselors at the secondary level are being developed to make sure homeless youth are receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies. Partnerships with Title I-A and other federal programs are used when available to access online courses, summer school, and tutoring for credit recovery.

In addition to training, Idaho conducts annual onsite monitoring and requires the submission of an annual self-assessment each year an LEA does not have an onsite visit. Part of the monitoring process includes requiring evidence that the LEA policy and school processes and procedure ensure that homeless youth and runaway youth receive appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending public school.

c. **Eligible Children and Youth Do Not Face Barriers:** Every effort is made by all Homeless Liaisons and the state coordinator to include students in all academic and extracurricular activities. LEAs have policies to ensure homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities. Outreach is made by the liaison as needed to local support groups to assist with needs students might have to participate is extracurricular activities. ISDE is actively coordinating and collaborating with state athletic associations to ensure access and opportunity for students.

5. **Strategies to Address Other Problems** *(722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—

i. requirements of immunization and other required health records;
ii. residency requirements;
iii. lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;
iv. guardianship issues; or
v. uniform or dress code requirements.

Idaho state and local policies prohibit LEAs from denying a child enrollment for lack of records and include short timelines for obtaining needed records, certifications, and other documents. All LEAs are required to set aside a minimum of 0.25 of 1% of their Title I allocation for homeless students. This can be used for all the above, as needed. For all subgrants and beginning in 2016–2017, a needs assessment must be completed for the set-aside. ISDE and LEAs use the results of surveys, focus groups, and training evaluations to identify additional barriers caused by enrollment delays. ISDE disseminates information and provides technical assistance about how to remove barriers to school access throughout the state in its resource documents, trainings, and articles for publication. ISDE encourages LEAs to seek aid from local service or charitable organizations to help provide assistance that helps meet these needs. The State Coordinator is working in partnership with the Idaho Volunteer Lawyers Program to assist liaisons and youth across the state with issues and barriers that cannot be resolved at the local level. LEA's requiring uniforms must provide

these items to enrolled homeless or foster youth. In addition, MV Homeless Education Grant funds and homeless set aside funds can used to provide necessary clothing for school dress codes or school activities.

6. **Policies to Remove Barriers** (*722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act)*: Demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

   The state coordinator provides regular trainings and ongoing technical assistance to LEA Liaisons and staff on all provisions of the ~~law~~ McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Act~~including those related to fees, fines, and absences~~. The ISDE and all LEAs must have a current homeless education policy that removes barriers to identification, enrollment, and retention of homeless children and youth barriers ~~including those due~~ to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences. State-level trainings assure that students remain enrolled in their school of origin for the duration of the school year, regardless of attendance status. In the case that a student identified as homeless officially withdraws or transfers, a McKinney-Vento status form is forwarded to the Liaison of the new district. These trainings address minimizing barriers to enrollment and retention related to outstanding fees, fines, or absences. ~~This is~~LEA policies and school processes and procedures are monitored ~~at the LEA level~~ through the onsite federal program monitoring process, which requires specific evidence of compliance.

7. **Assistance from Counselors** *(722(g)(1)(K))*: A description of how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths, and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college.

   The state coordinator works with LEA liaisons and school counselors at the secondary level to make sure homeless youth are receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with state, local, and school policies. A new indicator has been added to the 17-18 monitoring tool to address how youth will receive assistance from counselors to prepare and improve the readiness for college. It is a requirement and an expectation from the ISDE that counselors/liaisons will inform unaccompanied homeless youth of their status as independent students under section 480 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and that they may obtain assistance from the liaison to receive verification of such status for the purposes of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid. ISDE training will be offered to counselors as well as training in collaboration with Higher Education program staff.

## Appendix A Measurements of Interim Progress

*Instructions: Each SEA must include the measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency, set forth in the State's response to Title I, Part A question 4.iii, for all students and separately for each subgroup of students, including those listed in response to question 4.i.a. of this document. For academic achievement and graduation rates, the State's measurements of interim progress must take into account the improvement necessary on such measures to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps.*

**A. Academic Achievement**

**Mathematics - 2016 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2017-2021 interim targets**

| ~~Mathematics~~ | ~~2016~~ | ~~2017~~ | ~~2018~~ | ~~2019~~ | ~~2020~~ | ~~2021~~ | ~~2022~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~All Students~~ | ~~41.6%~~ | ~~44.8%~~ | ~~48.0%~~ | ~~51.2%~~ | ~~54.4%~~ | ~~57.6%~~ | ~~60.8%~~ |
| ~~Economically Disadvantaged Students~~ | ~~30.3%~~ | ~~33.8%~~ | ~~37.3%~~ | ~~40.8%~~ | ~~44.3%~~ | ~~47.8%~~ | ~~51.3%~~ |
| ~~Students with Disabilities~~ | ~~15.2%~~ | ~~19.8%~~ | ~~24.4%~~ | ~~29.0%~~ | ~~33.6%~~ | ~~38.2%~~ | ~~42.8%~~ |
| ~~English Learners~~ | ~~7.1%~~ | ~~12.2%~~ | ~~17.3%~~ | ~~22.4%~~ | ~~27.5%~~ | ~~32.6%~~ | ~~37.7%~~ |
| ~~Minority Students*~~ | ~~25.8%~~ | ~~29.8%~~ | ~~33.8%~~ | ~~37.8%~~ | ~~41.8%~~ | ~~45.8%~~ | ~~49.8%~~ |

| Mathematics | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 41.6% | 44.8% | 48.1% | 51.3% | 54.6% | 57.8% | 61.1% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 30.3% | 34.2% | 38.0% | 41.9% | 45.8% | 49.7% | 53.5% |
| Students with Disabilities | 15.2% | 19.9% | 24.6% | 29.3% | 34.0% | 38.8% | 43.5% |
| English Learners | 7.1% | 12.3% | 17.4% | 22.6% | 27.7% | 32.9% | 38.1% |
| | | | | | | | |
| Black / African American | 22.2% | 26.5% | 30.8% | 35.2% | 39.5% | 43.8% | 48.1% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 56.8% | 59.2% | 61.6% | 64.0% | 66.4% | 68.8% | 71.2% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 19.4% | 23.9% | 28.4% | 32.8% | 37.3% | 41.8% | 46.3% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 22.0% | 26.3% | 30.7% | 35.0% | 39.3% | 43.7% | 48.0% |
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 33.6% | 37.3% | 41.0% | 44.7% | 48.4% | 52.0% | 55.7% |
| White | 46.6% | 49.6% | 52.5% | 55.5% | 58.5% | 61.4% | 64.4% |
| Two Or More Races | 42.2% | 45.4% | 48.6% | 51.8% | 55.0% | 58.3% | 61.5% |

**English Language Arts/Literacy - 2016 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2017-2021 interim targets**

| ~~ELA/Literacy~~ | ~~2016~~ | ~~2017~~ | ~~2018~~ | ~~2019~~ | ~~2020~~ | ~~2021~~ | ~~2022~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~All Students~~ | ~~53.0%~~ | ~~55.6%~~ | ~~58.2%~~ | ~~60.8%~~ | ~~63.4%~~ | ~~66.0%~~ | ~~68.6%~~ |
| ~~Economically Disadvantaged Students~~ | ~~40.6%~~ | ~~43.9%~~ | ~~47.2%~~ | ~~50.5%~~ | ~~53.8%~~ | ~~57.1%~~ | ~~60.4%~~ |
| ~~Students with Disabilities~~ | ~~15.0%~~ | ~~19.7%~~ | ~~24.4%~~ | ~~29.1%~~ | ~~33.8%~~ | ~~38.5%~~ | ~~43.2%~~ |
| ~~English Learners~~ | ~~6.9%~~ | ~~12.0%~~ | ~~17.1%~~ | ~~22.2%~~ | ~~27.3%~~ | ~~32.4%~~ | ~~37.5%~~ |
| ~~Minority Students*~~ | ~~37.4%~~ | ~~40.9%~~ | ~~45.4%~~ | ~~45.4%~~ | ~~49.9%~~ | ~~54.4%~~ | ~~58.9%~~ |

| ELA/Literacy | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Students | 53.0% | 55.6% | 58.2% | 60.8% | 63.4% | 66.1% | 68.7% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 40.6% | 43.9% | 47.2% | 50.5% | 53.8% | 57.1% | 60.4% |
| Students with Disabilities | 15.0% | 19.7% | 24.4% | 29.2% | 33.9% | 38.6% | 43.3% |
| English Learners | 6.9% | 12.1% | 17.2% | 22.4% | 27.6% | 32.8% | 37.9% |
| | | | | | | | |
| Black / African American | 34.1% | 37.8% | 41.4% | 45.1% | 48.7% | 52.4% | 56.1% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 65.0% | 66.9% | 68.9% | 70.8% | 72.8% | 74.7% | 76.7% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 30.6% | 34.5% | 38.3% | 42.2% | 46.0% | 49.9% | 53.7% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 33.6% | 37.3% | 41.0% | 44.7% | 48.4% | 52.0% | 55.7% |
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 46.7% | 49.7% | 52.6% | 55.6% | 58.5% | 61.5% | 64.5% |
| White | 57.9% | 60.2% | 62.6% | 64.9% | 67.3% | 69.6% | 71.9% |
| Two Or More Races | 54.5% | 57.0% | 59.6% | 62.1% | 64.6% | 67.1% | 69.7% |

## ~~J.~~B. Graduation Rates

**Graduation rate - 2016 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2017-2021 interim targets**

| ~~Graduation Rate~~ | ~~2016~~ | ~~2017~~ | ~~2018~~ | ~~2019~~ | ~~2020~~ | ~~2021~~ | ~~2022~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~All Students~~ | ~~78.9%~~ | ~~81.2%~~ | ~~83.4%~~ | ~~85.7%~~ | ~~87.9%~~ | ~~90.2%~~ | ~~92.5%~~ |
| ~~Economically Disadvantaged Students~~ | ~~72.0%~~ | ~~75.0%~~ | ~~78.0%~~ | ~~81.0%~~ | ~~84.0%~~ | ~~87.0%~~ | ~~90.0%~~ |
| ~~Students with Disabilities~~ | ~~58.4%~~ | ~~62.9%~~ | ~~67.3%~~ | ~~71.8%~~ | ~~76.2%~~ | ~~80.7%~~ | ~~85.1%~~ |
| ~~English Learners~~ | ~~72.3%~~ | ~~75.3%~~ | ~~78.2%~~ | ~~81.2%~~ | ~~84.2%~~ | ~~87.1%~~ | ~~90.1%~~ |
| ~~Minority Students*~~ | ~~72.3%~~ | ~~75.3%~~ | ~~78.2%~~ | ~~81.2%~~ | ~~84.2%~~ | ~~87.1%~~ | ~~90.1%~~ |
| **Graduation Rate** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| All Students | 79.7% | 82.2% | 84.8% | 87.3% | 89.9% | 92.4% | 94.9% |
| Economically Disadvantaged | 71.9% | 75.4% | 78.9% | 82.4% | 86.0% | 89.5% | 93.0% |
| Students with Disabilities | 60.5% | 65.4% | 70.4% | 75.3% | 80.3% | 85.2% | 90.1% |
| English Learners | 73.3% | 76.6% | 80.0% | 83.3% | 86.7% | 90.0% | 93.3% |
| | | | | | | | |
| Black / African American | 77.8% | 80.6% | 83.4% | 86.1% | 88.9% | 91.7% | 94.5% |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 83.1% | 85.2% | 87.3% | 89.4% | 91.6% | 93.7% | 95.8% |
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 58.5% | 63.7% | 68.9% | 74.1% | 79.3% | 84.4% | 89.6% |
| Hispanic or Latino | 73.7% | 77.0% | 80.3% | 83.6% | 86.9% | 90.1% | 93.4% |
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 69.7% | 73.5% | 77.3% | 81.1% | 84.9% | 88.6% | 92.4% |
| White | 81.3% | 83.6% | 86.0% | 88.3% | 90.7% | 93.0% | 95.3% |
| Two Or More Races | 77.3% | 80.1% | 83.0% | 85.8% | 88.7% | 91.5% | 94.3% |

## ~~K.~~C. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

**English proficiency - 2017 baseline, 2022 long-term goal, and 2018-2021 interim targets**

| ~~2017~~ | ~~2018~~ | ~~2019~~ | ~~2020~~ | ~~2021~~ | ~~2022~~ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ~~33.2%~~ | ~~36.9%~~ | ~~40.6%~~ | ~~44.3%~~ | ~~48.1%~~ | ~~51.8%~~ |

| 2017 Baseline | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 Goal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 48% | 51.46% | 54.92% | 58.38% | 61.84% | 65.30% |

## **Appendix B** Idaho's Accountability Framework

01. **School Category.**
a. Kindergarten through grade eight (K-8): Schools in this category include elementary and middle schools as defined in Subsection 112.05.f.
b. High Schools, not designated as alternative high schools, as defined in Subsection 112.05.f.
c. Alternative High Schools
02. **Academic Measures by School Category.**
a. K-8:
i. Idaho Standards Achievement Tests (ISAT) Proficiency.
ii. ISAT growth toward proficiency based on a trajectory model approved by the State Board of Education.
iii. ISAT proficiency gap closure.
iv. Idaho statewide reading assessment proficiency.
v. English Learners achieving English language proficiency.
vi. English Learners achieving English language growth toward proficiency.
b. High School:
i. ISAT proficiency.
ii. ISAT proficiency gap closure.
iii. English Learners achieving English language proficiency.
iv. English Learners achieving English language growth toward proficiency.
v. Four (4) year cohort graduation rate, including students who complete graduation requirements prior to the start of the school district or charter schools next fall term.
vi. Five (5) year cohort graduation rate, including students who complete graduation requirements prior to the start of the school district or charter schools next fall term.
c. Alternative High School:
i. ISAT proficiency.
ii. English learners achieving English language proficiency.
iii. English learners achieving English language growth towards proficiency.
iv. Four (4) year cohort graduation rate, including students who complete graduation requirements prior to the start of the school district or charter schools next fall term.
v. Five (5) year cohort graduation rate, including students who complete graduation requirements prior to the start of the school district or charter schools next fall term.
03. **School Quality Measures by School Category.**
a. K-8:
i. Students in grade 8 enrolled in pre-algebra or higher.
ii. State satisfaction and engagement survey administered to parents, students, and teachers (effective starting in the 2018-2019 school year).
iii. Communication with parents on student achievement (effective starting in the 2018-2019 school year).
b. High School:
i. College and career readiness determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification, and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs.
ii. State satisfaction and engagement survey administered to parents, students, and teachers (effective starting in the 2018-2019 school year).

iii. Students in grade 9 enrolled in algebra I or higher.
iv. Communication with parents on student achievement (effective starting in the 2018-2019 school year).

c. Alternative High School:

i. Credit recovery and accumulation.
ii. College and career readiness determined through a combination of students participating in advanced opportunities, earning industry recognized certification, and/or participation in recognized high school apprenticeship programs.
iii. State satisfaction and engagement survey administered to parents, students, and teachers (effective starting in the 2018-2019 school year).
iv. Communication with parents on student achievement (effective starting in the 2018-2019 school year).

# Appendix C GEPA 427 Statement

Information Regarding Equitable Access to and Participation in the Programs included in the Idaho Consolidated State Plan

The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) adheres to Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA). In carrying out its educational mission, the Idaho State Department of Education will ensure to the fullest extent possible equitable access to, participation in, and appropriate educational opportunities for individuals served. Federally funded activities, programs, and services will be accessible to all teachers, students and program beneficiaries. The ISDE ensures equal access and participation to all persons regardless of their race, color, ethnicity, religion, national origin, age, citizenship status, disability, gender or sexual orientation in its education programs, services, and/or activities.

For state-level activities as well as all other activities supported by federal assistance through our electronic grant application, ISDE will fully enforce all federal and state laws and regulations designed to ensure equitable access to all program beneficiaries and to overcome barriers to equitable participation. The ISDE will hold LEAs accountable for ensuring equal access and providing reasonable and appropriate accommodations to meet the needs of a diverse group of students, staff, community members and other participants.

Steps taken to ensure equitable access may include, but are not limited to the following; developing and administering a pre-participation survey to all potential participants in order to identify special accommodation needs (i.e., wheelchair access, assistive technology, transportation assistance); holding program related sessions/activities in Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible and compliant facilities; printing materials in multiple languages, when appropriate; offering multi-lingual services for participants and others as needed and appropriate; responsiveness to cultural differences; fostering a positive school climate through restorative practices; conducting outreach efforts and target marketing to those not likely to participate; making program materials available in braille or via audiotapes, when appropriate; providing assistive technology devices to translate/make accessible grant and program materials for participants requiring such accommodations; using technologies to convey content of program materials; using materials that include strategies for addressing the needs of all participants; pre-program gender and cultural awareness training for participants; development and/or acquisition and dissemination of culturally relevant and sensitive curriculum and informational materials; use of transportation services that include handicapped accommodations; transportation vouchers or other forms of assistance, on an as needed basis, to members (including teachers, students, and families) who must use public transportation to attend program activities.

## Appendix D Research Supporting Educator Mentoring Focus

Burkhauser, S., Gates, S. M., Hamilton, L. S., & Ikemoto, G. S. (2012). First-Year Principals in Urban School Districts: How Actions and Working Conditions Relate to Outcomes. Technical Report. Rand Corporation.

Potemski, A., & Matlach, L. (2014). Supporting New Teachers: What Do We Know about Effective State Induction Policies? Policy Snapshot. Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

Strong, M. (2006). Does new teacher support affect student achievement? (Research Brief). Santa Cruz, CA: New Teacher Center. Retrieved from http://www.newteachercenter.org/sites/default/ files/ntc/main/resources/BRF_

Villar, A., & Strong, M. (2007). Is mentoring worth the money? A benefit-cost analysis and five-year rate of return of a comprehensive mentoring program for beginning teachers. ERS Spectrum, 25(3), 1–17.

# Appendix E

## Psychometric Summary of AdvancED's Student Engagement Survey

### Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the psychometric properties of AdvancED's Student Engagement Survey. It is based on a pilot study AdvancED conducted with a total sample size of 20,494 students. The representative sample of students spanned three states: Alabama, North Dakota, and South Carolina. The characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1 below. Special attention was given to the oversampling of minority groups within the original sampling framework in order to test for any bias that could have arisen between testing groups based on any demographic characteristic.

**Table 1.** Sample Size of the Pilot Study with Race Percentages by Groups

| Race/Ethnicity | High School | Middle School | Elementary School |
|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1.0% | 2.0% | 2.7% |
| Asian | 1.5% | 0.9% | 0.9% |
| Black or African American | 27.1% | 27.6% | 27.1% |
| Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander | 0.4% | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Two or More Races | 7.0% | 10.8% | 10.2% |
| White | 59.9% | 55.9% | 55.2% |
| Unknown | 3.1% | 2.4% | 3.3% |
| Actual Sample Size | 6514 | 6880 | 7100 |

### Overview of the Student Engagement Survey

The Student Engagement Survey was designed to measure elementary, middle and high school student engagement through student opinions about their learning experiences. The 20 items are categorized under the three domains of engagement type (behavior, cognitive and emotional). These domains are then broken down further by three components of engagement quality – committed, compliant and disengaged. Finally, each component is aligned to two levels. Thus, the committed component has an "invested" or "immersed" level; the compliant component has a "strategic" or "ritual" level; and the disengaged component has a "retreatism" or "rebellion" level.

Results are categorized by engagement type and quality of engagement. Survey results provide a useful summary of the detailed information represented in students' responses and provides information relative to a benchmark. A respondent who finishes the survey is labeled as Committed, Compliant, or Disengaged for each of the three domains. This label is based on

which component of engagement the respondent answers the majority of the time within each factor. It should be noted that the Behavioral domain has six items which means it is possible that a respondent has an even number of responses across two or more components. In these cases, the respondent would be labeled as having a "mixed engagement type. The percentage reported for each domain is calculated by counting the number respondents in each domain out of the total number of respondents taking part in the survey. The percentage reported for each component of engagement is calculated in the same way.

## Reliability and Validity

Data from the pilot were used to examine the reliability and validity of the three versions of the instrument – elementary, middle, and high school students. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, with values of .7 and above representing adequate internal consistency (see Table 2). The Middle and High student groups of the Student Engagement Survey fall within the "good" range for reliability. The exception in this case is the Elementary students where the reliability was found to be closer to "adequate". It is theorized that drop in reliability may actually be a byproduct of the respondents ages and mental capacity as opposed to survey content. All three groups received survey questions that are similar in content with some differentiation among groups.

**Table 2.** Reliability of Student Engagement Surveys.

| Group | Reliability |
|---|---|
| High School | 0.80 |
| Middle School | 0.80 |
| Elementary School | 0.67 |

Construct validity was examined using confirmatory factor analysis. Table 3 below shows the results of the CFA across several common fit indices. All values in Table 3 represent good fit of the data to the model across all of the fit indices. "Good" is defined as Root Mean Square Residual (RMSR) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) less than 0.05 and Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Normed Fit Index (NFI) between 0.90 and 0.95.

**Table 3.** Three Factor Fit Indices for Student Engagement Surveys.

| Group | RMSR | RMSEA | GFI | CFI | NFI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| High School | 0.0132 | 0.0339 | 0.9795 | 0.9420 | 0.9341 |
| Middle School | 0.0133 | 0.0342 | 0.9770 | 0.9385 | 0.9341 |
| Elementary | 0.0095 | 0.0259 | 0.9860 | 0.9422 | 0.9311 |

## Rasch Results

Each individual item was reviewed using a Rasch analysis, utilizing several fit indices to determine how well the items performed. Across all three forms, 3 of items on the high school form, 3 items from the middle school form, and 1 item from the elementary form were considered "on bounds" meaning their values were close to the threshold values used to determine item fit. All other items were within commonly accepted parameters and considered to be functioning exceptionally well within the confines of the instrument. A table of these values is not presented given the large number of items but is available upon request.

## Differential Item Functioning Results

Similarly, Differential Item Functioning (DIF) analysis was conducted to examine the performance of items in relation to different demographic groups. As an example, Table 4 shows the results of DIF analysis for a single survey item that tests bias relative to two race categories. DIF test values for item #12: "The skills I am learning in class…" are included in Table 4. Mantel-Haenszel P-Values greater than 0.05 and effect sizes less than the absolute value of 0.25 are labeled as not having bias between the groups being investigated. In other comparisons where DIF was indicated, we believe it is an artifact of sample size (for example, American Indian and Alaska Native) but AdvancED will continue to monitor this as more respondents use the measure.

**Table 4.** DIF Results for Item #12 Based on Black/African American versus White Race Categories for all Subgroups.

| Group | Mantel-Haenszel P-Value | Effect Size |
|---|---|---|
| High School | 0.0750 | 0.00 |
| Middle School | 0.2289 | 0.00 |
| Elementary School | 0.1331 | 0.03 |

*ESSA Plan, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction*, 31 Aug. 2017, pp. 422–423., www.nd.gov/dpi/SchoolStaff/SSI/ESSA/plan/