c. If the States uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 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.

B. Procedure and Inclusion Criteria

The K-2 model calculates the percentage points that these school types will receive when the proper conditions are met. There are ~~two~~ three indicators for this model, proficiency, chronic absenteeism (the SQSS indicator), and English language learning (EL). Proficiency is based on the state assessment and alternative assessment for English Language Arts (ELA) and Math statewide tests. The EL calculations are based on the English proficiency statewide test for English language learning proficiency levels. The proficiency indicator is worth ~~90%~~80% of the overall score. Chronic absenteeism is worth 10% of the overall score. The EL indicator is worth 10% of the overall score.

To be eligible for participation in the K-2 model, schools must have 20 FAY students in ~~each~~ the proficiency indicator. To qualify for the EL indicator, the school must have 20 EL-FAY students. The proficiency and EL~~two~~ indicators are calculated with different groups of students. Specifically, the group of students included in the proficiency calculations are those students who attended three full academic years (FAY) at the K-2 school and have taken the statewide assessment or the statewide alternative assessments in their third-grade year. The entity where the student took the third-grade assessments is not considered in these calculations. The three-year FAY K-2 school earns the credit for educating the students prior to their third-grade school year. Therefore, the proficiency indicator is applied to a prior year group of students. Proficiency results are worth ~~90~~80% of a K-2 school's letter grade. If a school does not have the n-count of 20 FAY students, ~~the~~ the ~~school's assessment records are pooled for three years to obtain proficiency points on the state assessment~~school does not qualify for a proficiency score. Recently Arrived English Learner (RA EL) students are excluded from proficiency calculations for ELA only.

English language learner calculations include students currently attending the K-2 school. Kindergarten, first grade, and second grade students who are present in the school for a full academic school year, through the end of the AZELLA testing window, are eligible for inclusion. The school must have at least 20 of these FAY students to be eligible for EL points. Five points are possible for EL growth, which is defined as an increase in English language proficiency of one or more levels from the prior testing period to the current testing period. Five points are possible for EL proficiency, which is defined as testing proficient in the current year, given that the student had an EL need on prior assessments. The EL growth and proficiency points are combined for a total possible 10 points.

i. 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.

    Lowest Performing Schools are identified using the model and weighted indicators identified in section 4(v)(b) above. Each school receives a weighted average based off the model used to assess them for a Final Comprehensive Achievement Score (CAS)~~Score~~. The schools will be included as long as they have sufficient n-count for proficiency. If there are other indicators where the n-count cannot be met, the denominator will be adjusted. Example, if a K-8 school does not have sufficient n-count of EL scores making them ineligible for the 10 EL points, their denominator will be reduced to 90 for the final calculation. The five models are then grouped together: K-8 Schools, 9-12 Schools, Schools Serving a Combination to include Grade 12, Schools Serving a Combination NOT including Grade 12,

26

Commented [PR1]: ESSA Requires use of the SQSS indicator. Initially, Chronic Absenteeism was not applied to the K-2 Model. This change inserts Chronic Absenteeism into the K-2 model as it is in all other K-8 schools.

Commented [PR2]: Proficiency reduced from 90% to 80% to make room for CA.

Commented [PR3]: This language just cleans up the specificity.

Commented [PR4]: Accountability has never had the capacity or structure in place to pool K-2 students across multiple years. Further, ADE does not pool students in other grades in order to manifest an N-count, so the impact of including (up to) 5th graders in a K-2 model is inappropriate.

Commented [PR5]: Updates language to reflect scoring terminology.

and K-2 Schools. ~~They are then standardized separately by their mean and standard deviation creating a Z score. All schools are then grouped back together.~~ The funded Title 1 schools are then ranked based on their Comprehensive Achievement Scores~~standardized Z scores~~. Based on this ranking a cut score for the bottom 5% is established.

Schools will be reidentified every three years.

Technical Business Rules can be found on the ADE Website at the following address: https://www.azed.gov/sites/default/files/2022/05/CSI%20Business%20Rules%20FY22%20Final.pdf

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.

All high schools with 5-year cohort graduation rate of less than 66.7% were identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement for low graduation rate beginning in 2018-2019 and again for SY 2021-22.

All high schools with 5-year cohort graduation rate of less than 66.7% will be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement for low graduation rate every three years.

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.

Subgroup Achievement.

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools are identified by calculating the same components as CSI (Proficiency, Growth, EL, etc.) but only for members of each particular subgroup, called a Subgroup Achievement Score (SAS).

A school's ~~Final Points~~$_{Subgroup}$ SAS for each subgroup is ~~are~~ calculated with the following formula:

$$\cancel{Final\ Points_{subgroup}}SAS_{subgroup} = \frac{Total\ Points}{Eligible\ Points}$$

Please refer to 4(vi)(a) on how CSI is determined. To determine the schools in which subgroups need additional targeted support and improvement, the final ~~score~~ SAS is used to determine subgroups scoring lower than the ~~highest performing CSI school~~ 5% cutoff from all eligible CAS values determined in the CSI-LA procedure, above.

Any Additional Targeted Support and Improvement school receiving Title I, Part A funds that does not meet the statewide exit criteria for ATSI schools after 4 years by raising the achievement level of low achieving subgroups, will be identified as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Targeted (CSI-T) School. The first year of identification as CSI-T will be 2024-25 if not exited from ~~TSI~~ ATSI and

then this will be calculated every 4th year thereafter.

d. <u>Year of Identification</u>. 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.

Arizona will identify the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools for low achievement beginning in 2017-18. Arizona will identify all high schools in the state that graduate less than two- thirds of their students as Comprehensive Support and Improvement -low graduation rate schools beginning in 2018-19.

Arizona will identify all types of Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools at least once every three years.

e. <u>Targeted Support and Improvement</u>. 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))*

Any Arizona school that has one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and any low achieving subgroups will be identified as Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI).

Any school in which any subgroup is below two standard deviations of the statewide mean of school total points, ~~by model type~~as measured by the Subgroup Achievement Score (SAS), during the prior three years of most current data will be identified as Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI). The TSI threshold for identification is determined by calculating the statewide mean and standard deviation from among all valid school-wide CAS values in each year. ~~For each model type (K-8, 9-12, K-12, etc.) the statewide mean and standard deviation is calculated for the schools evaluated under that model. Each model's standard deviation is subtracted from the relevant mean in order to establish a cut point.~~ Schools with the same subgroup(s) below the cut point for the three most recent years of data are identified for TSI. All schools may be identified for TSI, regardless of Title 1 status. TSI identification occurs annually. Initial identification will occur in Fall of 2022, using data from the 2021-2022, 2018-2019, and 2017-2018 school years.

Arizona will identify TSI - Consistently Underperforming Subgroups schools annually.

f. <u>Additional Targeted Support</u>. 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))*

28

Commented [PR10]: Updates language to reflect scoring terminology.

Commented [PR11]: Updates language to reflect scoring terminology. Also drops the 'by model type' confusion also used in prior ATSI language.

Commented [PR12]: Accountability has not pooled schools by model type for TSI identification. The threshold is based on the all-schools CAS statewide mean and standard deviation, which allows for the identification of any such school on the same scale, rather than providing different scales for each model.

Any Arizona school, in which any subgroup of students (N20), on its own, would lead to identification as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School, based on the Subgroup Achievement Score (SAS) will be identified as Additional Targeted Support and Improvement beginning in 2018-19. Schools will be identified every three years.

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

ii. Annual Measurement of Achievement *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))*: Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.
A participation rate of less than 95 percent on statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments will be a factor in school improvement decisions. Also, schools will be monitored annually with interventions required if student participation stays under 95 percent for multiple years.

A participation rate of less than 95 percent on statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments is factored into the calculation of the proficiency indicator. If a school tested under 95% of their eligible students, then a penalty term is added to the denominator. The penalty term is equal to the number tests the school should have administered to have 95% tested.
Simplified example:

School A had 100 students eligible to assess in mathematics. They tested 93 with 49 earning a passing score. Percent proficient is the ratio is 49/93. Since they needed two more students to reach 95%, their ratio is changed to 49/(93+2) or 49/95.This will help ensure that the requirement of 95% student participation is met.

iii. 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.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement- low achievement schools (CSI-LA) (Title 1 lowest 5% schools) exit criteria:
   - A minimum of two consecutive years of increased student proficiency on the state assessmentperformance as measured by the Comprehensive Achievement Score; and
   - Implementation of school improvement goals, strategies and action steps in state required Integrated Action Plan; and
   - Above original identification score set by the bottom 5% of Title 1 schools, considering all applicable criteria. Or,
   - Any identified school failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid CAS may request an appeal by qualitative review to exit identification.
   - Any identified school failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid CAS for two consecutive years shall be exited from identification.
   - The State does not count the 2019-2020 school year toward the

number of years (not to exceed four years) in which a school must meet the criteria in order to exit CSI status before it must take more rigorous State-determined action.
- The State does not count the 2020-2021 school year toward the number of years (not to exceed four years) in which a school must meet the criteria in order to exit before it must take more rigorous State-determined action.
- The State is revising the statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement in fall 2022 based on data from the 2021-2022 school year

Schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools - low graduation rate (CSI-G) exit criteria:
- A minimum of two years increased graduation rate using 5-year cohort data; and
- A graduation rate above the 2/3rds identification threshold. Or,
- An identified school with no enrolled students shall be exited from CSI-G identification.
- An identified school with no students enrolled in the appropriate graduation cohort, or with no valid graduation rate may request an appeal by qualitative review to exit identification.

- CSI- Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status Schools (CSI-T) -Exit Criteria
  - A minimum of two consecutive years of increased overall and subgroup achievement as measured by the Subgroup Achievement Score (SAS) for the identified subgroup(s); and
  - A valid SAS above the identification threshold that resulted in the most recent ATSI identification for that subgroup; and,
  - Implementation of school improvement goals, strategies, and action steps relative to overall and subgroup achievement in state required Integrated Action Plan; andOr
  - An identified subgroup failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid SAS may request an appeal by qualitative review to exit identification.
  - An identified subgroup failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid SAS for two consecutive years shall be exited from identification.
  - Overall and subgroup achievement above bottom 5% of Title I schools. considering all applicable criteria.

All Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools will be expected to exit within four years of identification.

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 receiving additional Targeted Support exit criteria:

- A minimum of two years of consecutive increased subgroup achievement as measured by the Subgroup Achievement Score (SAS) for the identified subgroup(s); and
  - A valid SAS above the identification threshold that resulted in the most recent ATSI identification for that subgroup; and

30

- Implementation of school improvement goals, strategies and action steps relative to subgroup achievement in state required Integrated Action Plan; ~~and~~Or
- An identified subgroup failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid SAS may request an appeal by qualitative review to exit identification.
- An identified subgroup failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid SAS for two consecutive years shall be exited from identification.
- ~~Subgroup no longer on its own, would be identified as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School~~
- ~~Implementation of improved graduation rate goals, strategies and action steps in state required Integrated Action Plan; and~~
- ~~Five-year cohort graduation rate greater than 66.6%.~~
- The State does not count the 2019-2020 school year toward the number of years in which a school must meet the criteria in order to exit before, for a school receiving Title I, Part A funds, it becomes a CSI school.
- The State does not count the 2020-2021 school year toward the number of years in which a school must meet the criteria in order to exit before, for a school receiving Title I, Part A funds, it becomes a CSI school
- The State is revising the statewide exit criteria for schools identified for additional targeted support and improvement under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) in fall 2022 based on data from the 2021-2022 school year.

> **Commented [PR23]:** Formalizes low-N-count appeal/exit process.

> **Commented [PR24]:** This is redundant to the above - I think it's an extant typo/format/update error.

c. <u>More Rigorous Interventions</u>. 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.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools that have not, after four years, made sufficient progress to exit comprehensive support and improvement status will receive intensified technical assistance and supports. To ensure implementation of more rigorous, evidence-based strategies and interventions that are intentionally focused on the root causes for insufficient progress, an Arizona Department of Education team will conduct an in-depth comprehensive needs assessment of the LEA and schools to determine primary needs, root causes, desired outcomes and goals.   This work is the foundation of the school's Integrated Action Plan. The integrated action plan will be developed in collaboration with the ADE, LEA, school staff and family and community stakeholders.

The Comprehensive needs assessment looks at effective leadership capacity and practices, instructional infrastructure, including effective teachers and instructions, curriculum and assessment systems; Effective organization of time, including instructional and non-instruction time and time for teacher planning and collaboration; and organizational conditions, climate and culture, student learning, fulfillment, safety and well-being, as well as professional satisfaction, morale, and effectiveness; Family and community engagement, effective reciprocal partnerships; and talent management.
This process will assist in determining gaps in the current implementation of strategies and interventions as well as identifying fidelity issues, intensity of interventions and resource allocation inequities. It will identify what is working and what is not. In collaboration with

LEAs and schools, the next best high-leveraged steps to eliminate causes and improve student outcomes will be identified. Requirements will be determined based on data and the school's specific needs and context. The Arizona Department of Education team will assist the LEA to identify new evidence- based interventions and actions.

New Integrated Action Plans will be written with direct assistance from Arizona Department of Education support teams, considering a variety of innovative, evidenced-based interventions and selecting interventions highly successful with similar populations and settings. Monitoring and support visits and technical assistance will increase and intensify. Partnering with an evidence-based outside service provide may be recommended.