

Revised State Template for the Consolidated State Plan

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



U.S. Department of Education Issued: March 2017

OMB Number: 1810-0576

Expiration Date: September 30, 2017

Paperwork Burden Statement According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0576. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 249 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this collection, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this collection, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20202-3118.

Contents

- Introduction3
- Cover Page.....5
- Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan6
- Instructions6
- A: Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)7
- B: Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children 36
- C: Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk..... 40
- D: Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction 41
- E: Title III, Part A, Subpart 1: English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement..... 43
- F: Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants..... 45
- G: Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers 46
- H: Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program..... 51
- I: Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B..... 51
- Appendix A 57
 - Measurements of Long-term Goals and interim progress 57
 - Academic Achievement 57
 - B: Graduation Rates 66
 - C: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency 67
 - Table II: Fiscal Year 2018 English Language Achievement Growth 68
 - Table III. Percent of Students with Intermediate Proficiency in 2017 Who Did Not Progress to Proficient in FY 2018 69
- Appendix B 70

Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),¹¹ 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. In order to ensure transparency consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department intends to post each State plan on the Department's website.

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 B.

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 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

¹¹ Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.


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): Michelle Udall, Associate Superintendent	Telephone: 602-364-2811
Mailing Address: 1535 W. Jefferson St. Phoenix, AZ 85007 Bin #5	Email Address: michelle.udall@azed.gov
<p>By signing this document, I assure that:</p> <p>To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Tom Horne	Telephone: 602.542.5460
Contact Information and Signatures	
	Date: 12/31/2024
Governor (Printed Name) Douglas Ducey	Date SEA provided plan to the Governor under ESEA section 8540: April 3, 2017
Signature of Governor	Date:

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

i. Standards are what a student needs to know, understand, and be able to do by the end of each grade. Standards build across grade levels in a progression of increasing understanding and through a range of cognitive demand levels. In Arizona, standards are adopted at the state level by the Arizona State Board of Education. Arizona’s standards review process involves opening the review and rule process by the Arizona State Board of Education, the convening of working groups made up of educators around the state, the completion of draft standards, which are then put forth for public and expert review, revision by the working group, and finally adoption by the Arizona State Board of Education. The process is driven by educator expertise and public stakeholder feedback to ensure the creation of rigorous, developmentally appropriate standards

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:

ADE no longer offers high school end of course assessments. ADE will offer a single grade ELA and Mathematics assessment for Grade 8.

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 mathematics² course work in middle school.

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. Arizona is an English-only state; therefore, the state does not have a threshold for determining the languages, beyond English, that are present to a significant extent; however, the state recognizes that other languages are spoken by our students. For the purposes of ESSA, the SEA will define a language other than English present to a significant extent when that language exceeds 10% of the total tested population. Based on 2018-19 data, the most prominent language, other than English, present to a significant extent in Arizona is Spanish at 4% which does not meet the threshold of 10%.
- ii. Identify any existing assessments in languages other than English and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available.

N/A

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.

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

N/A

- 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.

By Arizona State Statute, Arizona is an English-only state. A.R.S. § 15-755 designates that assessments be given in English A.R.S. § 15-752 requires that all instruction be in English.

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).
 1. The major subgroups are as follows:
 - a. American Indian/Native American
 - b. Asian
 - c. Black/African American
 - d. Hispanic/Latino
 - e. Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
 - f. White, and
 - g. Multiple Races
 2. The State will also use the following required subgroups in the accountability system:
 - a. Economically Disadvantaged Students
 - b. Students with Disabilities, and
 - c. English Learners.
- 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, children with disabilities, and English Learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

N/A
- 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.

N/A

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.

1. Arizona uses an n-count of 20 Full Academic Year (FAY) students for federal accountability.

2. Arizona uses an n-count of 10 for public reporting.

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

1. An n-size of 20 was established as that number is large enough to provide statistically valid and reliable results, but small enough to ensure schools are held accountable. Additionally, this n-size offers privacy protection for those subgroups too small to report without disclosing personally identifiable information.

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.

1. Arizona consistently reaches out to stakeholders including teachers, school administrators, education policy organizations, parents, and the community. As AZ continued to develop a more robust plan, it was shared for comment with all interested parties through meetings and online review and submission processes.

2. The table below is displaying how varying n-sizes could impact Arizona schools and the accountability system. This table shows how many schools could be included from accountability by subgroup depending on the n-size that is selected, as well as at the overall school level. As expected, the smaller the n-size, the more schools that would be included in accountability. The decision regarding n-size needs to be balanced with statistical validity and reliability.

Demographic	Total FAY Students	Total Schools	N10	N20	N25	N30
All	1,000,506	1,976	1,911	1,877	1,864	1,849
African American	49,380	1,976	1,076	759	650	541
American Indian	42,691	1,976	649	360	294	244
Hispanic/Latino	457,714	1,976	1,784	1,706	1,666	1,641
Asian	30,762	1,976	607	363	295	247
Hawaiian	3,752	1,976	67	11	5	4
White	384,232	1,976	1,637	1,468	1,420	1,371
Multi-Racial	33,658	1,976	1,039	660	512	393
English Learner	114,089	1,976	1,411	1,118	995	896
Economically Disadvantaged	471,457	1,976	1,600	1,554	1,535	1,517
Children with Disabilities	114,224	1,976	1,702	1,485	1,402	1,313

- d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.³³
1. The Arizona Department of Education suppresses aggregate data that falls below the minimum n-count of 10 to ensure that student information is protected. Student privacy is of utmost importance when reporting data and will be ensured for all students and subgroups
- 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.
1. Arizona uses an n-count of 10 for reporting.

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.

Arizona proposes setting long-term achievement goals that are ambitious and attainable for all

³³ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(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.

schools. The long-term goals for academic achievement focus on student growth as well as student proficiency on our state-wide assessments for English Language Arts and mathematics. The Arizona state-wide assessment is administered to all students in the third grade through eighth grade, and then once in high school. It is important to track the achievement of all students while simultaneously encouraging the growth of individual groups of students, goals that address a wide variety of student subgroups have also been created. By separating out groups of students, both the State Education Agency (SEA) and the Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) will be better equipped to direct services and supports where they are most needed. Failure to do so will result in a continuing pattern of wide achievement gaps among student subgroups.

Scores reported at the subgroup level allow the SEA to discover LEAs who are having great successes with students. In this manner, the SEA can facilitate peer-to-peer learning networks in the support of student academic achievement. Because some of our student groups lag far behind others, they will have to grow at a significantly greater rate to close proficiency gaps. Creating a peer-to-peer network will assist LEAs in achieving these rapid growth rates through Arizona specific, evidence-based practices to bring a more equitable educational opportunity to all students.

The work of setting long-term goals and MIPs requires the expertise of many. The creation of Arizona's goal-setting methodology began last year through a multi-sector, collaborative process involving business, community, educators, policymakers, and parents.

Several assumptions guided the work of the ESSA long-term goals/MIPs team: focus on equity for all students, strategies must accompany goals in order to accelerate outcomes, initiative alignment is imperative, target goals will be adjusted when more longitudinal data is available, and goals are intended to define an aspirational end point rather than model projections of current progress. Additionally, specific criteria were put into place to guide the formation of long-term goals and MIPs: ambitious, attainable, proficiency gaps close, and all LEAs show growth including those above the target indicator. To encourage growth in our top-performing groups of students, the team, as further outlined below, is recommending a final proficiency measure of "at least" 90 percent. Because some of our subgroups are already close to 90 percent proficiency, the "at least" designation indicates that growth beyond 90 percent proficiency is expected when attainable.

Our current reality indicates that half of LEAs are below the state average; therefore, aggressive improvement is of vital importance. It is important to note, however, that Arizona has only two years of data for its state-wide assessments at the times the goals were set. Psychometrically speaking, this was not adequate data to predict trends. Therefore, these long-term goals and MIPs will need to be reevaluated as additional state-wide data is received and when a new assessment begins in the 2021-2022 school year to ensure that our criteria of ambitious and attainable goals are met.

Methodology:

Arizona will use the same methodology for creating long-term goals and MIPs for both ELA and mathematics. Additionally, the methodology is designed to be highly transparent so that schools and communities will be able to clearly understand expectations.

Finally, MIPs are set for every three years to allow districts and schools time to implement strategies to support improvement efforts before they are compared against interim measures. In future years, when more data is available, the team is highly interested in considering additional growth measures. Specifically, the team would like to recognize those students who, although not at full proficiency, are on-track to meet proficiency within a certain period of time.

In this manner, schools who work with high numbers of underachieving students will be recognized for their work in accelerating achievement.

Proficiency Gap Reduction Strategy:

- 2016 state-wide English Language Arts and mathematics assessment data will be set as the baseline year. As 2015 was the first year of our new state-wide assessment administration, this year was not set as the baseline year. Due to the new test format, adjusted test administration procedures, and movement to online testing, the first year was viewed as a pilot year and thus not a good choice for a baseline year.

Long-Term Goal #1:

- By 2029-2030, close proficiency gaps by at least 50 percent. The proficiency gap is defined as the difference between 90 percent proficiency and baseline subgroup proficiency.
- This gap divided in half forms the expected growth percentage for each subgroup
- MIPs set for every three years provide LEAs with benchmarks to meet expected growth percentages
- Note that not all subgroups will end at equal levels of proficiency. Due to the wide gap in proficiency levels between subgroups, the team determined that while requiring all subgroups to be at the same level of proficiency at the end of long-term goal #1 is ambitious, it would not meet our criteria of attainability.
- Subgroups who close the proficiency gap by 50 percent prior to 2027-2028 must continue to show proficiency gains; thus, the rationale for setting an “at least” measure for this goal.

School and district report cards will display progress toward these goals on an annual basis

Long-Term Goal #2:

- By 2041-2042, all subgroups must reach at least 90 percent proficiency on ELA and mathematics state-wide assessments.
- Continue setting MIPs every three years until all subgroups reach 90 percent proficiency.
- Subgroups who meet 90 percent proficiency prior to 2039-2040 must continue to show improvement gains; thus, the rationale for setting an “at least” measure for this goal.

The data tables provide examples of the MIPs that need to be met by schools to close the proficiency gap by 50 percent in 2029 and, ultimately, achieve an overall proficiency of 90 percent by 2041.

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

See response 1 in this section and Appendix A.

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.

As noted above and as shown in Appendix A, there are wide gaps in proficiency between subgroups. As a result, Arizona is requiring that proficiency gaps be reduced by at least 50 percent as our first long-term goal. In this manner, schools and LEAs will be able to implement evidence-based strategies specifically designed for the struggling students that they serve while still being granted an adequate amount of time to implement these strategies with fidelity.

Additionally, our first long-term goal ensures that all groups, even our lowest performing, will be at or very near 50 percent proficiency. This represents a proficiency increase of over 40 percent for some subgroups but does not slow the progress of those groups who currently achieve at higher levels

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.

Arizona has set a long-term goal of 90 percent for 4-year graduation rate by 2032. This goal was established by a diverse group of stakeholders representing multiple educational partners who have collaboratively developed indicators to help further assess the status of education for the state as a whole and for counties, LEAs and schools, where data are available. This goal was established by reviewing the 2014 high school graduation rate of the top 10 attainment states in the country (83.3 percent), the 2015 high school graduation rate of the top nine graduation rates in the country (89 percent), and the 2015 graduation rate of all states (82 percent) and comparing it to Arizona's 2015 all student graduation rate (77 percent). In addition, the stakeholders reviewed the 2015 graduation rates of subgroups in Arizona. Interim progress measures for each subgroup are set at three-year intervals to allow time for schools to fully implement strategies to improve graduation rates.

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.

At this time, no long-term goals have been established for extended-year graduation rates.

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 in Appendix A.

Interim progress measures for each subgroup are set at three-year intervals to allow time for schools to fully implement strategies to improve graduation rates. These measures of interim progress are fully outlined in Appendix B .

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 graduate rate gaps.

By 2032, all subgroups are expected to achieve a 90 percent graduation rate. In order to accomplish this ambitious goal, some subgroup populations will need to improve at faster rates than others. Appendix B details the exact measures of interim progress for each subgroup which will lead toward our 90 percent goal by 2032.

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

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.

Arizona has outlined the projected interim progress of English Learners (EL) in the state of Arizona, and the actual progress achieved to date. The primary objective is to increase the number of students achieving progress toward EL proficiency by 3% per year, from fiscal year (FY) 2018 to FY 2030, for an overall EL growth rate of 6% per year during the same time period. These interim objectives are found in Appendix C, Table I. It shows a direct comparison of recent years, the impact of a cut scores changes on the growth measurement, and projects the direction the state of Arizona is headed in the coming years.

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 C.

Arizona identifies an English learner as making progress in achieving English language proficiency if that student has increased their English language achievement by at least one proficiency level in the specified academic year. English language proficiency levels used in the calculation include preemergent/emergent, basic/intermediate (low), intermediate (high), and proficient achievement levels. Students are included in the calculation if they have current and prior year test scores for the year evaluated. Therefore, students who missed a yearly reassessment test will not be included for that year. Data is categorized into two categories of growth and proficiency. Kindergarten is separated from all other grades and results are provided with and without kindergarten EL students for proficiency, growth, and weighted growth.

In FY 2016 the cut scores for English language proficiency were changed, impacting the progress rates and reclassification rates for English learners, and is also illustrated in Table I of Appendix C. Comparative measures of interim progress beg in FY 2017. The change in cut scores in FY 2016 prevents direct comparison as illustrated by the large change in proficiency levels presented in the table. In the lower portion of the table, weighted growth percent assigns two times the weight for students who improved one achievement levels in one year, and three times the weight for students who improved three achievement levels in that time.

Table II provides more detail about students' EL growth in FY 2018. The top portion of the table provides the percentages of each grade-band who achieved each level of achievement.

Table III further details those students who were at the high-intermediate range of EL achievement in FY 2017 and remained in that achievement range throughout FY 2018.

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

- a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator
 1. is based on the long-term goals;
 2. is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments;
 3. annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and
 4. 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.

The state assessment and alternative state assessment for ELA and Mathematics proficiency calculations include all grades 3-8, once in high school, and all subgroups.

Using the same indicator as the measure in Arizona's long-term goals and measures of interim progress will help achieve those goals. By having a higher weight on proficiency than on other indicators, it will place the focus on students achieving a proficiency score, thus increasing the chance to meet the goals.

The Academic Achievement Indicator will be worth 60% or a maximum of 60 points of all models. It will include both the state assessment and the state alternative assessment. The numerator will count the number of students scoring in the proficiency categories, whereas the denominator will include all those who tested, with a penalty if not reaching 95% participation. That percent will be multiplied by 60 points for the calculation of this indicator. In the calculation table (see *v.(b)*, below) the indicators have been inserted to show the calculation of all the indicators.

There will not be a growth measure for high school.

- 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.

Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) will be used for grades 4–8. An SGP describes how a “typical” student’s current-year score on the state ELA and Math assessment is compared with the current-year test scores of those students with the exact same prior test scores—his/her academic peers. In this sense, an SGP is a “norm-referenced quantification” (Betebenner, 2011, p. 3) of student academic growth. Comparison with academic peers is accomplished by employing quantile regression that relates the prior scores of each grade by subject cohort with their current-year scores. Each student is compared to his/her actual and conceptual academic peers. An SGP of 40 means that the student grew more than 40% of his/her academic peers in a year. In the event a student is without actual academic peers based on their individual data, the individual student is compared to his/her “conceptual” academic peers only.

The use of this particular type of normed growth measure ensures that very low and/or high performing students can receive high growth scores relative to their peers with the same academic achievement history. The growth model includes only academic achievement data.

Arizona’s growth model does not control for student demographic information or subgroup membership. However, analysis and comparisons can be aggregated and viewed by subgroup.

The Other Academic Indicator for K-8 is based on student growth percentiles. They are worth 20% or maximum of 20 points in the K-8 model. The median of all growth points will be calculated and that percentile times the available points. A school with a median SGP of 60 x 20% would earn 12 points.

K–11 and K–12 schools growth indicator will be based on 5% or 5 points following the same methodology.

In the calculation table (see *v.(b)*, below) the indicators have been inserted to show the calculation of all the indicators.

- c. Graduation Rate. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of
1. how the indicator is based on the long-term goals;
 2. how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students;
 3. how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate;
 4. 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
 5. 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).

The state of Arizona's technical manual for graduation calculations can be found on the following page: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/resources>

Arizona uses the 4-year graduation cohort in the identification criteria for **CSI Low Achievement and ATSI**, and the 5-year graduation cohort in identifying **CSI Low Graduation** rate schools identification

The Graduation Rate indicator in state's system of meaningful differentiation uses a 4-year adjusted cohort method graduation rate (ACGR). The Graduation Rate indicator uses a 100-point index and is calculated for all students and any valid subgroups in all schools that graduate students using the adjusted cohort methodology. The ACGR is calculated for all public schools that offer a high school diploma and offer at least a grade 12. Public reporting will use an n-count of 10 and for accountability indicators a 20 n-count will be used.

Arizona's long-term goal is 90 percent for 4-year graduation rate by 2030. This component includes graduates who earn regular diplomas within four years of entering high school. Measures of interim progress are aligned to the long-term goal in order to derive ambitious yet realistic checkpoints. This progress will be displayed on the report cards.

The Graduation Indicator for applicable models is worth 20% or a maximum of 20 points in the 9-12 model and 5% or a maximum of 5 points in the schools serving multiple grades to include 12th grade. The graduation rate percentage is multiplied by the available maximum points. If a graduation rate is 90% a school would earn 18 of the 20 available points in the 9-12 model and 4.5 points in the combination model.

In the calculation table (see *v.(b)*, below) the indicators have been inserted to show the calculation of all the indicators.

Arizona, for annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools for support and improvement, will use a 4-year adjusted cohort. Arizona publicly reports the 4-year and 5-year graduation rates one year in lag. These reports are aggregated not only at the subgroup level, but special programs, gender, county, and additional configurations.

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.

1. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator: Arizona uses the AZELLA and Alt-ELPA exams for English Language Proficiency and Growth.
 - a. Students who do not test proficient, indicated by scoring “Proficient” on the ELP Assessment, AZELLA, are considered as having an EL Need and used in the ELP calculations. This would include those that are recent arrivals.
 - b. EL Proficiency: Schools earn points based on their reclassification percentage aggregated to a school level compared to the state’s average.
 - c. EL Growth: schools earn points based on their student’s growth (change in performance levels) aggregated to a school level compared to the state’s average change in performance levels versus the prior year.
 - d. Schools with fewer than 20 FAY ELs do not earn these points.
2. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator is worth 5% or a maximum of 5 points in all models. Schools earn points based on their reclassification percentage aggregated to a school level compared to the state’s average. A table of standard deviations from the mean will assign a school’s points when comparing to the mean.

The Overall Proficiency Level (OPL) is determined based on three scores: Total Combined score, Reading score, and Writing score. To obtain an OPL of Proficient, the student must score Proficient in Reading, Writing, and in Total Combined. The Reading and Writing Proficient scores are 250 each. The Total Combined Proficient Scores range from 2,327 for Kindergarten to 2,550 for the high school grades. The table below provides the details by grade of the Proficient cut scores. All three scores, Reading, Writing, and Total Combined must be proficient for the student to receive an OPL of Proficient.

Students must be Proficient on all 3 prongs to receive an Overall Proficiency Level of Proficient.	Total Combined Proficient Cut Score	Reading Proficient Cut Score	Writing Proficient Cut Score
Grade K (Reassessment Test)	2327	250	250
Grade 1	2385	250	250
Grade 2	2428	250	250
Grade 3	2474	250	250
Grade 4	2499	250	250
Grade 5	2523	250	250
Grade 6	2530	250	250
Grade 7	2535	250	250
Grade 8	2540	250	250
Grades HS	2550	250	250

3. EL Growth: schools earn points based on their student’s growth (change in performance levels) aggregated to a school level compared to the state’s average change in performance levels the prior year. A table of standard deviations from the mean will assign a school’s points when comparing to the mean.

The below describes points for proficiency and growth

- a. Greater than or equal to the EL statewide mean – 5 points

- b. 0.01 to 0.50 standard deviations below the EL statewide mean – 4 points
- c. 0.51 to 1.00 standard deviations below the EL statewide mean – 3 points
- d. 1.01 to 2.00 standard deviations below the EL statewide mean – 2 points
- e. 2.01 to 3.00 standard deviations below the EL statewide mean – 1 points
- f. No growth or proficiency – 0 points

Please see the Federal Accountability Technical Manual located on the following page for more details: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/resources>

In the calculation table **below** the indicators have been inserted to show the calculation of all the indicators.

- 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 Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.
 - 1. School Quality or Student Success (SQSS) Indicators: Arizona uses two SQSS indicators, one for students in elementary grades, and one for students in high school grades.
 - a. SQSS indicator for students in elementary grades (1–8): Chronic Absenteeism (CA)—students absent for 10% or more of the year (18+ days for schools on a 180-day calendar).
 - 1) The population’s CA percent will be calculated and subtracted from 100%. That percentage will be applied towards the available 5 or 10 points.
 - a) The calculation will not include documented chronically ill students.
 - b) The calculation will not include students in kindergarten, as they are not required to attend school by state law.
 - 2) Example – School A has a 12 % Chronic Absenteeism rate. $100\% - 12\% = 88\%$ of available points in the model. A school eligible for 5 points will earn 4.4 points, a school eligible for 10 points will earn 8.8 points.
 - b. SQSS indicator for students in high school grades (9–12): Dropout Rate—students who are enrolled in the school at any time during the school year but are not enrolled at the end of the school year and did not transfer, graduate, or die.
 - 1) Students withdrawn due to chronic illness are also excluded from the dropout rate calculation.
 - 2) When the dropout rate is calculated, year-end or exit codes are used to determine the percentage of students who are no longer enrolled in any Arizona public school prior to exiting as a graduate or completer.
 - 3) The school’s drop-out percent will be calculated and subtracted from 100%. That percentage will be applied towards the available 5 or 10 points.
 - 4) Example – School A has a 5 % Drop-out rate. $100\% - 5\% = 95\%$ of available points in the model. A school eligible for 5 points will earn 4.75 points, a school eligible for 10 points will earn 9.5 points.

- c. Each of the SQSS indicators are calculated at each of the subgroup levels, as well as the school level. Section *iv.(e)(1)* of the submitted plan describes the calculations of the SQSS indicators.
 - 1) Maximum Points available for each school model is as follows:
 - a) K-8: Chronic Absenteeism 10% or 10 Points
 - b) 9-12: Dropout 10% or 10 points
 - c) Schools Serving a combination of grades: Chronic Absenteeism 5% or 5 points and Dropout 5% or 5 points.
 - d) The calculation table (see *v.(b)*, below) the indicators has been inserted to show the calculation of all the indicators.

2. Rationale

- a. Chronic absenteeism and dropout have been recognized as important indicators of students' long-term success. These indicators are also able to be aggregated at the subgroup levels for comparison and analysis. The following two excerpts from website articles on chronic absenteeism and drop-out encapsulate why these two variables are important to monitor and measure for the success of the students in Arizona.

“An overwhelming body of research demonstrates the negative short- and long-term consequences of chronic absenteeism on academic achievement. Students who are chronically absent are missing critical instruction time and are at the greatest risk of falling behind and dropping out of school. Chronic absenteeism disproportionately affects low-income students and students with disabilities, as well as students of color and English language learners. Across the country, millions of students are reported chronically absent each school year.” (University of Delaware, 2018)

According to NCES (2021) data from 2018 dropout rates varies substantially between racial and economic subgroups. “The status dropout rate varied by race/ethnicity in 2018. The status dropout rate for Asian 16- to 24-year-olds (1.9 percent) was lower than the rates for their peers who were White (4.2 percent), of Two or More Races (5.2 percent), Black (6.4 percent), Hispanic (8.0 percent), Pacific Islander (8.1 percent), and American Indian/Alaska Native (9.5 percent). In addition, the status dropout rate for those who were White was lower than that of every other racial/ethnic group except those who were Asian. The status dropout rate for those who were Hispanic was higher than that of most racial/ethnic groups but was not measurably different from the rates for those who were Pacific Islander and American Indian/Alaska Native.”

Using chronic absenteeism and dropout as federal accountability indicators will help Arizona students achieve at a higher rate of achievement when efforts are made to improve these data points.

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.

The Federal system creates a system of meaningful differentiation which includes all schools using one set of measures. The federal system will identify Comprehensive and Targeted Support and Improvement schools as required by ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D).

All of the indicators use student level data; therefore, Arizona will be able to calculate each indicator by subgroup provided the subgroup has a sufficient n-count.

All charter schools in the state are included in accountability provided they meet the n-count.

- b. 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.

K-8 Schools

- Proficiency 60%
- EL (Achievement and growth) 10%
- Growth 20%
- Chronic Absenteeism 10%

9-12 Schools

- Proficiency 60%
- EL (Achievement and growth) 10%
- Graduation Rate 20%
- Drop-out 10%

Schools Serving a Combination to include Grade 12

- Proficiency 60%
- EL (Achievement and growth) 10%
- Growth 15%
- Chronic Absenteeism 5%
- Graduation 5%
- Drop-out 5%

Schools Serving a Combination NOT including Grading 12

- Proficiency 60%
- EL (Achievement and growth) 10%
- Growth 20%

- Chronic Absenteeism 5%
- Drop-out 5%

Maximum points for each criterion match the percentage. For example, Proficiency 60% means the maximum points available are 60 points; growth 20% means the maximum points available are 20 points and so on with the total maximum points being 100 points.

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.

Eighty-nine schools receive points for each category using the model weights for these categories. Points from all eligible categories are added together to calculate the total number of points schools received. Each model allows for schools to receive a total of 100 points. Schools in the bottom 5% are identified for CSI-LA (minimum).

The following table illustrates how calculations will be handled when a component does not meet the N-size and cannot be included a school's accountability.

Table 1 - Model Calculations

School Type	K-8	K-8	K-11	K-12	HS 9-12	HS 9-12
Description	With EL	Without EL	NOT Including Grade 12	Including Grade 12	With EL	Without Graduation
K-8 Only Growth (15-20)	Median SGP 44 .44x20 = 8.8pts	Median SGP 44 .44x20 = 8.8pts	Median SGP 44 .44x20 = 8.8pts	Median SGP 44 .44x15 = 6.6pts	n/a	n/a
K-8 Only Chronic Absenteeism (5-10)	CA Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x10 = 9.2pts	CA Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x10 = 9.2pts	CA Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x5 = 4.6pts	CA Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x5 = 4.6pts	n/a	n/a
ALL Proficiency (60)	45% Proficiency .45x60 = 27pts	45% Proficiency .45x60 = 27pts	45% Proficiency .45x60 = 27pts	45% Proficiency .45x60 = 27pts	45% Proficiency .45x60 = 27pts	45% Proficiency .45x60 = 27pts
ALL EL (10)	ELP + ELG = 6pts	n/a	ELP + ELG = 6pts	ELP + ELG = 6pts	ELP + ELG = 6pts	ELP + ELG = 6pts
HS 9-12 Only Graduation (5-20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Grad Rate 75% .75x5 = 3.75pts	Grad Rate 75% .75x20 = 15pts	n/a
HS 9-12 Only Dropout (5-10)	n/a	n/a	DO Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x5 = 4.6pts	DO Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x5 = 4.6pts	DO Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x10 = 9.2pts	DO Rate is 8% 100%-8% = 92% .92x10 = 9.2pts
Subtotal	51	45	51	52.55	57.2	42.2
Eligible Points	100	90	100	100	100	80
Achievement Score	(51/100) = 51	(45/90) = 50	(51/100) = 51	(52.55/100) = 52.55	(57.2/100) = 57.2	(42.2/80) = 52.75

Schools that are eligible for less than 100 points have their total points adjusted by dividing the school's points earned by their total potential points. Schools may not be eligible for certain components because they have less than 20 FAY students in that category. For instance, a school that has less than 20 FAY students who took the AZELLA, are not eligible for EL points. A school's Final Points (the *Comprehensive Achievement Score (CAS)*) are calculated with the following formula:

$$CAS = \frac{Total\ Points}{Eligible\ Points}$$

- 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.
1. Any school for which an initial Low Achievement (CSI-LA) accountability determination cannot be made based on the indicator calculations described above shall be evaluated based on an alternate methodology to determine the academic achievement and overall performance of the school. Such methodology may include one or more of the following:
 - a. Qualitative—qualitative analysis using extant school-level data to determine comparable performance for the subject population.
 - b. Quantitative Alternates, which may include:
 - 1) Indicator Scoring—Convert valid remaining indicator scores to z-scores for comparison to indicator-level thresholds set by the standard calculation methodology; Or,
 - 2) Low-N worst-case analysis—for schools which miss the N-count for the proficiency indicator, calculate a worst-case scenario in which each missing student performs at the lowest measured level, to produce a lowest-possible score.
 - c. Mixed-Methods—a combination of qualitative and quantitative analyses used to compare the academic and overall performance of the population.
 - d. Other evidence-based methodologies as necessary, provided evidence illustrates sufficient improvement in academic achievement.
 2. Any school for which an initial Low Graduation Rate (CSI-G) accountability determination cannot be made due to the N-count for a Graduation Cohort not being met in an identification year, an alternative methodology shall be used to determine eligibility for identification. Such methodology may include one or more of the following, as needed.
 - a. If a school serving students in the relevant graduation cohort (usually the prior-year 5-year cohort) does not meet the N-count for a valid grad-rate calculation, three years of graduation cohort data may be pooled to determine a longitudinal graduation rate.
 - b. A school's longitudinal graduation rate trend line may be used to predict a statistically valid confidence interval for comparison to the target graduation rate.
 - c. A Low-N worst-case analysis, inserting missing students with worst-case-scenario values to produce a lowest-possible score.
 - d. Some mixed methodology based on variables such as credits at time of enrollment, time to graduation of such students, or other indicators that may influence an analysis of the school's graduation rate.
 - e. Other evidence-based methodologies as necessary, provided such evidence illustrates

sufficient levels of graduation outcomes.

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.

1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Low Achievement (CSI-LA): The lowest performing Title I schools are identified using the model and weighted indicators identified in section 4(v)(b) and (c) above.

a. Standard Methodology (4(v)(b)):

1) All schools meeting the N-count for the Proficiency indicator shall be included in the standard CSI-LA analysis.

2) Such schools receive a weighted average based off the model used to assess them for a Final Comprehensive Achievement Score (CAS).

a) If there are other indicators where the N-count cannot be met, the denominator will be adjusted.

b) 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.

3) The Statewide Low Achievement Threshold (SLAT) is calculated from among the CAS values of all schools receiving Title I funds during the prior year.

a) The SLAT is set no lower than the bottom 5% of all such schools.

b) The SLAT is used for all Low Achievement calculations (CSI-LA, ATSI, CSI-T, MRO-LA, and MRO-T).

4) All such schools below the SLAT shall be identified for CSI-LA.

b. Alternate Methodology: Each school not meeting the requirements for the standard methodology shall be evaluated using one or a combination of the methods proscribed above in section 4(v)(c).

2. **The Federal Accountability Technical Manual** can be found on the ADE Website at the following address: <https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/resources>

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.

1. All high schools with the most recent 5-year cohort graduation rate of less than 66.7% shall be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement for Low Graduation rate (CSI-G) every three years. Typically, the 5-year cohort used for Graduation Rate calculations is taken from one year prior to the current year (i.e., in 2024, using the 5-year graduation rate for the 2023 graduation cohort).

2. Please see the Graduation, Dropout, and Persistence Rate Technical Manual located on the following page for more details on Graduation Rate calculations:

<https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/resources>

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.

1. All schools identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI – see paragraph (f), below) and receiving funds under Title I in the prior year, which fail to exit such identification after 6 years shall be identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Targeted (CSI-T).
- 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.
1. Arizona began identifying the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools for Low Achievement (CSI-LA) beginning in 2017-18.
 - a. The first identification was completed in 2017.
 - b. The second cohort was identified in 2022.
 - c. The third cohort shall be identified in 2025.
 - d. Barring externalities, future CSI-LA identifications shall occur every three years.
 2. Arizona began identifying all high schools in the state that graduate less than two-thirds of their students as Comprehensive Support and Improvement for Low Graduation (CSI-G) beginning in 2018-19.
 - a. The first CSI-G identification occurred in 2018.
 - b. The second identification occurred in 2021.
 - c. The third identification occurred in 2024.
 - d. Barring externalities, future CSI-G identifications shall occur every three years.
 3. Arizona began identifying schools receiving Title I, Part A funds previously identified as CSI-LA for elevation to Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Targeted (CSI-T) in 2024.
 - a. Schools identified for ATSI in 2018 were eligible for elevation to CSI-T in 2024.
 - b. Schools identified for ATSI in 2022 shall be eligible for elevation to CSI-T in 2028.
 - c. Barring externalities, future identifications shall occur every six years.
- 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))
1. Subgroup Achievement:
 - a. All subgroups which meet the N-count for proficiency shall have a Subgroup Achievement Score (SAS) calculated using the same components as the CSI-LA procedure described in 4(v)(b), above.
 - 1) Only eligible members of the subgroup are included within the subgroup population, as if they constituted a school unto themselves.

- 2) A school's SAS for each subgroup is calculated with the following formula:

$$SAS_{subgroup} = \frac{Total\ Points}{Eligible\ Points}$$

- 3) SAS values for each subgroup population within each school are calculated annually to be used for all versions of Subgroup identification (TSI, ATSI, CSI-T, MRO-T).

b. Subgroup Identification

1) Eligibility:

- a) All Arizona public schools serving students in grades K—12, with subgroup populations meeting the federal N-count (N=20) shall be considered for initial subgroup identifications (TSI, ATSI), regardless of Title-I funding status.
- b) Schools identified for any CSI Low Achievement status (CSI-LA, CSI-T, MRO-LA, or MRO-T) shall be informed of their TSI subgroup eligibility but shall not be identified for TSI.
- c) Schools identified for ATSI (see section (f), below) for the same subgroup(s) as their identification in TSI, shall be informed of their TSI subgroup eligibility but shall not be identified for TSI until meeting the exit requirements for ATSI.
- d) A school may qualify for the identification of multiple subgroups. Each identified subgroup may enter or exit TSI identification individually, based on the performance of that subgroup only. (Potentially, a school may ONLY be identified for their lowest subgroup if the feds will allow that.)

2. Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) Identification:

a. Methodology:

- 1) Any school with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups is eligible for TSI identification.
 - a) Evidence of consistent performance relies on valid SAS values and indicators during each of the prior three years of most current data.
 - b) Subgroup performance is compared to the statewide CAS values and indicators calculated during the CSI-LA process and is updated annually.
- 2) Any subgroup in any school shall be identified for Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) by meeting these underperformance criteria in each of the most recent three years as follows:
 - a) The subgroup Proficiency Indicator is in the bottom 5% of all statewide proficiency results, as measured in the CAS value. And,
 - b) Any other indicator is in the bottom 5% of all statewide results for that indicator, as measured in the CAS value. The 'other indicator' does not need to be the *same* indicator for each of the three years of current data.
 - c) Example, if a school has a subgroup in the 4th percentile for Proficiency in each of the last three years, and was in the 3rd percentile for Chronic Absenteeism for the prior two years, and below the 5th percentile for the last year, such a school shall be identified for TSI.

b. Arizona identifies schools TSI schools annually.

- 1) Each identification cycle includes the three most prior years of current data.
 - 2) The first TSI identification occurred in 2022, based on data from 2018, 2019, and 2022.
 - 3) Identification in 2023 relied on data from 2019, 2022, and 2023.
 - 4) Identification in 2024 relied on data from 2022, 2023, and 2024.
 - 5) Barring externalities, future identifications shall occur annually on the prior three years of current data.
- 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))*
1. Subgroup Identification differences:
 - a. Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) is a subgroup-based identification. ATSI follows the same subgroup achievement guidelines set forth in e(1), above.
 - b. While TSI focusses on consistent underperformance over the prior three years, ATSI is a single-year indicator of performance.
 - c. While TSI is based on a underperformance in two SAS-component indicators in comparison to statewide indicator comparisons, ATSI identification compares SAS values to the CSI-LA SLAT from that year.
 2. Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) Identification:
 - a. Any Arizona school, in which any subgroup of students meeting the requirements for a valid SAS (above) and identified for TSI in each of the prior two years shall be eligible to be identified for ATSI. (note, we are open to other ‘prior X years’ options)
 - b. Schools with subgroups identified for TSI in each of the prior two years shall have their current SAS value(s) compared to the Statewide Low Achievement Threshold used to identify CSI-LA in the identification year.
 - 1) Any such school with a final SAS lower than the Statewide Low Achievement Threshold used for all Low Achievement calculations in that identification year shall be identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI).
 - 2) Please refer to 4(vi)(a) on how CSI-LA and SLAT are calculated.
 3. ATSI identification shall occur every 6 years.
 - a. The first ATSI identification occurred in 2018, based on a prior identification methodology.
 - b. The second ATSI identification occurred in 2022, based on a prior identification methodology.
 - c. The next ATSI identification shall occur in 2028, from among schools with valid TSI identifications in 2027, based on their 2028 SAS.
- 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

- vii. 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. 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.
- b. A participation rate of less than 95 percent on statewide mathematics and English Language Arts (ELA) assessments is factored into the calculation of the proficiency indicator.
 1. In order to promote testing of all students, each calculation includes a 95% Tested modifier.
 2. The 95% value of all populations (schools or subgroups) of test-eligible students is determined and used as the modifier's denominator.
 3. The number of tested students is included as the numerator.
 4. The resulting value is applied to the calculated raw proficiency value for each student population.
 5. Example:
 - a. A School has 100 test-eligible students in ELA and Mathematics. For each exam, 95 students are expected to take the exam. The state expects no less than 190 total exams.
 - b. 92 students take the ELA exam, and 96 students take the Math exam. 188 total exams are produced.
 - c. The modifier is calculated: $\frac{188}{190} = 98.95\%$
 - d. The school's raw proficiency value is adjusted by the modifier. If the calculated raw proficiency score was 100%, the school would only receive 98.95% of the eligible points.
 6. It is possible for a school to get a *bonus* to their proficiency indicator by testing more than 95% of their students. In practice, this impact is minimal and only inflates the proficiency values of schools or subgroups already performing well above the bottom 5% threshold.

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.
 1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement – Low Achievement (CSI-LA) Exit Criteria:
 - a. CSI-LA schools are identified every three years, for an expected duration of not more than three years. With the understanding that the identification threshold should move up every three years, a clarification of exit criteria and expectations is necessary.
 - b. CSI-LA schools are expected to exit identification at or by the next identification period.
 - 1) An identified school may exit if they meet sufficient criteria as set forth below but may be reidentified if the identification threshold has sufficiently increased beyond their current performance.
 - 2) The State of Arizona does not wish to promote schools meeting a prior-cycle exit criteria yet falling under a new-cycle identification criteria directly to more rigorous state-determined action (MRO-LA).

- 3) As such, the quantitative criteria for any cycle of identification is set by the Statewide Low Achievement Threshold for that cycle, not any ensuing cycle, and exceeding that threshold with a valid CAS meets one quantitative requirement to exit, even if the CAS is below the new identification threshold set for the next cycle.
- c. CSI-LA schools must meet the implementation requirement. CSI-LA schools must also meet an exception criterion OR a quantitative criterion to exit CSI-LA identification. These criteria are as follows:
- 1) Implementation requirement: CSI-LA schools must implement school improvement goals, strategies, and action steps in state-required Integrated Action Plan to address student achievement.
 - 2) Exception criteria:
 - a) Any identified school failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid CAS may request an appeal by qualitative review that includes evidence of academic improvement to exit identification.
 - b) See section 4(v)(c)(1), above, for examples of qualitative analyses that may meet the exception criteria.
 - c) Alternately, any identified school with a significant change in school model or school status may request an appeal by qualitative review to determine if the school continues to meet the identification criteria. For instance, a school that ceases serving high school students after identification may need to be reconsidered using only the K-8 indicators, or a school that ceases to operate as an entity in an ensuing year (becomes a district program) may no longer meet the identification requirements.
 - 3) Quantitative criteria:
 - a) A valid CAS posted in the next identification year, above the original SLAT resulting in their most recent CSI-LA identification. Note – a single-score exit qualification may only occur in an identification year; or,
 - b) Two improved valid CAS values above the original identification score, with the 2nd score above the original SLAT on which their most recent CSI-LA identification was based. Note, this may allow a school to exit CSI-LA one year early.
- d. Historic Notes:
- 1) The State does not count the 2019-2020 school year toward the number of years (then 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.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) Schools identified for CSI-LA in 2022 were initially given 4 years to exit, under a prior iteration of this consolidated plan. This updated plan intended for the 2025 identification cycle shrinks that exit window to three years, but clarifies the exit criteria to provide leniency.
2. Schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools – Low Graduation rate (CSI-G) Exit Criteria:

- a. CSI-G schools are identified every three years, for an expected duration of not more than three years.
 - b. CSI-G schools are expected to exit at or by the next identification period.
 - 1) An identified school may exit if they meet sufficient criteria as set forth below but may be identified during the next identification cycle if their relevant graduation rate meets the criterion defined in *(vi.)(b)(1)*, above. In such cases, the school shall be identified anew.
 - 2) The State of Arizona does not wish to promote such schools directly to more rigorous state-determined action (MRO-G), provided they met the exit criteria before the next identification cycle.
 - c. CSI-G schools must meet the implementation requirement. CSI-G schools must also meet an exception criterion OR a quantitative criterion to exit CSI-G identification. The criteria are as follows:
 - 1) Implementation Requirement: schools must implement school improvement goals, strategies, and action steps in state-required Integrated Action Plan to address increased timely graduation.
 - 2) Exception criteria:
 - a) An identified school with no enrolled students shall exit from CSI-G identification.
 - b) 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.
 - c) See section *4(v)(c)(2)*, above, for examples of qualitative analyses that may meet the exception criteria.
 - d) Alternately, any identified school with a significant change in school model or school status may request an appeal by qualitative review to determine if the school continues to meet the identification criteria. For instance, a school that ceases serving graduation cohorts or ceases to operate as an entity in an ensuing year (becomes a district program) may no longer meet the identification requirements.
 - 3) Quantitative criteria:
 - a) Two years of consecutive improvement over the initial year's posted graduation rate, with the most recent graduation rate above the identification threshold. Note – this may allow a school to exit CSI-G outside the standard identification cycle. Or,
 - b) Two years of improvement over the identification graduation rate, with an exit-year graduation rate above the identification threshold.
 - c)
3. CSI- Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status Schools (CSI-T) Exit Criteria
- a. CSI-T schools are identified every six years, for an expected duration not to exceed three years.
 - 1) CSI-T schools are identified from among those schools previously identified for ATSI
 - 2) Such schools are identified based on *subgroup performance* and continue to be judged based on the Subgroup Achievement Score for the underperforming population(s) that led to the initial ATSI identification.

- 3) It is possible for a school to be identified for multiple subgroups, but each group has its own qualifications for exit. Any school elevated to CSI-T shall have each subgroup elevation be considered individually, based on the original Statewide Low Achievement Threshold leading to their initial ATSI identification.
- b. CSI-T schools are expected to exit at or by the next identification period.
- 1) An identified school may exit if they meet sufficient criteria as set forth below but may be immediately identified for ATSI if the next identification threshold has sufficiently increased beyond their current performance and were eligible for TSI identification in the prior year.
 - 2) The State of Arizona does not wish to promote such schools directly to more rigorous state-determined action (MRO-T).
 - 3) As such, the quantitative criteria for any cycle of identification is set by the Statewide Low Achievement Threshold *from the initial year of ATSI identification*, and exceeding that threshold with a valid SAS meets a quantitative requirement to exit, even if the SAS is below the new identification threshold set for the next cycle.
 - 4) NOTE: The first cohort of schools identified for CSI-T was identified in 2024. The next CSI identification year is 2025, giving those schools only one year to improve. As such, ONLY schools' CSI-T subgroup identifications from the 2024 CSI-T cycle shall be granted 4 years to exit CSI-T, to align their exit window with the next CSI identification cycle (in 2028).
- c. CSI-T schools must meet the implementation requirements. CSI-T schools must also meet an exception criterion OR a quantitative criterion to exit CSI-T identification. These criteria are as follows:
- 1) Implementation requirement: CSI-T schools must implement school improvement goals, strategies, and action steps in state-required Integrated Action Plan to address student achievement.
 - 2) Exception criteria:
 - a) Any identified school failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid SAS may request an appeal by qualitative review that includes evidence of academic improvement to exit identification.
 - b) See section 4(v)(c)(1), above, for examples of qualitative analyses that may meet the exception criteria.
 - c) Alternately, any identified school with a significant change in school model or school status may request an appeal by qualitative review to determine if the school continues to meet the identification criteria. For instance, a school that ceases serving graduation cohorts or ceases to operate as an entity in an ensuing year (becomes a district program) may no longer meet the identification requirements. Further, a school identified for a given subgroup that has ceased serving that subgroup (i.e.. a school for Special Education students changing to be a school for all students) may similarly appeal for qualitative review.
 - 3) Quantitative criteria:
 - a) A valid SAS posted in an identification year, above the original SLAT resulting in the ATSI identification leading to their eligibility for CSI-T. Note – a single-score exit qualification may only occur in an identification year; or,

- b) Two improved valid SAS values above that original ATSI identification score, with the 2nd score above the original SLAT on which their most recent CSI-T identification was based. Note, this may allow a school to exit CSI-T one year early.
 - d. Historic Note
 - 1) The first CSI-T identification occurred in the fall of 2024, from among schools identified for ATSI (then called TSI) in 2018.
 - 2) The first CSI-T cohort (identified in 2024) shall be granted up to four years to exit CSI-T (in 2028) to align their exit window with the next full cycle, even though 2025 is the next identification window for CSI-LA.
- 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.
 - 1. Schools identified for Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) are identified every six years and expected to exit by the next ATSI identification cycle.
 - a. ATSI schools are identified from among those schools identified for TSI during each of the prior two years.
 - b. Such schools are identified on the basis of *subgroup performance* and continue to be judged based on the Subgroup Achievement Score for the underperforming population(s) that led to their TSI identification.
 - c. It is possible for a school to be identified for multiple subgroups, but each group qualifies to exit identification on an individual basis.
 - 2. ATSI schools are expected to exit at or by the next ATSI identification period.
 - a. An identified school may exit if they meet sufficient criteria as set forth below but may be immediately identified for ATSI if the next identification threshold has sufficiently increased beyond their current performance and were eligible for TSI identification in the prior year.
 - b. The State of Arizona does not wish to promote schools making such improvements directly to more rigorous state-determined action (MRO-T).
 - c. As such, the quantitative criteria for any cycle of identification is set by the Statewide Low Achievement Threshold *from the initial year of ATSI identification*, and exceeding that threshold with a valid SAS meets a quantitative requirement to exit, even if the SAS is below any new identification threshold set for the next cycle.
 - 3. ATSI schools must meet the implementation requirements. ATSI schools must also meet an exception criterion OR a quantitative criterion to exit ATSI identification. These criteria are as follows:
 - a. Implementation requirement: ATSI schools must implement school improvement goals, strategies, and action steps in state-required Integrated Action Plan to address student achievement.
 - b. Exception criteria:
 - 1) Any identified school failing to meet the N-count requirement for a valid SAS may request an appeal by qualitative review that includes evidence of academic improvement to exit identification.
 - 2) See section 4(v)(c)(1), above, for examples of qualitative analyses that may meet the

exception criteria.

- 3) Alternately, any identified school with a significant change in school model or school status may request an appeal by qualitative review to determine if the school continues to meet the identification criteria. For instance, a school that ceases serving graduation cohorts or ceases to operate as an entity in an ensuing year (becomes a district program) may no longer meet the identification requirements. Further, a school identified for a given subgroup that has ceased serving that subgroup (ie. a school for Special Education students changing to be a school for all students) may similarly appeal for qualitative review.

c. Quantitative criteria:

- 1) Two improved valid SAS values above that original ATSI identification score, with the 2nd score above the original SLAT on which their most recent ATSI identification was based. Note, this may allow a school to exit ATSI up to four years early. Or,
- 2) While ATSI schools are expected to exit within six years of identification, they may exit during the next CSI Low Achievement cycle, three years after identification, provided they post a valid SAS above the original ATSI identification SLAT leading to their eligibility for ATSI.
 - a) Example 1: A school identified for Students with Disabilities (SWD) in 2022 scored below the 2022 SLAT of 21.99. If, in 2025, they post a SWD SAS of 23.00, above the identifying 21.99, that subgroup may exit ATSI, even if the 2025 SLAT is set above their SAS.
 - b) Example 2: A school identified for English Language Learners (ELL) in 2022 scored below the 2022 SLAT of 21.99. If in 2025 they are *still* below the 21.99 SLAT, they will not exit. In 2028 (the next CSI-LA cycle), presuming they have *not* met other quantitative exit requirements, they may exit if they post a SAS for their ELL population above the 21.99, they may exit *their 2022 identification*. It is possible this would lead to a new ATSI identification based on the 2028 SLAT and 2026-2027 TSI eligibility.
 - c) Note – a single-score exit qualification may only occur in a Low Achievement identification year (every three years, aligned with the CSI-LA cycle).

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.

1. Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools that have not, after three years, made sufficient progress to exit comprehensive support and improvement status will receive individualized technical assistance and/or support.
2. To determine support needed the most recent School Improvement Action Plan and its progress will be evaluated along with the current CAS (Comprehensive Achievement Score) and/or graduation rate percentage.
3. Upon review of multiple data points, a new integrated action plan will be developed and monitored to support increased student achievement and/or graduation rate levels.

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.

1. As part of the site visit and/or fiscal review protocols, Arizona Department of Education Support and Improvement staff will address allocation of resources to schools in improvement. .
- 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.
 1. Technical assistance will include offered support in completion of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, development of the Integrated Action Plan and , monitoring/reviewing the implementation of school and LEA Integrated Action Plans.
- 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.

N/A

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.⁴

The Arizona Department of Education will publish and annually update educator effectiveness data at: <http://www.azed.gov/hetl/equitable/>.

The Arizona Department of Education Reporting Notes

- The Equity Plan defines an "out-of-field" teacher as a teacher that is not "appropriately certified." The Arizona Department of Education has used "not highly qualified" in place of "out-of-field" since the previous equity plans leveraged highly qualified status. ADE is currently vetting rules that will determine Arizona teachers appropriately certified status.
- The Arizona Department of Education used FY2016 (SY 2015-2016) highly qualified data to determine "out-of-field" percentages. The percentage/ratio of "out-of-field" teachers was multiplied by the student subgroup population to estimate the student percentage requested. This assumes students are evenly distributed among teachers.
- The Arizona Department of Education reports data corresponding to four performance labels: highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective.
- The Arizona Department of Education used FY2016 free/reduced lunch counts to determine poverty quartiles, e.g., low, mid, and high. All students at high poverty schools were assumed to be "low-income". This assumption was made since only aggregate data was immediately available for this report.
- The Arizona Department of Education used FY2016 October 1 student enrollment counts. Non-minority students are those with ethnicity of "White". Minority students are those with ethnicities of Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Multi-Race Non-Hispanic.
- The Arizona Department of Education used FY2016 school aggregated teacher evaluation data. FY2016

⁴ 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.

data had not been finalized. The percentage/ratio of ineffective teachers was multiplied by the student subgroup population to estimate the student percentage requested. This assumes students are evenly distributed among teachers.

- The Arizona Department of Education used FY2016 teacher years-of-experience to determine inexperienced teacher counts. An inexperienced teacher is a teacher with less than 3 years of teaching experience as reported in the Teacher Input Application (TIA), formerly the Highly Qualified Teacher Input Application. The percentage/ratio of inexperienced teachers was multiplied by the student subgroup population to estimate the student percentage requested. This assumes students are evenly distributed among teachers.

DIFFERENCES IN RATES CALCULATED USING DATA OTHER THAN STUDENT-LEVEL DATA

Schools Assisted under Title I, Part A

STUDENT GROUPS	Rate at which students are taught by an ineffective teacher	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an out-of-field	Differences between rates	Rate at which students are taught by an inexperienced teacher	Differences between rates
Low-income students	1.27%	0.03%	2.79%	0.65%	24.07%	2.37%
Non-low-income students	1.24%		2.14%		21.70%	
Minority students	1.31%	0.22%	2.46%	0.28%	23.22%	2.19%
Non-minority students	1.09%		2.18%		21.03%	

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

LEAs will provide instruction in the identification of bullying and harassment behavior and strategies to reduce bullying and harassment at least annually to all enrolled students and school staff. LEAs will use positive behavior intervention strategies reported in accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes §15-341(A)(36) to reduce bullying and harassment. Each LEA will document and report to the Arizona Department of Education the number of bullying and harassment incidents each school year to ensure

these incidents are reduced.

LEAs will develop strategies that identify patterns of misbehavior resulting in students removed from the classroom for reasons of discipline. The LEA will use positive behavior supports to reduce out of class removals. Safeguards and procedures related to disciplinary practices are outlined in Arizona Revised Statutes §§15-841 and 15-842.

Recognizing that out-of-school suspensions and expulsions occur even in preschool, the Arizona Department of Education will provide support to LEAs, school leaders, and teachers in the form of professional learning and technical assistance opportunities to improve the understanding of appropriate developmental expectations of young children and the components of high-quality birth through age eight learning environments. Additionally, the Arizona Department of Education will identify strategies and resources to support the social and emotional development of children.

LEAs shall not use behavioral interventions that are aversive or compromise the student's health and safety. Physical restraint shall only be used consistent with Arizona Revised Statutes §15-505.

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.

Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) will use a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework that incorporates Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies for instruction, as appropriate. Instruction will be provided using within class groups whenever feasible.

Students will move between within class groups based on the student's response to instruction and intervention as well as in-class assessment results. Intervention strategies will be aligned directly to student need and time in intervention will vary to meet those needs. Processes to support students as they transition between school years will be determined by LEAs. The Arizona Department of Education will provide professional learning, technical assistance, service and support to LEAs as needed or appropriate to support the implementation of these strategies.

Recognizing that transitions are especially critical for Arizona's youngest learners; the Arizona Department of Education is committed to ensuring smooth and effective transitions for preschool children to kindergarten. This formative age represents a time of key physical, emotional, and social changes that affect all students as they move from one setting to the next. In Arizona, children spend their first five years in many different settings; it is essential to support kindergartners and their families as they make this significant transition. The Arizona Department of Education will provide professional learning and technical assistance opportunities to support LEAs, school leaders, and teachers with implementation of kindergarten transition strategies that are appropriate to their communities.

Transitions also occur for our students as they move from elementary to middle school, middle to high school, and high school to postsecondary endeavors. Arizona recognizes the need to support schools and LEAs in their efforts to provide a well-rounded education for their students as they transition from grade to grade and from school to school, including academic and other programs and options such as Career and Technical Education (CTE) program options, health and wellness programs, advanced and accelerated learning options such as advanced placement programs and gifted education programs, arts and music programs, athletics and physical education programs and educational technology options and supports. The SEA has developed data systems which ensure that state-level student records are accurately maintained as students transition between school sites while maintaining strict privacy controls. Additionally, schools develop an Education and Career Action Plan (ECAP) for all students in grade 9- 12 (<http://www.azed.gov/ecap/>). The ECAP process assists students in creating a college and career plan with the appropriate selections of coherent sequences of course work which prepares them for their individual

post high school goals, which could include college. Both counselors and teachers are vital components in a successful ECAP process for each student. As a result, the SEA provides technical assistance and professional development related to the implementation of ECAPs at the school level.

Many school systems have also implemented optional Pre-ECAPs, career action planning in the middle school to assist students as they transition from middle to high school.

The Arizona Department of Education funds an online college and career planning resource the AzCIS (Arizona Career Information System: <https://azcis.intocareers.org>) so that students beginning in fifth grade can start their Pre-ECAP portfolios and begin a self – exploration and career awareness process. The system has been developed so that students’ portfolios can be seamlessly transferred into high school without losing their career and college exploration, assessments results, and other academic items. This allows Arizona students to successfully transition into their high school, ready for the next step. Also, the AzCIS and portfolio can be used at the postsecondary level or into a career center for access to career and continued education.

Additionally, a new ECAP Tracker report has been designed to help school counselors to identify quickly and easily which students might need targeted interventions, so that their ECAP process and portfolio are completed with quality. This report is based upon a tiered intervention model.

The Arizona Department of Education and the ESS (Exceptional Student Services) section has worked with stakeholders in our state to ensure that students with disabilities and their IEP- Transition plans align with the high school ECAP requirements. We have designed an ECAP– IEP Crosswalk document, process, and technical assistance for teachers and counselors, to ensure that every student in Arizona stays in school and graduates successfully college, career and life ready.

Finally, it is vital to note the importance of comprehensive academic standards which follow a clear learning progression. These state-wide standards ensure that students master standards in a consistent manner thus easing transition from grade to grade.

LEAs will be encouraged to provide all school personnel professional development on topics that improve student learning outcomes such as: Early Childhood, Multi-Tiered Systems of Support, Universal Design for Learning, evidence-based instruction, standards- based instruction, the Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), school improvement, data driven instruction, disability awareness, behavior management, children with special health care needs, school safety, gifted learners, education career action planning, or other professional development needs as identified by local Comprehensive Needs Assessments.

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:

- i.* The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;
- ii.* Joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under Title III, Part A;
- iii.* The integration of services available under Title I, Part C with services provided by those other programs; and
- iv.* Measurable program objectives and outcomes.

The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office completes the following four-stage process in the continuous improvement cycle to ensure that all migratory students' needs in Arizona are met. This process includes: 1) a comprehensive needs assessment that captures the current needs of the migratory students; 2) a service delivery plan is drawn up based on the needs identified in the first stage; 3) implementation of the program services needed to assist the students; and 4) a program evaluation to determine if the objectives of the services were met. The last stage informs the first stage for the next cycle. The Service Delivery Plan identifies the Measurable Program Outcomes that help guide our subgrantees in providing access to equitable supplemental instructional and support services with their Migrant Education Program allocation.

Identifying: As a member of the Identification and Recruitment Rapid Response (IDRC) Consortium, and ISOSY (Instructional Services for Out of School and Secondary Youth) the State Director and ID&R Coordinator work with 13 other states in planning and developing identification strategies and supporting each other's efforts to identify and serve migratory students to include preschool-aged children and out of school youth. Through this collaboration a deeper understanding of state industry and seasonal and temporary work as well as mobility patterns has been achieved so to better understand mobility patterns and services provided by other states. The Arizona Migrant Education Program engages in school, community and field-based recruitment. In school-based recruitment efforts, Local Education Agencies (LEAs), include an occupational survey in their registration enrollment packet. Recruiters collect surveys, pre-screen, and contact families to determine if a face-to face interview is needed to enroll students in the Migrant Education Program.

Community-based recruitment allows the LEA Migrant Education Program to identify migratory students who have dropped out of school, out-of-school youth (OSY) and preschool students when visiting with families at fairs, community outreach events and community conferences. Field-based recruitment activities include LEA Migrant Education Program recruiters to visit with employers and their employees at the work sites to provide them information about our program and to conduct interviews. OSY are also identified when recruiters visit work sites. The State Migrant Education Program and McKinney-Vento Directors cross train LEA McKinney- Vento liaisons so that identification and services may be provided to the Migrant families. After the Local Education Agency (LEA) Migrant Education Program identifies and recruits a migratory student, the MEP (Migrant Education Programs) advocates complete a needs assessment to determine the needs of the migratory student. The assessment includes their educational needs as well as homelessness, educational interruption, and eligibility for Priority for Service (PFS). To enhance our recruitment efforts the Arizona Migrant Education Program has created partnerships with local employers, community-based organizations, and government agencies.

Planning: In planning migrant student programs and projects, the SEA coordinates efforts with LEAs and local community organizations to ensure that services are available to all migratory children and out of school youth. The Arizona Migrant Education Program collaboratively plans with Title III and Title I to review LEA needs and determine the best use of resources. In addition, Arizona plans programs that will meet the needs of pre-school migratory students by working with Early Childhood Education. When planning projects for OSY, the Migrant Education Program will work with the Post-Secondary Coordinator for the agency. The State Migrant Parent Advisory Council (SMPAC) is also consulted, and feedback is taken by the SEA on driving the measurable program objectives and strategies. The SEA provides guidance and technical assistance to ensure the LEAs are using their MEP allocation to effectively meet the GPRA measures 1-4: (1)The percentage of MEP students that scored at or above proficient on their state's annual Reading/Language Arts assessments in grades 3-8; and (2)The percentage of MEP students that scored at or above proficient on their state's annual Mathematics assessments in grades 3-8; and (3)The percentage of MEP students who were enrolled in grades 7-12, and graduated or were promoted to the next grade level; and (4)The percentage of MEP students who entered 11th grade that had received full credit for Algebra 1.

Implementation: The SEA will communicate current information and best practices to LEA Migrant Education Programs to ensure that Migratory children fully benefit from the same free public education provided to other children in the most equitable and effective manner. This support will be offered through in-person meetings, monthly webinars, bi-annually boot camps, regional conferences as well as on-line context to ensure maximum accessibility by all LEAs. At the LEA level, Migrant Education Programs conduct in-home visits to provide instructional services to migratory preschool students and some LEAs operate a MEP-funded preschool throughout the regular academic year. The Arizona Migrant Education Program will partner with Arizona Department of Education Early Childhood Education to provide guidance, professional development, and resources on best practices in providing Early Childhood services. The home visits are conducted by the MEP advocates to help increase migrant students' preparedness for academic success.

The LEAs screen OSY by using the Graduation and Outcomes for Success profile. LEAs will also utilize the student profile in MIS2000. Arizona is a Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) distribution state. Our OSY and high school students are directed to this program for credit recovery and credit accrual. Some students may return to school and use the classes in the PASS program to gain credits for graduation or enroll in adult education programs and obtain a High School Equivalency (HSE) diploma. Arizona Migrant recruiters work with Tres Rios HEP program to provide HSE information to OSY. The SEA facilitates an on-going working relationship at the LEA level with Seasonal Head start Programs for our migratory preschool students to attend preschool at their sites. Adelante Health and Sunset Health are partners who work with our State Migrant Office and LEAs to provide health services to our students and families.

Evaluation: The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program provides access to technical assistance and monitors the LEA Migrant Education Program Sites to ensure that instructional and support services made available to migratory children align with the strategies and Measurable Program Outcomes in the Service Delivery Plan. The program works with Title III and Title I-A in annual LEA program monitoring when allowable, to ensure appropriate services are being provided to migratory students. The Migrant Education Program will review an LEAs Local Comprehensive Needs Assessment to evaluate whether joint planning among local, state, and federal programs is occurring. In addition, the SEA will evaluate LEA service codes to ensure that pre-school and OSY migratory children are receiving services aligned with their needs. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program assesses the needs of the Arizona migratory children during the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and identifies goals and measurable program outcomes in the Service Delivery Plan and works collaboratively with the LEA Migrant Education Programs statewide to reach these outcomes. The SEA established Measurable Program Objectives (MPOs) in response to the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) completed for the three-year Service Delivery Plan. The outcomes of the MPOs are measured by annual LEA surveys, regular monitoring, and SEA/LEA data.

- Goal #1, MPO 1a: There will be a 5% increase in the number of eligible migratory students in grades K-8 who receive at least one supplemental instructional service.
- MPO 1b: Migratory students in grades K-8 who receive supplemental reading instructional services will demonstrate a 5% gain on local pre/post reading assessments.
- MPO 1c: Migratory students in grades K-8 who receive supplemental math instructional services will demonstrate a 5% gain on local pre/post math assessments.
- MPO 1d: 85% of parents attending parent meetings focused on providing information about reading and/or math instructional resources will report that the information they received was beneficial for helping them support their child in school.
- Goal#2, MPO 2a: 85% of parents of preschool-aged children that attend parent training will

report that the information received was beneficial for helping their preschool children be ready for kindergarten.

- MPO 2b: Migratory children ages 3-5 (not in kindergarten) receiving MEP-funded instructional services will have a gain of 5% on pre/post school readiness assessments.
- Goal#3: 80% of MEP staff responding to a survey will report that professional development taught them strategies for engaging OSY in the MEP.
- MPO 3b: 45% of eligible migratory students enrolled in high school will receive at least one supplemental instructional service.
- MPO 3c: 85% of migratory parents that attend a parent meeting will report that the information they received regarding graduation requirements, academic expectations, and/or college and career preparation was beneficial

2. **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.

The LEA Migrant Education Programs ensure the timely record transfer of pertinent school records of migratory children. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program assists LEA Migrant Education Programs if a request for records is made to the Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office. The Arizona Department of Education MEP works with school staff to locate historical and current records from migratory students transferring to their LEA. The Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) is a national database used by the LEAs and SEAs (State Educational Agencies) for efficient transfer of student records for migratory students. The local LEA Migrant Recruiters conduct individual face to face interviews and complete the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and AZ The LEA Migrant Education Programs ensure the timely record transfer of pertinent school records of migratory children. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program assists LEA Migrant Education Programs if a request for records is made to the Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office. The Arizona Department of Education MEP works with school staff to locate historical and current records from migratory students transferring to their LEA. The Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) is a national database used by the LEAs and SEAs for efficient transfer of student records for migratory students. The local LEA Migrant Recruiters conduct individual face to face interviews and complete the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and AZ Attachment for each family as required. The LEA Migrant Program Data Specialist reviews each Certificate of Eligibility (COE) to verify migrant eligibility and documentation of all migrant data elements. The COE and all student data are stored in the MIS2000 migrant database and managed by the Arizona MEP State Data Specialist. The Arizona State Director, State ID&R Coordinator and LEA representatives participate in interstate collaboration with sending and receiving states. The SEA MEP coordinates efforts with LEAs and local community organizations to ensure that services are available to all migratory children. The State and LEA Migrant Education Programs conduct local and community-based identification and recruitment activities through networking with area partners and agencies such as the Interstate Migrant Education Council (IMEC); the Mexican Consulate; the Arizona Interagency Farmworkers Coalition (AIFC); Identification and Recruitment Consortium (IDRC), and Instructional Services for Out-of-School and Secondary Youth. Through these partnerships, Arizona MEP can expand their recruitment efforts to extend to migrant work sites which include fields, nurseries, orchards, and dairies.

3. **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.

The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program has developed a Service Delivery Plan that identifies Measurable Performance Outcomes, based on the findings from our most recent State Comprehensive Needs Assessment. The process includes surveying all stakeholders (families, staff and students) to identify a comprehensive list of Migratory student needs. Our priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds in the State is that each LEA Migrant Education Program aligns their allocation budget to meet the Measurable Program Outcomes outlined in the Service Delivery Plan. The Arizona Migrant Education Program has a Student Profile in the MIS2000 migrant database that includes information on a student's grade history, state assessment history, PFS history and the services they have received while in the Migrant Education Program. The LEA Migrant Advocates use this information to determine which supplemental instructional services the students need. The LEA Migrant Education Programs identify the Priority for Service students and priority is given to migratory students who are failing to meet stated academic achievement standards (State Assessments) and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education Title I, Part D Office works collaboratively with the State Agencies and LEAs statewide to review submitted plans and applications, and to support them in reaching program objectives and outcomes regarding the bi-directional transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs. State Agency and LEA plans include measurable achievement objectives for student achievement. The activities designed to meet these objectives will encourage all educational staff to become more actively involved in the educational process of their children.

To support the bi-directional transition of children and youth between correctional facilities and locally operated programs, the Arizona Department of Education Title I, Part D Office:

- Provides technical assistance and monitors the State Agencies and LEAs to ensure Title I, Part D services are available and provided for eligible children, and those services are aligned to Title I, Part D plans and grant applications as submitted to ADE to ensure compliance with all ESSA regulations;
- A Liaison Cadre will be formed to have stakeholder representation from state agencies, LEAs, public schools, facilities, and treatment. The purpose of the Cadre is to assist in the connection among these stakeholders to ensure Title I, Part D programmatic services, compliance, monitoring, transition procedures, etc..... are reviewed and, when necessary, make plan adjustments.
- Works with state agencies and LEAs, public schools, facilities and treatment centers to ensure the timely record transfer of pertinent school records, including health information of eligible served children, assists LEAs if a request for records is made and works with school staff to locate historical and current records from program eligible students transferring to their LEA or from the LEA to a correctional facility. This promotes successful transition to enrollment into a public school, another care facility, postsecondary education, career technical education, or employment
- Consults with the juvenile detention community at least four times during the year regarding the planning, operation and evaluation of the Arizona Department of Education Title I, Part D Program Office for both the state program and local projects;
- Works with State Agencies and LEAs to note when a youth has come into contact with both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems; and delivers services and interventions designed to keep such youth in school that are evidence-based; and,

- Works with State Agencies and LEAs to maintain and improve educational achievement and to graduate from high school in the number of years established by the State under either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate or the extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
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.

State agencies and LEAs in Arizona will show improvement for students as measured by approved and valid data submitted to the Arizona Department of Education for the Comprehensive School Performance Report in the following areas:

- Improve Reading achievement by 5 percent.
- Improve Math achievement by 5 percent.
- Improve acquisition of High School diploma and a GED by 1 percent.
- Improve accrual of credits by 3 percent per student
- Improve transition services by 3 percent per each type.
- Improvement in vocational or technical skills by 3 percent.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has implemented and is expanding access via statewide and regional based cohorts to a systemic approach to professional learning and capacity building aimed at strengthening teachers' content and instructional efficacy. Title II-A funds are used to support and provide no-cost and low-cost access to this systemic training which focuses on developing leadership capacity throughout the K-12 system continuum from teachers through LEA administration. Professional learning and coaching focuses on developing and maintaining effective mentoring and induction systems and maximizing evaluation systems and leadership strategies to support effective teacher practice through meaningful and effective coaching, systems of support, and evaluation practices. The work supported by Title II-A funds includes standards development and implementation for teacher leaders, mentoring and induction, and supervisors of principals which in turn will inform development, revision, and implementation of systems of professional development and support for educators and LEAs statewide. Improving leadership efficacy to support and improve teacher practice and efficacy will in turn improve student achievement as students will have access to effective teachers who continually develop in their practice year over year.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education's strategies are prioritized to address the areas that will have the greatest impact on the equitable access issue for both high poverty and high minority students:

- **Train administrators how to use observational data and leadership/coaching strategies to improve teacher performance.** This will allow administrators and teacher leaders to target professional learning opportunities as well as review systems resulting in increased student academic achievement.

- **Reduce the number of inexperienced teachers by employing effective retention and recruitment strategies.** By introducing evidenced-based mentoring and induction programs for beginning teachers, targeted professional learning, and incentives for improved practice, opportunities for students to access effective instruction will increase.
- Additionally, the department is engaging stakeholders and LEAs to determine and build capacity around best practices and opportunities for scaling effective strategies to address critical recruitment and retention strategies including workplace climate and culture, educator grow your own programs, educator diversity, and teacher leader opportunities.
- **Provide incentives for teaching in high need areas.** Such incentives could include salary increases, social support programs, housing allowances, teacher-leadership opportunities, improved administrative/leadership support, and assistance to schools to develop a collaborative community of learning. These incentives will draw the most effective teachers who still have a passion for the profession and who are willing to do the extra work or to drive the extra miles necessary to connect with our highest need students in our most remote or challenging schools.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has a robust multi-tiered licensing system for teachers, principals, superintendents, and other school leaders. Arizona certification rules and statutes ensure that students are served by quality educators who must meet high standards. A Teaching Certificate can be earned with a bachelor’s degree, fingerprint clearance, appropriate coursework or completion of an approved Educator Preparation Program and passage of subject and content knowledge exams. Arizona also provides a pathway for career changers to complete an alternative teacher preparation program while teaching full time. Additionally, applicants may qualify for a teaching certificate with expertise demonstrated through relevant work experience of at least five years in a field that is relevant to a content area or subject matter taught in public schools.

Additionally, Arizona statutes allow teachers and school administrators who are fully certified out of state and in good standing in their state to qualify for a 12-year Teaching Certificate. These reciprocity rules will help Local Education Agencies (LEAs) recruit qualified educators from other states and reduce burdens on educators who have already met certification requirements in another state.

The ADE continues to investigate and implement additional licensure pathways to support effective educator transition to high need areas such as special education, school counselors, and social workers by creating endorsement and licensure options which allow experienced practitioners to focus on critical training and skills to qualify for additional credentials. Additionally, the Department is reviewing and investigating licensure pathways and options in support of community-to-prepared educator programs to address educator workforce needs at the local level including high needs areas, diversity, and educator retention.

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 children 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.

The Arizona Department of Education’s School support and Improvement, Exceptional Student Services and Office of English Language Acquisition Services departments provide professional development and technical assistance using various instructional designs to support teachers, principals, and other school leaders throughout the year. The creation of these programs is informed by feedback provided by constituents in the field solicited during the year. All of these instructional designs promote active engagement focusing on increasing educator effectiveness, and apply learning theories, research, models

and evidence-based practices, programs and interventions. These delivery models include single- and multi-year grants, face-to-face professional development, online professional development and modules, and training that is delivered to individuals and groups of all sizes.

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 2101(d)(3) to continually update and improve the activities supported under Title II, Part A.

The Arizona Department of Education collects data related to educator evaluation used to update and improve Title II-A supported activities in two formats: LEAs in the state are required to submit, through our Teacher Input Application, teacher and principal evaluation results aggregated at the school level for teachers and the LEA level for principals. Additionally, LEAs submit the evaluation instruments utilized for teacher evaluation through Arizona's Local Education Agency Tracker system. We utilize this data to drive activities provided by the agency related to both teacher and principal evaluation.

The State has a number of structures in place to consult on a continual basis with stakeholders supported by Title II-A across the state which ensures engagement from rural, urban, and suburban stakeholders as well as educators throughout the K-12 continuum. Title II-A staff engages stakeholders across the state regularly in a variety of ways including statewide and regional "table talks", regional and statewide human resource roundtables, regional LEA leadership consultations, as well as external stakeholder collaborations and advisory councils. Examples of topics addressed at these consultations include educator retention and recruitment issues and practices as well as successful practices related to both utilizing Title II-A funds, evidence based, embedded, ongoing, effective professional learning opportunities at all levels, and effective educator evaluation practices.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education program review and approval process has the following State Board of Education (SBE) rule language to attempt to ensure new educators are adequately prepared to meet the needs of low income and minority students. Educator preparation programs are required to show how future educators are exposed to research, knowledge and skills to address all learners. They are required to show evidence that pre-service educators have ample opportunities for structured practice in a range of settings with diverse learners.

R7-2-604.01. Educator Preparation Programs: Professional preparation institutions shall include evidence that the educator preparation program is aligned to standards described in the Board approved professional teaching standards or professional administrative standards and relevant national standards, and provides field experiences, and a capstone experience.

R7-2-604.7 "Field experience" means scheduled, directed, structured, supervised, frequent experiences in a PreK-12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience. Field experiences must assist educator candidates in developing the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to ensure all students learn, and provide evidence in meeting standards described in the Board approved professional teaching standards or professional administrative standards, and relevant Board approved academic standards.

Arizona Department of Education staff work in collaboration with approved educator preparation programs to ensure teachers have the necessary training and resources to be the most effective teachers possible upon entering the classroom. Arizona's educator preparation programs are already heavily engaged in making changes in these areas and are committed partners.

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.

Upon first enrollment in an Arizona public school, a parent/guardian will answer three questions regarding home language. If any of the three questions is answered with a language other than English, an AZELLA Placement test is administered to the student by a trained and qualified test administrator within the first 30 days of enrollment. If the student scores below “Proficient,” he/she is offered English language services. All students who score below “Proficient” on the AZELLA, even those students who have been opted out of English language services by their parents, participate in AZELLA testing every spring until they score “Proficient.” Scoring “Proficient” on the AZELLA is a requirement for exiting English language services. To score “Proficient” on AZELLA requires the student to score “Proficient” on the Reading domain, the Writing domain, and overall. The overall score is a composite score comprised of the Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking domain scores. Arizona policies and procedures ensure consistency with the federal civil rights guidelines.

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.

The SEA Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS)) in collaboration with stakeholders from the field and in partnership with Region 15-West ED designed Arizona’s Language Development Approach, the foundation for language development making explicit the principles that must be considered and implemented throughout a system designed for English Learners to ensure they have equitable access and opportunity to achieve comparable academic outcomes. Local Education Agencies (LEAs) must choose from four Structured English Immersion (SEI) Models adopted by Arizona’s State Board of Education in December 2019. Each SEI Model is grounded and inclusive of all four principles outlined in Arizona’s Language Development Approach. English Education Program Specialists are available to assist all eligible entities with grant applications and funding, professional learning opportunities, and planning for the implementation of SEI Programs to ensure students meet long-term goals of English language proficiency on the AZELLA as well as demonstrate proficiency in state academic standards. Professional learning opportunities provided by the SEA concentrate on Arizona’s Language Development Approach, Structured English Immersion Models, the new English Language Proficiency Standards aligned to the Arizona English Language Arts Standards, formative assessments and progress monitoring to support educators who work with English learner students.

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 subgrant 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.

The SEA Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS) monitors all eligible entities receiving Title III, Part A subgrant funds on a rotating annual basis. Program monitoring includes a physical review of the identification process, required paperwork, appropriate EL student placement in an SEI program and equitable access to a high-quality academic language and literacy instruction provided to other

students. Additionally, select LEAs are monitored annually for fiscal Title III compliance. LEAs out of compliance programmatically or fiscally are found in corrective action status, are required to make necessary adjustments, and are monitored again the following year. Any LEA with a corrective action finding is provided technical assistance via website, virtually or in person by EL SEA Education Program Specialists, including professional learning for all staff, working with ELs, guidance documents and resources.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education will use funds received under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 for state level activities as allowable per all applicable subparts of ESEA section 4103(b), to include:

- Providing monitoring and engaging in performance management activities to LEAs that receive an allocation through Title IV, Part A to support the effective local implementation of planned programs and services;
- Identifying and eliminating State barriers to the coordination and integration to programs, initiatives, and funding streams that meet the purposes of Title IV, Part A, particularly those supporting offering a well-rounded education to all students, so that LEAs can better coordinate with other agencies, schools, and community-based services and programs to support their local efforts; and
- Providing academic standards support and guidance for related Title IV-A content areas, specifically Arts Education, Physical and Health Education, and Education Technology. Supports include but are not limited to professional development for standards and assessment implementation, teacher evaluation recommendations, and annual update and maintenance;
- Title IV-A staff works cross-collaboratively with ADE and external partners to ensure all students have equitable access and opportunity to a well-rounded education.
- Providing continuous public transparency for LEA use of Title IV-A funds including programmatic activity, planned and executed expenditures, as well as SEA state-wide Title IV-A initiatives and activities;
- Supporting all LEAs through providing professional learning, training and technical assistance to build local capacities in providing effective programs and activities that:
- Offer well-rounded, accelerated and enriched educational experiences to all students, including Native American students as defined under ESSA. State emphasis to include arts education and arts integration and STEAM programs, accelerated learning opportunities and gifted education programs and services, social and emotional, physical and health education as described in section 4107, including female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, and low-income students who are often underrepresented in critical and enriching subjects;
- Foster safe, healthy and active, supportive, and drug-free environments that support student academic achievement, as described in section 4108; and
- Increase access to personalized, rigorous learning experiences supported by technology.
- Technical assistance, service and support may be provided by the Arizona Department of Education through a combination of face-to-face (conferences, workshops, meetings) and virtual opportunities (webinars, online courses, phone conferences). Additionally, support at any level may also be provided in conjunction with other partners – such as Regional Centers, County Education Service

Agencies (ESA), postsecondary institutions, national partners and others.

The final degree and scope of annual state-level activities will be determined by the amount of funds ultimately annually allocated to the Arizona Department of Education under Title IV- A.

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).

Subgrant awards to eligible LEAs under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 will be made in accordance with ESEA section 4105(a), (b) and (c), based on the final annual allocations received under this Subpart. Per ESEA section 4105(a)(2), the Arizona Department of Education will ensure that no allocation to an LEA under this subsection may be made in an amount that is less than \$10,000; unless the amount reserved by the SEA under section 4104(a)(1) is insufficient to make allocations to local educational agencies in an amount equal to the minimum allocation described in subsection (a)(2), such allocations shall be ratably reduced.

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.

Arizona's Title IV, Part B (21st CCLC) program supports student participants in meeting the State's rigorous academic standards. Funded programs are designed to align with State and school goals and specifically assist targeted students in their school day learning objectives. Sub-grantees design CCLC services to address issues identified in their needs assessment that can impact student success and target identified students who are struggling to meet academic expectations, including those in foster care, who are homeless, migrant and English Language Learners and those who are served through Title I, including equitable consultation with tribal representatives when LEAs with 21st CCLC programs are within 50 miles of a tribe's council chambers or are located outside this area but have more than 30 Native students from one of more Arizona tribes and equitable consultation and private school students where those schools fall within the regular service attendance area of the individually funded communities.

Arizona funds 21st CCLC programs serving students and their families in schools with at least 40% low-income students and gives priority to low-performing schools identified by Federal and Arizona State Accountability labels for the school year prior to application submission.

Arizona's 21st CCLC programs maintain a strong commitment to improving math, reading/language arts/literacy, and science through small class instruction and tutoring. Complementing this primary focus, 21st CCLC programs in the State supplement the students' regular academic school day by creating a rich variety of classes and activities outside of the instructional day that help students become proficient and connect with learning through project-based, hands-on enrichment that is tied to real-world college and career application, and that build career competencies and readiness. This enrichment includes offerings in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math), environmental literacy programs, art, culture, music and physical education, mentoring, social emotional learning, technology education including coding, and nutrition and health education.

Other Title funding is used to a significant degree by Arizona's 21st CCLC programs, enabling a much greater impact on school day student achievement and on academic and youth development outcomes than would be possible using 21st CCLC funding alone. Additionally, due to Arizona's requirement that 21st CCLC programs develop partnerships, resources such as collaboration with Institutions of Higher Education, the businesses and corporations, health care organizations, cultural and recreational institutions, government and military agencies, national service and volunteer organizations, faith-based organizations, senior citizen organizations, media organizations, sports franchises and associations, other community organizations, and community individuals. These community partners are highly developed and these resource ideas are shared in a highly collegial manner between current grantees as well as new incoming grantees.

Out of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds allocated to Arizona, ADMINISTRATIVE and ACTIVITIES funds will be allocated and used as allowable by Statute. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE funds enable the State to carry out its administrative responsibilities including the management of subgrant competitions.

Arizona uses a state-of-the-art online Grants Management system for collecting, reviewing and approving 21st CCLC applications, budgetary and programmatic revisions, fiscal reimbursement requests and completion reports. Federal grants management assurances, GAN (Grant Award Notifications) and other key documentation and communication are archived online for reference or auditing purposes. (The Arizona peer review process is described in detail in section 2 below.) Additionally, STATE ACTIVITIES funds enable Arizona to provide a comprehensive tiered system of ongoing compliance monitoring, training, and technical assistance through a cadre of seven Regional 21st CLCC Specialists. Arizona reserves the remaining STATE APPLICATION funds for its allocation of awards to eligible entities with an average of \$120,000 each annually for a five-year period with funds reducing to 75% in Years 4 and 5 of the grant where renewable. (The application process is described in detail in section 2 below.)

Arizona ensures that all communication and assistance regarding the application for funding, program and fiscal management are clearly in alignment with State and Federal Statute and guidance from start to finish to enable sub-grant leadership the highest probability of building capacity and ensuring successful management.

Applicants for 21st CCLC funds in Arizona must assure the State that data collection and mandatory reporting will be submitted as required for the federal 21APR data collection system and for requisite Arizona fiscal and programmatic reporting and evaluation purposes as well. Included in Arizona's requirements for its grantees is to collect and report on the number of participants who improve in classroom participation during the instructional day and in homework completion.

The State requires its 21st CCLC sub-grantees to monitor and report on grant outcome objectives that are SMART - Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time Bound (showing growth annually within the program year). Arizona's grantees must report on grant objectives for student participants' academic progress in the areas of math and reading/language arts/literacy measured through benchmark or formative testing; growth in adult family members understanding/knowledge of how to help their child succeed academically and movement in at least one youth development indicator.

Arizona monitors include the following major output objective indicators that programs are maintaining compliance: Number of students reaching "regularly attending" status of 30 days or more; Summary of Classes listing program offerings, which grant objectives each class/activity is designed to impact, average daily attendance by class; number of adult family members of 21st CCLC students served and how they were involved; how the annual professional learning requirement for grant leaders was met; that healthy snack and transportation is provided; that the learning environment is safe; staffing; fiscal records are kept in order; at least one active partnership is involved in the program.

Arizona requires sub-grantees to complete mid-year and end of year reports allowing for desktop compliance monitoring, continuous improvement planning with sites. One portion of this required reporting asks each site to complete a Site Evaluation Plan which includes a self- assessment of all components of grant compliance and a comprehensive SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) based on their findings for grant objectives. These are both a report to the State, and a document used for sharing and discussion with awardees' local communities as a continuous improvement document.

The current State evaluation plan monitors academic improvement in the areas of math and reading/language arts/literacy for student participants. Data is gathered through a secure system and access is limited by a rigorous Arizona system to ensure that student data access does not violate FERPA. Data is gathered on every student who has attended a 21st CLCC program for one (1) day or more that includes 1) a unique student identifier that follows the student to any school in the state, 2) the number of days the student attended the 21st CCLC Program at that site that year, and 3) the grade that student was in for that

year. Evaluation results are available for public review. The focus of the State evaluation plan may be revised to include other factors, particularly those identified by the U.S. Education Department as critical GPRA measures in the future.

All new grantees and site leaders who are new to the grant at their site are provided with an initial Regional in person New Grantee Orientation (with a pre-orientation web-based learning component). Every site receives a 21st CCLC Program Guidance Handbook to use as a reference. This Handbook is also available online, along with other resources useful to 21st CCLC leaders in Arizona. Annual and periodic desktop monitoring and scheduled and unscheduled site visits enable the State to develop technical assistance and professional learning as needed. Professional learning is offered through the U.S. Education Department's You4Youth (Y4Y) portal, through peer led networking trainings at "lighthouse" 21st CCLC programs, online through the Arizona Department of Education's 21st CCLC website, through phone calls, emails and various other means as needed.

Based on a weighted system of compliance monitoring and risk assessment, Arizona's Regional 21st CCLC Program Specialists document any issues that need to be addressed and follow up to ensure that all identified issues are addressed. Effort is taken to ensure that technical assistance, guidance and training provided support programs to maintain compliance and full funding. Level of support is matched to level of need and is successful in most cases. However, for the rare circumstances when programs do not have the capacity to come into compliance, they may be terminated or opt out of funding.

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.

A State that receives funds under this part for a fiscal year shall provide the amount made available under section 4202(c)(1) to eligible entities for community learning centers in accordance with this part. To be eligible to receive an award, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the State Educational Agency at such time, in such manner, and including such information as the SEA may reasonably require. Contents, approval of certain applications, permissive local match, peer review, geographic diversity, duration of awards, number of awards and priority regulations are included under SEC. 4204, LOCAL COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

Arizona announces annual statewide application competitions contingent on adequate funding. When soliciting competitive projects, Arizona's application process is carefully aligned with Federal and State requirements. Competitive grants are awarded in accordance with Federal and Arizona State Statutes, which require a Request for Grant Proposal be written specifying all required expectations for the entities to perform through a description or scope of work. Application guidance has been designed to create a level playing field where all applicants have an equal opportunity for success. The State accomplishes this in part by making expectations transparent and guidance as clear as possible, and by communicating this guidance in written and verbal formats via an ADA compliant website. Clarification can be sought via email and all responses are posted on the application page of the State's 21st CLCC website in a FAQs section so that no applicant receives access to information that another applicant would not have access to. Arizona is committed to ensuring that the application process continues to result in a geographically diverse and proportionate mix of Regional (urban vs. rural), regular public school and charter school and tribal sites benefitting from 21st CLCC grant awards.

Arizona's 21st CLCC grant awards for no less than \$50,000 annually for up to five (5) years provided funds are available and performance objectives are met, with the last two (2) years of funding being reduced for all awards to 75% in Years 4 and 5 of grant funding. Awards may be renewed for each successive year, up to the 5-year term, upon maintaining satisfactory compliance/low risk. A tiered system of technical assistance and

compliance monitoring, including submission of a Continuing Application for each following year, ensures that each sub-grantee is eligible for renewed funding each year of the five potential years of funding.

The 21st CLCC grant applicants respond to the following application sections online through Arizona's Grants Management system:

- Program Need
- Program Design and Implementation
- Adequacy of Resources
- Program Objectives and Activities
- Evaluation
- Sustainability

Incorporated in the application sections, the applicants must demonstrate how their proposed program will comply with all aspects of the statutory requirements, including how its activities will meet the measures of effectiveness described in section 4205(b). The law and the Measures of Effectiveness are among the downloadable resources on the State's 21st CCLC website's application page and are referenced in the guidance for completing Arizona's 21st CCLC grant application.

Applicants must complete and upload the following assurances as part of their online applications:

- General Statement of Assurance (GSA) . this form is completed by the fiscal agent to ensure the entity's compliance with Statutes and regulations including, sound accounting practices. The GSA contains an assurance that funds will supplement and not supplant other funds as indicated in ESSA.
- Participant Verification Form. This form is signed by external non-LEA partners to demonstrate their commitment to assist or provide some type of resources or expertise the 21st CCLC program.
- Adequacy of Resources Form. This form provides signatures of responsible parties for each category of service provision, management and fiscal oversight, which provides assurance that capacity is in place to manage a federal grant accountably and in compliance with all requirements and regulations; data collection, evaluation and reporting.
- Private School Affirmation of Consultation Form
- LEA Tribal Affirmation of Consultation form (where applicable)
- Statement of Assurance of Original Work
- Statement of Assurance of Community Notification
- Consortium Certification & Assurance. This form provides assurance to the State that consortium members will comply with State & Federal requirements.
- Consortium Memorandum of Understanding outlines the responsibilities members of the consortium are responsible for.

All the State's awarded programs must provide for a safe and healthy learning environment by ensuring that the following components are incorporated in their applications and program implementation:

- Healthy food. Provide child nutrition programs including after school snack and summer meals. Most of Arizona 21st CCLC programs also offer free breakfast as part of their program and evening meals are increasingly being offered as well. These snacks and meals are funded by USDA snack and meals reimbursements through the Arizona Department of Education's Office of Health and Nutrition.

- Transportation. Safe transportation from school or an alternative program site if that is part of the program.
- Students with disabilities are served with appropriate accommodations in an easily accessible environment.
- Adult family members of those students who are actively participating in the regular 21st CCLC program are involved in the success of their children by providing adults with educational services and activities that are designed to help them advance their children's academic achievement. These may be services to support family engagement and/or family literacy that supports student learning.

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) 21st CCLC specialists conduct an initial screen of all applications to ensure eligibility and compliance with Arizona's Competitive Discretionary Grant Guidelines and Procedures. If any of the following criteria is not met the application will be disqualified and will not move on to the Peer Review Process:

- i.* Application submitted by the due date and time
- ii.* 40% or higher Free and Reduced Lunch count
- iii.* Complete Application and
- iv.* Correct Application (written to serve students of one school site).

Further, if any of the following criteria are not met, the application issues will be addressed prior to award:

- i.* Charter Board Compliance Check – good standing. This check relates to the charter contract as well as state, federal and local laws;
- ii.* Arizona Grant Management- good standing with fiscal management and reporting, no programmatic holds;
- iii.* 21st CCLC Prior Grant – good standing, compliant with grant requirements; and
- iv.* Budget Alignment – budget requests are substantially allowable and reasonable within application parameters.

Applicants that are disqualified during the initial screening are notified of non-compliance status. Any applicant may appeal application decisions. During the initial screening, ADE staff also confirms whether applications moving on to the Peer Review have met the criteria to receive Priority Points based in three areas:

- i.* low standing in Federal and Arizona State Accountability labels for the year prior to application submission.
- ii.* 80% or more of students attending the school qualify for free/reduced cost meals; and/or
- iii.* rural classification of the school.

Arizona uses a panel of peer reviewers to review and score 21st CCLC applications. A geographically diverse panel of reviewers with relevant expertise in effective academic, enrichment, youth development and related youth programs is selected to participate. No reviewer is selected that has a conflict of interest evidenced by being a current application round applicant or a representative thereof. The reviewers receive a thorough training through a secure online portal which includes reviewer expectations, an education in the law establishing the grant, Arizona's application and application guidance, and training in completing consistent scoring and comment writing based on a scoring rubric that is provided within the application guidance. Each application receives 3 independent reviews. Reviewers provide numerical scores and written comments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each of the sections of the application using a rubric and based on the established criteria for each section. The reviewers are also able to alert 21st CCLC staff to

any conditions which they believe should be addressed by ADE.

Upon completion of the grant review, a rank ordered funding slate is developed based on averaging the 3 peer reviewers' scores for each application. Arizona awards the top-ranking applications for which it has sufficient funding. All funding is contingent upon receipt of federal funds. In the event that anticipated federal funding is decreased, a proportional decrease will be made to all awardees.

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.

The purpose of the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) grant program is to provide rural districts with financial assistance for initiatives aimed at improving student achievement. The grant will address the unique needs of rural school districts such as the lack of personnel and resources. LEAs participating in the Rural and Low- Income School program will be supported by leveraging flexible funding.

- The primary objectives, outcomes and activities are developed, monitored, and evaluated within the LEAs Consolidated Application, which is completed through the web-based grants management system. This includes the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Integrated Action Plans for districts and schools. The funding application is evaluated and approved by the Arizona Department of Education ensuring all federal guidelines are met.
- The rural districts frequently struggle accessing the resources necessary to allow all students to be successful on achieving the challenging state academic standards and meeting or exceeding on the Arizona State Accountability System measures of student progress

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 Arizona Department of Education will provide technical assistance to eligible LEAs to support funds consistent with ESEA section 5222(a) authorized under Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III; Title IV, Part A such as:

- Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Integrated Action Plans
- Programmatic and fiscal application processes
- Coordination with applicable allowable program areas
- Parent/Community Engagement activities

Technical assistance, service and support may be provided by the Arizona Department of Education Program Specialists through a combination of:

- Professional development (conference, workshops, meetings)
- Virtual opportunities (webinars, online courses, phone conferences)
- Support with other partners (County Education Service Agencies, post-secondary institutions and other agencies)

I: Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, 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.

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Office of Homeless Education provides guidance and technical

assistance to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) on the identification of homeless children and youth, as defined in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. Accordingly, homeless children and youth are those who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. This definition also includes the following criteria:

- children and youth who are sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason.
- children and youth who may be living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, shelters.
- children and youth who have a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.
- Children and youth who are living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, train stations, or similar settings; or
- Migratory children who qualify as homeless because they are children who are living in similar circumstances listed above.

Additionally, unaccompanied youth is defined as a homeless child or youth not in the physical custody of a parent or legal guardian.

Each LEA is required to designate a Homeless Education Liaison to collaborate with school personnel and community-based organizations to identify and immediately enroll homeless students. To identify homeless students, LEAs are required to use either an electronic or hard copy of the Housing Questionnaire. Once identified, all eligible students are to be immediately enrolled, even when lacking enrollment records or documentation, such as previous academic records, immunization and other health records, proof of residency, and proof of legal guardianship.

Upon the identification and enrollment of homeless students, LEAs are required to assess the needs presented by the students through locally developed informal needs assessment tools. To eliminate barriers for homeless students, and in consideration of the needs assessment results, all LEAs will annually develop, review, and revise policies to increase access to educational opportunities and academic success.

Additionally, each LEA will submit the required student data elements for homeless students and youth to AzEDs. The ADE Office of Homeless Education supports LEAs by providing annual training, professional development, monthly webinars, and identification tools, as well as supplemental materials provided by the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE). Specific strategies that will be employed by the SEA include:

- Deliver training to homeless liaisons regarding requirements specific to the McKinney-Vento Act through in-person and virtual platforms to ensure maximum accessibility to the training.
- Expand training opportunities to include identification and specific needs related to runaways, unaccompanied homeless youth, and preschool-aged children.
- Monitor LEA implementation of the requirements in the McKinney-Vento Act.
- Ensure LEAs make school placement decisions based upon the best interests and needs of homeless children and youth.
- Monitor to ensure LEAs follow guidelines related to the immediate enrollment of children and youth who are identified as homeless and unaccompanied homeless youth.
- Monitor to ensure LEAs eliminate all barriers for homeless students and youth and unaccompanied homeless youth to access educational opportunities and achieve comparable academic and social outcomes.

- Continue to convene a state-wide advisory committee to ensure the needs of all homeless children and youth are identified and addressed.
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.

The Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education has established a dispute resolution procedure to ensure an opportunity for the parent/guardian/unaccompanied youth to dispute a local educational agency decision on eligibility, school selection, enrollment and transportation.

To this end, if a dispute arises over eligibility, school selection or enrollment, the LEA must immediately enroll the homeless student in either the school of origin or the school of residency, whichever is sought by the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth, pending resolution of the dispute. It is the responsibility of the LEA to provide transportation to the selected school and ensure support from the designated Homeless Liaison in guiding the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth throughout the duration of the dispute resolution process. Upon reaching resolution, the LEA provides the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth with written notice of the LEA's decision regarding school selection or enrollment, as well as the right to appeal. Once delivered, confirmation of the written notice to the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth is to be sent to the ADE Office of Homeless Education via Certified Mail (United States Postal Service) or hand delivered with the written signature of the parent, guardian, or homeless youth.

If the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth is dissatisfied with the resolution, an appeal may be filed with the ADE Office of Homeless Education by the parent, guardian, unaccompanied youth, public school district or charter network.

To initiate the state-level dispute resolution process, the following must occur within seven workdays after the parent, guardian, or homeless youth receives the written notification of the resolution made at the LEA level:

- With assistance from the LEA Homeless Education Liaison, the parent, guardian, or homeless youth, must submit a Notice of Appeal to the Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education, along with the following documentation:
- A copy of the State-Level Notice of Appeal Form (page 3)
- A copy of the LEA's written decision

Within seven days of receipt of the Notice of Appeal, the ADE Homeless Education Coordinator convenes a panel of at least two ADE employees, including the State Director for Homeless Education and an additional department employee. This panel reviews the entire record of the dispute, including any written statements, to make a determination in the best interest of the child or youth. Within seven workdays from the date the panel convenes, ADE issues the final decision in writing to the parents/legal guardian, district homeless liaison and the district homeless education program director.

To this end, if a dispute arises over eligibility, school selection or enrollment, the LEA must immediately enroll the homeless student in either the school of origin or the school of residency, whichever is sought by the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth, pending resolution of the dispute. It is the responsibility of the LEA to provide transportation to the selected school and ensure support from the designated Homeless Liaison in guiding the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth throughout the duration of the dispute resolution process. Upon reaching resolution, the LEA provides the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth with written notice of the LEA's decision regarding school selection or enrollment, as well as the right to appeal. Once delivered, confirmation of the written notice to the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth is to be sent to the ADE Office of Homeless Education via Certified Mail (United States Postal Service) or hand delivered with the written signature of the parent, guardian, or homeless youth.

If the parent, guardian, or unaccompanied youth is dissatisfied with the resolution, an appeal may be filed

with the ADE Office of Homeless Education by the parent, guardian, unaccompanied youth, public school district or charter network.

To initiate the state-level dispute resolution process, the following must occur within seven workdays after the parent, guardian, or homeless youth receives the written notification of the resolution made at the LEA level:

- With assistance from the LEA Homeless Education Liaison, the parent, guardian, or homeless youth, must submit a Notice of Appeal to the Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education, along with the following documentation:
- A copy of the State-Level Notice of Appeal Form (page 3)
- A copy of the LEA's written decision

Within seven days of receipt of the Notice of Appeal, the ADE Homeless Education Coordinator convenes a panel of at least two ADE employees, including the State Director for Homeless Education and an additional department employee. This panel reviews the entire record of the dispute, including any written statements, to make a determination in the best interest of the child or youth. Within seven workdays from the date the panel convenes, ADE issues the final decision in writing to the parents/legal guardian, district homeless liaison and the district homeless education program director.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education will provide ongoing training to all school personnel on the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program, to heighten the awareness of children and youth and runaways experiencing homelessness. These training opportunities include in-person meetings, phone conference calls, webinars and conferences (local and national opportunities) and are conducted regionally throughout the State of Arizona.

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.

Currently, Arizona does not have a public preschool program; however, children and youth experiencing homelessness have the same access to the provision of early childhood special education services as defined in Arizona Education Code:

- Preschool programs operated or administered by an LEA;
- Head Start programs receiving funding from an LEA or for which an LEA receives the grant;

- Preschool special education services operated or funded by the LEA or mandated under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;
- Preschool programs and services administered or funded by the LEA through the use of Title I or similar government grants; and
- Home-based early childhood educational services funded and administered by an LEA.

The Office of Homeless Education will continue to build upon existing collaboration with the Early Childhood Education Unit, providing new avenues for training, technical assistance and collaboration at the local level.

The Arizona Department of Education enables schools to maintain current course names and local course codes and also links those courses and codes to a common statewide course framework through the Arizona Education Data Standards (AzEDS) school and LEA data reporting process.

Furthermore, the Office of Homeless Education works collaboratively with local educational agencies to develop locally driven policies and procedures to support children and youth experiencing homelessness and ensure they face no barriers that prevent them from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school.

The Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education provides ongoing training and technical assistance to local educational agencies, ensuring all barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs are removed and addressed for children and youth experiencing homelessness.

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.

The Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education provides training and technical assistance that ensures all barriers to the enrollment and retention of children and youth are removed. The training and technical assistance review both state education code and Every Student Succeeds Act requirements for removal of barriers for children and youth experiencing homelessness. These barriers include immunization requirements; residency requirements; lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation; guardianship issues; or uniform or dress code requirements.

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 Arizona Department of Education Office of Homeless Education collaborates with the Arizona School Boards Association and Arizona State Board for Charter Schools to develop draft policies ensuring all barriers to the enrollment and retention of children and youth in homeless situations are removed. The draft policies are then amended and/or adopted by local educational agencies. Through the monitoring process, the Office of Homeless Education will review all local educational agency homeless education policies ensuring

all barriers to the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth are removed, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences.

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 Arizona Department of Education will develop an annual assurance, through the General Statement of Assurance, ensuring local educational agencies provide assistance from counselors to advise youth and prepare and improve the readiness of such youth for college. SEA will provide LEA Counselors with support materials via the College Cost Reeducation Act; to increase access to Higher Education through local collaborative efforts such as College Depot, Maricopa Community Colleges, Arizona State University, University of Arizona and Northern Arizona University. In addition to specific needs for Unaccompanied Youth such as; FASFA completion, fee waivers for costs associated with college enrollment requirements and collaborate/advocate on behalf of the student.

Appendix A

Measurements of Long-term Goals and 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.

Academic Achievement

3rd Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	43	49	55	61	67	72	78	84	90
Black or African-American	32	39	47	54	61	68	76	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	30	38	47	56	64	73	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	46	52	57	63	68	74	79	85	90
Multiple Races	52	57	62	66	71	76	81	85	90
White (non-Hispanic)	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90
Asian	67	70	73	76	79	81	84	87	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	18	27	36	45	54	63	72	81	90
Economically Disadvantaged	30	38	45	53	60	68	75	83	90
SPED	15	24	34	43	53	62	71	81	90

4th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	48	53	59	64	69	74	80	85	90
Black or African-American	36	43	50	56	63	70	77	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	36	43	50	56	63	70	77	83	90

American Indian or Alaska Native	24	32	41	49	57	65	74	82	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90
Multiple Races	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90
White (non-Hispanic)	64	67	71	74	77	80	84	87	90
Asian	73	75	77	79	82	84	86	88	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
Economically Disadvantaged	35	42	49	56	63	69	76	83	90
SPED	16	25	35	44	53	62	72	81	90

5th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	47	52	58	63	69	74	79	85	90
Black or African-American	35	42	49	56	63	69	76	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	35	42	49	56	63	69	76	83	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	21	30	38	47	56	64	73	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	51	56	61	66	71	75	80	85	90
Multiple Races	55	59	64	68	73	77	81	86	90
White (non-Hispanic)	62	66	69	73	76	80	83	87	90
Asian	73	75	77	79	82	84	86	88	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	27	35	43	51	59	66	74	82	90
Economically Disadvantaged	34	41	48	55	62	69	76	83	90
SPED	12	22	32	41	51	61	71	80	90

6th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041

FAY only 2016	39	45	52	58	65	71	77	84	90
Black or African-American	27	35	43	51	59	66	74	82	90
Hispanic or Latino	26	34	42	50	58	66	74	82	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	24	34	43	53	62	71	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	39	45	52	58	65	71	77	84	90
Multiple Races	49	54	59	64	70	75	80	85	90
White (non-Hispanic)	55	59	64	68	73	77	81	86	90
Asian	68	71	74	76	79	82	85	87	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	12	22	32	41	51	61	71	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	25	33	41	49	58	66	74	82	90
SPED	8	18	29	39	49	59	70	80	90

7th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only 2016	43	49	55	61	67	72	78	84	90
Black or African-American	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	17	26	35	44	54	63	72	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90
Multiple Races	51	56	61	66	71	75	80	85	90
White (non-Hispanic)	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90
Asian	68	71	74	76	79	82	85	87	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	29	37	44	52	60	67	75	82	90
SPED	8	18	29	39	49	59	70	80	90

8th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only 2016	35	42	49	56	63	69	76	83	90
Black or African-American	25	33	41	49	58	66	74	82	90
Hispanic or Latino	24	32	41	49	57	65	74	82	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	22	32	41	51	61	71	80	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	34	41	48	55	62	69	76	83	90
Multiple Races	38	45	51	58	64	71	77	84	90
White (non-Hispanic)	48	53	59	64	69	74	80	85	90
Asian	63	66	70	73	77	80	83	87	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	22	31	39	48	56	65	73	82	90
SPED	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

11th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
Black or African-American	21	30	38	47	56	64	73	81	90
Hispanic or Latino	21	30	38	47	56	64	73	81	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	22	32	41	51	61	71	80	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	30	38	45	53	60	68	75	83	90
Multiple Races	38	45	51	58	64	71	77	84	90
White (non-Hispanic)	42	48	54	60	66	72	78	84	90
Asian	57	61	65	69	74	78	82	86	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

Economically Disadvantaged	19	28	37	46	55	63	72	81	90
SPED	4	15	26	36	47	58	69	79	90

3rd Grade Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	47	52	58	63	69	74	79	85	90
Black or African-American	34	41	48	55	62	69	76	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	36	43	50	56	63	70	77	83	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	25	33	41	49	58	66	74	82	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90
Multiple Races	56	60	65	69	73	77	82	86	90
White (non-Hispanic)	61	65	68	72	76	79	83	86	90
Asian	77	79	80	82	84	85	87	88	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	27	35	43	51	59	66	74	82	90
Economically Disadvantaged	35	42	49	56	63	69	76	83	90
SPED	20	29	38	46	55	64	73	81	90

4th Grade Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	46	52	57	63	68	74	79	85	90
Black or African-American	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	34	41	48	55	62	69	76	83	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	34	42	50	58	66	74	82	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	51	56	61	66	71	75	80	85	90
Multiple Races	53	58	62	67	72	76	81	85	90
White (non-Hispanic)	61	65	68	72	76	79	83	86	90
Asian	77	79	80	82	84	85	87	88	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90

Economically Disadvantaged	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90
SPED	16	25	35	44	53	62	72	81	90
5th Grade Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	47	52	58	63	69	74	79	85	90
Black or African-American	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90
Hispanic or Latino	37	44	50	57	64	70	77	83	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	26	34	42	50	58	66	74	82	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	53	58	62	67	72	76	81	85	90
Multiple Races	54	59	63	68	72	77	81	86	90
White (non-Hispanic)	61	65	68	72	76	79	83	86	90
Asian	79	80	82	83	85	86	87	89	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	32	39	47	54	61	68	76	83	90
Economically Disadvantaged	35	42	49	56	63	69	76	83	90
SPED	14	24	33	43	52	62	71	81	90

6th Grade Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	41	47	53	59	66	72	78	84	90
Black or African-American	26	34	42	50	58	66	74	82	90
Hispanic or Latino	29	37	44	52	60	67	75	82	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	20	29	38	46	55	64	73	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	44	50	56	61	67	73	79	84	90
Multiple Races	49	54	59	64	70	75	80	85	90

White (non-Hispanic)	56	60	65	69	73	77	82	86	90
Asian	71	73	76	78	81	83	85	88	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	17	26	35	44	54	63	72	81	90
Economically Disadvantaged	27	35	43	51	59	66	74	82	90
SPED	9	19	29	39	50	60	70	80	90
7th Grade Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90
Black or African-American	20	29	38	46	55	64	73	81	90
Hispanic or Latino	23	31	40	48	57	65	73	82	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	14	24	33	43	52	62	71	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	27	35	43	51	59	66	74	82	90
Multiple Races	37	44	50	57	64	70	77	83	90
White (non-Hispanic)	46	52	57	63	68	74	79	85	90
Asian	60	64	68	71	75	79	83	86	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	9	19	29	39	50	60	70	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	21	30	38	47	56	64	73	81	90
SPED	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

8th Grade Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	28	36	44	51	59	67	75	82	90
Black or African-American	18	27	36	45	54	63	72	81	90
Hispanic or Latino	23	31	40	48	57	65	73	82	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	12	22	32	41	51	61	71	80	90

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	34	41	48	55	62	69	76	83	90
Multiple Races	32	39	47	54	61	68	76	83	90
White (non-Hispanic)	38	45	51	58	64	71	77	84	90
Asian	55	59	64	68	73	77	81	86	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	20	29	38	46	55	64	73	81	90
SPED	5	16	26	37	48	58	69	79	90

Grade 11 Math									
Subgroups	Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032	2035	2038	2041
FAY only	30	38	45	53	60	68	75	83	90
Black or African-American	19	28	37	46	55	63	72	81	90
Hispanic or Latino	20	29	38	46	55	64	73	81	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	11	21	31	41	51	60	70	80	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	28	36	44	51	59	67	75	82	90
Multiple Races	33	40	47	54	62	69	76	83	90
White (non-Hispanic)	41	47	53	59	66	72	78	84	90
Asian	57	61	65	69	74	78	82	86	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	11	21	31	41	51	60	70	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	18	27	36	45	54	63	72	81	90
SPED	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

B: Graduation Rates

Subgroup	2015 Baseline	2018	2021	2026	2029	2032 Long term goal
All students	77%	79.6	82.2	84.8	87.4	90%
Economically disadvantaged students	73%	76.4	79.8	83.2	86.6	90%
Children with disabilities	66%	70.8	75.6	80.4	85.2	90%
English learners	25%*	*	*	*	*	90%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	66%	70.8	75.6	80.4	85.2	90%
Asian	87%	87.6	88.2	88.8	89.4	90%
Hispanic/Latino	72%	75.6	79.2	82.8	86.4	90%
Black/African American	74%	77.2	80.4	83.6	86.8	90%
White	84%	85.2	86.4	87.6	88.8	90%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	70%	74.0	78.0	82.0	86.0	90%
Multiple Races	72%	75.6	79.2	82.8	86.4	90%

*In 2017, Arizona will change its methodology for determining EL subgroup graduation rate. Currently, this graduation rate is determined by the number of 12th grade students who are still classified as EL students who graduate with their cohort. In 2017, this rate will be determined by assessing the number of EL students who were ever classified during high school as EL and graduated with their cohort. Once the EL graduation rate using the new methodology is determined, baseline and MIPs will be realigned.

C: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency

In FY 2016 the cut scores for English language proficiency were changed, impacting the progress rates and reclassification rates for English learners, and is illustrated in Table I. Table II provides more detail about student’s EL growth in FY 2018. The top portion of the table provides the percentages of each grade-band who achieved each level of achievement. Table III further details those students who were at the high-intermediate range of EL achievement in FY 2017 and remained in that achievement range throughout FY 2018.

Table I: Achieved and Projected Interim Progress for English Language Learners

	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	2018 Interim Objective	2020 Interim Objective	2024 Interim Objective	2026 Interim Objective
EL students that grew at least one level excluding kindergarten	42.30%	31.45%	33.20%	30%	36%	42%	48%
EL students that grew at least one level including kindergarten	45.45%	37.88%	38.94%	30%	36%	42%	48%
EL students that reclassified as Proficient excluding kindergarten	19.59%	9.63%	10.40%				
EL students that reclassified as Proficient including kindergarten	18.89%	10.61%	10.88%				
Weighted growth excluding kindergarten		34.48%	36.98%				
Weighted growth including kindergarten		46.60%	46.86%				

Table II: Fiscal Year 2018 English Language Achievement Growth

	KG	Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-12
No Growth	61.04%	75.38%	76.48%	80.31%
Progressed 1 level	22.26%	21.70%	21.69%	17.26%
Progressed 2 levels	15.28%	2.69%	1.90%	2.39%
Progressed 3 levels	1.42%	0.23%	0.04%	0.05%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Intermediate proficiency in FY 2017 continued in FY 2018	42.86%	54.28%	74.57%	77.58%

Table III. Percent of Students with Intermediate Proficiency in 2017 Who Did Not Progress to Proficient in FY 2018

Remained intermediate by Grade from 2017 to 2018	Grade	Percent
	Grade 1	58.93%
	Grade 2	44.53%
	Grade 3	63.04%
	Grade 4	72.75%
	Grade 5	71.55%
	Grade 6	80.10%
	Grade 7	83.23%
	Grade 8	82.95%
	Grade 9	71.42%
	Grade 10	70.15%
	Grade 11	72.17%
	Grade 12	75.55%

NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

The purpose of this enclosure is to inform you about a new provision in the Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) that applies to applicants for new grant awards under Department programs. This provision is Section 427 of GEPA, enacted as part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law (P.L.) 103-382).

To Whom Does This Provision Apply?

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new grant awards under this program. **ALL APPLICANTS FOR NEW AWARDS MUST INCLUDE INFORMATION IN THEIR APPLICATIONS TO ADDRESS THIS NEW PROVISION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE FUNDING UNDER THIS PROGRAM.**

(If this program is a State-formula grant program, a State needs to provide this description only for projects or activities that it carries out with funds reserved for State-level uses. In addition, local school districts or other eligible applicants that apply to the State for funding need to provide this description in their applications to the State for funding. The State would be responsible for ensuring that the school district or other local entity has submitted a sufficient section 427 statement as described below.)

What Does This Provision Require?

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its Federally- assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs. This provision allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation: gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age. Based on local circumstances, you should determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, etc. from such access or participation in, the Federally-funded project or

activity. The description in your application of steps to be taken to overcome these barriers need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

What are Examples of How an Applicant Might Satisfy the Requirement of This Provision?

The following examples may help illustrate how an applicant may comply with Section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to carry out an adult literacy project serving, among others, adults with limited English proficiency, might describe in its application how it intends to distribute a brochure about the proposed project to such potential participants in their native language.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audio tape or in braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to carry out a model science program for secondary students and is concerned that girls may be less likely than boys to enroll in the course, might indicate how it intends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment.
- (4) An applicant that proposes a project to increase school safety might describe the special efforts it will take to address concern of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students, and efforts to reach out to

and involve the families of LGBT students

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

Section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) requires a description of the steps that will be taken to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, federally assisted programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries. To ensure equitable participation and access project resources, the following considerations will be made:

- When requested, the Arizona Department of Education will produce dissemination materials (e.g., direct mailings, e-mails, on-line announcements) in both English and Spanish. Other considerations will be made to ensure the document is readily accessible to traditionally underrepresented groups.
- The project staff will coordinate the process of cooperation and collaboration between and among the project participants to ensure equitable access and participation of recipients of the project funds.
- The project staff will conduct accessibility assessments of their programs' physical and instructional environments.
- The project staff will eliminate physical and learning barriers in the educational settings and provide reasonable accommodations to those being served.
- The project staff will carefully consider issues of cultural diversity and sensitivity by reviewing instructional elements of the program. Careful attention to topics covered in the program will be considered based on how participants might respond, react, or perceive information being presented.
- Training on cultural, gender, race, and national origin will be provided to all personnel associated with this project.

The Arizona Department of Education shall maintain non-discriminatory learning environments to ensure that participants are not excluded from participation

in, denied the benefits of or otherwise subjected to discrimination in any program or activity of the district on the basis of race, color, ethnicity, religion, gender, disability or national origin. The right of any student to attend and participate in school activities will be limited only when the welfare of others may be threatened. When students act irresponsibly, they will be held accountable so as to preserve an appropriate educational setting for others. These provisions are supported in the proposal as well as in the Department's policies and rules supporting diversity.

Estimated Burden Statement for GEPA Requirements

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1.5 hours per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is required to obtain or retain benefit (Public Law 103-382. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Washington, DC 20210-4537 or email ICDocketMgr@ed.gov and reference the OMB Control Number 1894-0005.