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

Introduction 3
Completing and Submitting a Consolidated State Plan 3
Alternative Template 3
Individual Program State Plan 3
Consultation 4
Assurances 4
Cover Page 5
Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan 6
Instructions 7
A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) 8
The Arizona Department of Education Reporting Notes 32
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 45
F. Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants 46
G. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers 47
H. Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program 53
I. Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B 54
Appendix A: Measurements of interim progress 58
Appendix B 72

Introduction

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

Completing and Submitting a Consolidated State Plan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cover Page

Contact Information and Signatures	
SEA Contact (Name and Position): Kelly Koenig, Associate Superintendent	 Telephone: 602-364-2811
Mailing Address: 1535 W Jefferson St. Phoenix AZ 85007 Ben #5	Email Address: Kelly.koenig@azed.gov
By signing this document, I assure that: To the best of my knowledge and belief, all information and data included in this plan are true and correct. The SEA will submit a comprehensive set of assurances at a date and time established by the Secretary, including the assurances in ESEA section 8304. Consistent with ESEA section 8302(b)(3), the SEA will meet the requirements of ESEA sections 1117 and 8501 regarding the participation of private school children and teachers.	
Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name) Kathy Hoffman	Telephone:602.542.5460

Contact Information and Signatures	
Signature of Authorized SEA Representative	Date:
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]

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

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

   ☒ Yes

   □ No

   ii. If a State responds "yes" to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
   a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
   b. The student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
   c. In high school:
      1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
      2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
      3. The student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.

      ☒ Yes

      □ No

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

[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.

Arizona's Academic Standards for Mathematics are designed in a manner that allows any student to access advanced coursework.

- Specific "Plus" Standards have been identified allowing teachers to extend content for Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II.
- The Arizona Mathematics Standards for High School contain an additional set of standards that are found outside the limits of a high school Algebra 1, Geometry, or Algebra 2 minimum course of student as outlined by the Arizona Mathematics Standards. The plus standards are intended to be included in honors, accelerated, advanced courses, fourth credit courses, as well as extensions of the regular courses (Algebra 1, Algebra 2, and Geometry). Additionally, the plus standards provide opportunity for teachers to provide additional content for those students who have already demonstrated mastery of content.
- The SEA offers training in relation to the implementation of all academic standards, including Mathematics, at free or low cost to all LEAs. Additionally, the SEA's gifted and talented coordinator offers opportunities for professional development related to the identification and support of gifted and talented students in Arizona.
- All have the opportunity to offer advanced coursework to students. A student may begin taking Algebra I prior to high school.
- 2016-2017: For accountability, schools receive credit for their scores in both proficiency and acceleration/readiness category.
- 2017-2018: For accountability, students in Grade 8 who take high school end-of-course (EOC) Math will be able to be counted in accountability calculations.
- 2018-2019: For accountability Grade 8 students will be handled as in the prior two years.

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 2015-2016 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
   - *iii.* Indicate the languages identified in question 3(i) for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed.
   - *iv.* N/A
   - *v.* 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 ahs 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).
The major subgroups are as follows: American Indian/Native American, Asian. Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, and Multiple Races. The State will also use the following required subgroups in the accountability system: Economically disadvantaged students, children with disabilities, and 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.

The State, at the request of stakeholders, will also track students who take advanced math end-of-course assessments prior to high school. These groups will be part of the K-8 acceleration measures described below.

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.

Arizona's federal system of accountability for all Arizona public schools and LEAs, the final n-size will be 20 as that number is large enough to provide 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.

Arizona's state accountability measures use an n-count of 10 based on many discussion and hearings at the board of education meetings. The main decision factor was to hold more schools accountable for the students that they serve.

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

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. Arizona's state accountability using a n-count of 10 is in line with the lowest number allowed by FERPA.

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.
Below is a table displaying how varying n-sizes could impact Arizona schools and the accountability system. This table shows how many schools could be excluded from accountability by subgroup depending on the n-size that is selected. 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. The A-F Ad Hoc committee that proposed this n-size consisted of teachers, superintendents, parents, educational lobbyists and State Board of Education members. The committee reviewed data and made recommendations. The State Board of Education also did a month-long roadshow, including an online survey and 18 face-to-face meetings, to incorporate feedback from all stakeholders prior to the State Board of Education making final decisions. Thus, a final n-size of 20 has been determined and approved by the State Board of Education.

Demographic	Total Students	Total Schools	N30	N25	N20	N10
African American	91,541	2401	1,165	1,072	956	668
American Indian	74,531	2401	1,679	1,577	1,474	1,079
Hispanic/Latino	692,634	2401	401	365	332	244
Asian	42,262	2401	1,443	1,367	1,278	958
Hawaiian	5,251	2401	1,413	1,412	1,408	1,355
White	604,639	2401	502	445	373	242
Multi-Racial	43,926	2401	1,585	1,433	1,264	831

English Learner	95,788	2401	1,239	1,161	1,057	734
Economically Disadvantaged	630,602	2401	878	858	843	805
Children with Disabilities	167,907	2401	948	867	780	562

d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.[3]
Arizona Department of Education suppresses aggregate data that falls below the minimum n-size to ensure that student information is protected. Additional ways to protect data are also being discussed.

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.
N/A

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 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. Because our state-wide assessment is given every year, from the third grade to the junior year, long-term goals and measures of interim progress (MIPs) have been created for every tested grade level. Additionally, because it is important to track the achievement, because 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. To this end, the team created additional subgroups, beyond those required by ESSA, titled Algebra

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

1 Prior to High School, Geometry Prior to High School, and Algebra 2 Prior to High School to better track the exceptional work that our LEAs are doing with advanced learners and to recognize their efforts in this area. 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. The Arizona Education Progress Meter, http://education.azgovernor.gov/edu/progress, utilized data and statistical procedures to develop goals for multiple facets of education. Important to this ESSA State Plan is their work in the area of 3rd grade reading and 8th grade mathematics. Two working groups met for just over one year to lay a foundation for goals in these two areas. Both teams looked at a variety of data sources to build goal recommendations: AzMERIT ELA and Mathematics results, Move on When Reading trends, NAEP assessment data, as well as other nationally recognized assessments. Additionally, each team used psychometricians from our state universities to assist in validating goal choices. Though this work focused on 3rd grade reading and 8th grade mathematics, it created a firm foundation for work on the remainder of the grade levels. By linking the Progress Meter to the ESSA long-term goals and MIPs, Arizona ensures a coherent system of goals that will be supported by the entire state rather than a disjointed set of initiatives which serves to cause confusion, fracture funding, and derail improvement initiatives. This alignment is essential to the success of these goals and will ultimately lend to the coherence of school funding. As Arizona continues, through both federal and state funds, to fine tune funding streams for our LEAs, the committee felt it important to recognize the need for consistent funding. Through consistent and reliable funding, innovative strategies to support all learners can be developed and sustained.

Additionally, consistent and reliable funding assists LEAs in building a strong cadre of teachers and leaders to fully support learners within our Arizona schools and to accelerate the closing of proficiency gaps.

Several assumptions guided the work of both the Progress Meter teams and 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.

Psychometrically speaking, this is 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 to ensure that our criteria of ambitious and attainable 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 as they ramp up over the next few years. 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. Until we have more data, however, developing an "on-track" measure is not possible.

Proficiency Gap Reduction Strategy:

1) 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.
2) Long-Term Goal #1: By 2027-2028, close proficiency gaps by at least 50 percent.
    a) The proficiency gap is defined as the difference between 90 percent proficiency and baseline subgroup proficiency.
    b) This gap divided in half forms the expected growth percentage for each subgroup
    c) MIPs set for every three years provide LEAs with benchmarks to meet expected growth percentages
    d) 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.

e) 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.
f) Incentives are likely to be built into the statewide accountability system to reward schools who make faster progress toward these goals.

3) School and district report cards will display progress toward these goals on an annual basis Long-Term Goal #2: By 2039-2040, all subgroups must reach at least 90 percent proficiency on ELA and mathematics state-wide assessments.
   a) Continue setting MIPs every three years until all subgroups reach 90 percent proficiency.
   b) 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 2027 and, ultimately, achieve an overall proficiency of 90 percent by 2039.

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.

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 jump 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.

The A-F Ad Hoc Committee as established by the State Board of Education approved a long-term goal of 90 percent for 4-year graduation rate by 2030. This goal was established by a diverse group of stakeholders representing multiple educational partners who have collaboratively developed indicators, known as the Progress Meter, to help further assess the status of education for the state as a whole and for counties, LEAs and schools, where data are available. There are currently more than 100 individuals working to collaboratively set goals for each indicator by the end of this year. This goal was established by reviewing the 2014 average all student high school graduation rate of the top 10 attainment states in the country (83.3 percent), the 2015 average all student high school graduation rate of the top nine graduation rates in the country (89 percent), and the 2015 average all student 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. This long-term goal was presented to the State Board of Education.

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. If the A-F Ad Hoc Committee and/or the State Board of Education would like to establish goals for the extended-year rates, they may do so.
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 A.

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.

5. By 2030, 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 A details the exact measures of interim progress for each subgroup which will lead toward our 90 percent goal by 2030.

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.

The goal is to outline the projected interim progress of English language 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 2028, for an overall EL growth rate of 6% per year in 2028. Including these interim objective growth rates in the following chart allows a direct comparison of recent years, the impact of cut scores changes on 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 A.
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 pre-emergent/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 grade-bands. Grade-band 1 includes grades 1 through 3, grade-band 2 includes grades 4 through 6, and grade-band 3 includes grades 7 through 12. Kindergarten is separated from these grade bands and results are provided with and without kindergarten EL students.

   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 of Appendix A. This information is included to demonstrate that comparative interim progress cannot precede FY 2016 for this measure, and therefore begins in FY 2017. 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. The weighted growth measure aligns with the school accountability system for Arizona state schools.

   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.

iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))
Though the Arizona Department of Education and the State Board of Education's vision was to create a unified state and federal system of accountability for all Arizona public schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), the interpretation of ESSA law related to accountability contradicted the requirements of Arizona State law related to the A-F Letter Grade

Accountability System required by Arizona Revised Statutes § 15-241. Specifically A.R.S. § 15-241(H) requires the State Board of Education to "use achievement profiles appropriately to assess the educational impact of accommodation schools, alternative schools and extremely small schools, may develop profiles for schools that participate in the board examination system prescribed in Arizona chapter 7, article 6 of this title and schools that participate in Arizona online instruction pursuant to section 15-808 and may develop other exceptions as prescribed by the state board of education for the purposes of this section." As a result, the Arizona A-F system cannot be used for federal meaningful differentiation. Therefore, the Federal system of meaningful differentiation includes all schools (traditional and alternative) 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).

K-8 Schools

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

9-12 Schools

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

ELL: 10%

- ELL Proficiency (5%): using AZELLA, schools get points based on their percentage of students proficient compared to the state average ELL proficiency.
- ELL Growth (5%): schools get points based on their student's growth (change in performance levels) aggregated to the school level compared to the state's average change in performance levels the prior year.
- The following students count: current ELL status, including recent arrivals, with AZELLA scores; with two AZELLA scores to measure growth.

  Schools with fewer than 20 FAY, ELLs do not get these points. Their point total is calculated with a maximum of 90 points not 100

$$\boldsymbol{EL\ School\ Proficiency}\ \% = 100\left[\frac{(No.\ of\ AZELLA\ FAY\ students\ proficient\ on\ AZELLA)}{(No.\ of\ AZELLA\ FAY\ students\ with\ an\ EL\ need, including\ parent\ withdrawals,\ who\ had\ a\ valid\ current\ AZELLA\ proficiency\ level)}\right]$$

To earn proficiency points, the school's EL proficiency percentage is compared to the State's current year proficiency percentage.

$$\boldsymbol{EL\ K-8\ Statewide\ CY\ \ Proficiency}\ \% = 100\left[\frac{(Sum\ of\ School\ Averages\ that\ have\ the\ necessary\ AZELLA\ FAY\ n-count)}{(No.\ of\ Schools\ that\ have\ the\ necessary\ AZELLA\ FAY\ n-count\ to\ be\ eligible\ for\ points)}\right]$$

Up to 5 points are awarded for proficiency using the following system:

TRANSFORMED	Range	Points
EL Proficiency is greater than or equal to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Proficient	To be determined	5
EL Proficiency standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Proficient is between -0.01 and -0.50	To be determined	4
EL Proficiency standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Proficient is between -0.51 and -1.00	To be determined	3
EL Proficiency standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Proficient is between -1.01 and -2.00	To be determined	2
EL Proficiency standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Proficient is between -2.01 and -3.00	N/A	1
If a school's EL Proficiency is 0%, due to no reclassification	0.0000	0

EL growth calculates the growth percentage of EL students using their current year compared to prior year AZELLA results, unless they are kindergarten students in which case the placement test is compared to the current year reassessment. In addition, any student who takes a placement exam for the first time by October 1st and then takes a spring reassessment will be included. Students who had a placement exam in one school and a reassessment in another school within the same school year will not be included as they will not qualify as FAY.

The table below shows how many points each level of growth is worth. Students who had a placement exam in one school and a reassessment in another school within the same school year will not be included as they will not qualify as AZELLA FAY.

Prior Year Achievement Level (or Placement Test for kindergarten students)	Current Year Achievement Level	Point Value
Basic/Intermediate	Intermediate	1
Pre-Emergent/Emergent	Basic	
Basic	Intermediate	
Intermediate	Proficient	
Pre-Emergent/Emergent	Intermediate	2
Basic/Intermediate	Proficient	

Basic	Proficient	
Pre-Emergent/Emergent	Proficient	3

The following formula is used to calculate growth:

$$\boldsymbol{EL\ School\ Growth}\ \% = 100\left[\frac{\begin{pmatrix}(No.\ of\ AZELLA\ FAY\ students\ who\ increased\ one\ proficiency\ level)\\ +(No.\ of\ AZELLA\ FAY\ student\ who\ increased\ two\ proficiency\ levels\ x\ 2.0)\\ +(No.\ of\ AZELLA\ FAY\ students\ who\ increased\ three\ proficiency\ levels\ X\ 3.0)\end{pmatrix}}{\begin{matrix}No.\ of\ AZELLA\ FAY\ students\ tested\ with\ an\ EL\ need,\ including\ parent\\ withdrawals\ with\ a\ valid\ current\ and\ prior\ year\ AZELLA\ proficiency\ level\end{matrix}}\right]$$

To earn growth points, the school's EL growth percentage is compared to the State's current year growth percentage.

$$\boldsymbol{EL\ K-8\ Statewide\ Current\ Year\ Growth\ Percent}$$
$$= 100\left[\frac{(Sum\ of\ EL\ Growth\ of\ all\ schools\ AZELLA\ FAY\ n-count\ to\ be\ eligible\ for\ points)}{No.\ of\ schools\ that\ have\ the\ necessary\ AZELLA\ FAY\ n-count\ to\ be\ eligible\ for\ points}\right]$$

Up to 5 points are awarded for growth using the following system:

TRANSFORMED	Range	Points
EL Growth is greater than or equal to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Growth	To be determined	5
EL Growth standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Growth is between -0.01 and -0.50	To be determined	4
EL Growth standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Growth is between -0.51 and -1.00	To be determined	3
EL Growth standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Growth is between -1.01 and -2.00	To be determined	2
EL Growth standard deviation compared to the EL Statewide Current Year Percent Growth is between -2.01 and -3.00	To be determined	1
If a school's EL Growth is 0%, due to no Growth	0.0000	0

Chronic Absenteeism (10%)

- Chronic absenteeism: students absent for 10% or more of the year (18+ days) The calculation will not include documented chronically ill students. It will also not include kindergarten as they are not required to attend school by state law.
    - A school's current year chronic absenteeism percentage is less than the school's prior year chronic absenteeism percentage = 5 points
    - A school's current year and prior year chronic absenteeism percentage equals 0 = 5 points

- A school's current year chronic absenteeism percentage is greater than the school's prior year chronic absenteeism percentage = 0 points

9-12 Schools

- ELL: 10%
  - ELL Proficiency (5%): using AZELLA, schools get points based on their percentage of students proficient compared to the state average ELL proficiency.
  - ELL Growth (5%): schools get points based on their student's growth (change in performance levels) aggregated to the school level compared to the state's average change in performance levels the prior year.
  - The following student counts: current ELL status, including recent arrivals, with AZELLA scores; with two AZELLA scores to measure growth.

Schools with fewer than 20 FAY, ELLs do not get these points. Their point total is calculated with a maximum of 90 points not 100

- Drop-out: (10%)
  - 100% - the percentage of current fiscal year dropout.

- Graduation Rate (ADE 5-year cohort graduation rate): (20%)

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

Indicator	Measure(s)
Academic Achievement	Current considerations for all grades include AzMERIT and MSAA ELA and Math Proficiency calculation.
Academic Progress	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.
The other academic indicator for public schools that are not high schools is dropout.

c. Graduation Rate. Describe the Graduation Rate indicator, including a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; (iii) how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; (iv) if the

State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator; and (v) if applicable, how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State- defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).

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.

Indicator	Measure(s)	Description
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	Current considerations include AZELLA Proficiency and Growth calculations	ELL Growth (5%): schools get 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. The following student counts: current ELL status, including recent arrivals, with AZELLA scores; with two AZELLA scores to measure growth. Schools with fewer than 20 FAY, ELLs do not get these points. Their point total is calculated with a maximum of 90 points, not 100.

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.

Indicator	Measure(s)
School Quality or Student Success	School Quality and Success indicators for K-8 schools: Chronic absenteeism: students absent for 10% or more of the year (18+ days) • A school's current year chronic absenteeism percentage is less than the school's prior year chronic absenteeism percentage = 5 points • A school's current year and prior year chronic absenteeism percentage equals 0 = 5 points • A school's current year chronic absenteeism percentage is greater than the school's prior year chronic absenteeism percentage = 0 points School Quality and Success indicators for 9-12 schools: • Drop-out

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.

Arizona has two accountability systems. Though the State Board of Education sought to create a unified state and federal accountability system, ESSA law contradicts Arizona State law requirements for separate A-F Letter Grade Accountability Systems for traditional and alternative schools (Arizona Revised Statute §15-241).

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).

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	9-12 Schools	Combination including 12	Combination NOT including 12
Proficiency 60%	Proficiency 60%	Proficiency 60%	Proficiency 60%
Growth 20%		Growth 10%	Growth 20%
EL (Achievement and growth) 10%	EL (Achievement and growth) 10%	EL (Achievement and growth) 10%	EL (Achievement and growth) 10%
Chronic Absenteeism 10%		Chronic Absenteeism 10%	Chronic Absenteeism 5%
	Drop -out 10%	Drop -out 5%	Drop -out 5%
	Graduation Rate 20%	Graduation Rate 5%	

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.

Procedure and Inclusion Criteria

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

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

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

Schools must qualify for at least the proficiency portion of the model to be eligible for an overall score. Twenty out of 22 K-2 schools met this requirement and are eligible for points. Of these 22 schools, ten met the requirements for EL points and twelve did not. Where schools were not eligible for EL points, their overall points scale was adjusted to 90 eligible points. Where schools were eligible for both proficiency and EL points, the scale totals 100 eligible points. If schools did not meet the requirements for proficiency, they were not eligible for inclusion in the model as the proficiency component is 90% of the overall model.

Highlights

- 91% of K2 schools in the state meet the FAY requirements for proficiency points (20/22)
- 45% of K2 schools in the state meet the FAY requirements for EL points (10/25), but only 40% of these schools have enough proficiency points to be eligible for a letter grade.

Notes about the Methodology for the EL Indicator

Although only 8 schools received points for the EL indicator, 10 schools met the requirements for the EL indicator and were included in the calculations for the distribution of statewide EL growth and EL proficiency for this model. There were important details to be considered in the decision to use this procedure, which is the same procedure used for the K-8 and 9-12 letter grade models. Despite only including 10 schools, we aim to show that the K-2 statewide EL proficiency and growth averages are statistically sound.

The calculations for EL proficiency and growth aggregate student level data to the school level. At the school level a proficiency rate and growth rate are calculated for each school that contains 20 EL Fay students. These proficiency and growth rates are then transformed to normalize their distribution. They are then aggregated to a statewide level. The means and standard deviations are calculated at the statewide level and used for converting school's proficiency and growth rates into points. When the proficiency and

growth rates of the population of students is compared to the proficiency and growth rates of the averages of schools (discussed above) they are within 1% of each other. These values are nearly exact because the population of students that is aggregated to school levels encompasses 743 EL K-2 students, which is well above the threshold for statistical power.

In other words, whether the statewide proficiency/growth rate is calculated by summing across all students or by averaging across schools, the outcome is the same. The similarities of these values are below. These results are from Fiscal Year 2018, but similar results have occurred in Fiscal Year 2018 leading to the reliability of the model year to year:

Calculation	**Student Population**	**School Averaged**	**Difference**
Growth Rate	0.89769	0.90754	0.00985
Proficiency Rate	0.38953	0.39714	0.00761

However, it is necessary to use the averages across the 12 schools because their distribution provides the means and standard deviations necessary to convert proficiency and growth into a points system. This step cannot be done at the student level and then directly aggregated to the state level, it must first be aggregated to the eligible schools. Although the closeness of these values justifies the statistical soundness of a statewide average based on 12 eligible schools, despite being a low number. The population of students embedded in these schools is sufficient to fit the law of large numbers.

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.

Lowest-Performing Schools:

Lowest Performing Schools: The following indicators will be used to identify a minimum of the lowest- performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds as comprehensive support and improvement schools for low achievement:

K-8 schools

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

9-12 Schools

Proficiency	60%

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

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

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

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

Subgroup Achievement.
Any Additional Targeted Support and Improvement school receiving Title I, Part A funds identified in 2018-2019 that does not exit after 4 years, based on closing the achievement gap between subgroups or raising the achievement level of low achieving subgroups, will be identified as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School beginning in 2021-2022.

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.

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

Subgroup achievement is monitored annually. Any Arizona school that has one or more significant achievement gap(s) between subgroups and any low achieving subgroups will be identified as Targeted Support and Improvement. "Consistently underperforming" is

defined as a school being identified as having has one or more significant achievement gaps between subgroups and any low achieving subgroups for three consecutive years.

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))*

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

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

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 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.

All the students at grade level in the static file as the denominator regardless if they had an assessment, we would be holding them accountable for 100% of the students in the file to test.

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.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement- low achievement schools (Title 1 lowest 5% schools) exit criteria:

- A minimum of two consecutive years of increased student proficiency on the state assessment; and
- Implementation of school improvement goals, strategies and action steps in state required Integrated Action Plan; and
- Score on four indicators above bottom 5% of Title 1 schools.

Schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools - low graduation rate exit criteria:

- A minimum of two years increased graduation rate using 5-year cohort data; and

- Implementation of improved graduation rate goals, strategies and action steps in state required Integrated Action Plan; and
- Five-year cohort graduation rate greater than 66.6%.

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

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

- A minimum of two years of consecutive increased subgroup achievement; and
- Implementation of school improvement goals, strategies and action steps relative to subgroup achievement in state required Integrated Action Plan; and
- Subgroup no longer on its own, would be identified as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School

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.

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

The Comprehensive needs assessment looks at effective leadership capacity and practices, instructional infrastructure, including effective teachers and instructions, curriculum and assessment systems; Effective organization of time, including instructional and non-instruction time and time for teacher planning and collaboration; and organizational conditions, climate and culture, student learning, fulfillment, safety and well-being, as well as professional satisfaction, morale, and effectiveness; Family and community engagement, effective reciprocal partnerships; and talent management.

This process will assist in determining gaps in the current implementation of strategies and interventions as well as identifying fidelity issues, intensity of interventions and resource allocation inequities. It will identify what is working and what is not. In collaboration with

LEAs and schools the next best high-leveraged steps to eliminate causes and improve student outcomes will be identified.

The Arizona Department of Education team will assist the LEA to identify new evidence-based interventions and actions.

New Integrated Action Plans will be written with direct assistance from Arizona Department of Education cross-divisional support teams, considering a variety of innovative, evidenced-based interventions and selecting interventions highly successful with similar populations and settings. Monitoring and support visits and technical assistance will increase and intensify.

The Arizona Department of Education cross-divisional team will closely monitor progress of the new Integrated Action Plan.

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.

As part of the site visit and fiscal review protocols, Arizona Department of Education Support and Innovation staff will address allocation of resources to schools in improvement in LEAs serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement and LEAs serving a significant number of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans. Evidence of the LEA providing adequate additional resources to schools remaining in improvement status will be required and reviewed. Assistance with consolidated budgeting and planning will be given. Additional support will be provided by cross-divisional support teams.

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.

Technical assistance will include direct support in in conducting the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and thorough root cause analysis, the development and implementation of school and LEA Integrated Action Plans, with evidence-based strategies, action steps and interventions addressing student academic achievement and school success including, but not limited to such topics as:

- Evidence-based academic practices, strategies and interventions based on data
- School culture and climate
- Alternatives to suspension
- Restorative Justice
- Conscious Discipline
- Whole School Reform models
- School wellness indicators
- Gifted education and accelerated learning opportunities, including advanced placement programs
- Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) strategies

- Early childhood developmentally appropriate practices
- Ongoing progress monitoring

Arizona Department of Education, School Support and Improvement Unit provides support, technical assistance and monitoring:

- Support the Comprehensive Needs Assessment including thorough root cause analyses
- Conduct differentiated on-site support visits based on needs
- Assist LEAs with the evidence-based decision-making process
- Support use of transparent robust high-quality data
- Support the development of LEA & School Integrated Action Plans and selection of evidenced-based interventions
- Support implementation & monitoring of LEA & School Integrated Action Plans
- Monitor strategies and action steps for progress, completion and success
- Support implementation of bold evidence-based LEA and school systems and structures to create powerful change
- Support and guide selection and implementation of innovative, locally selected evidence-based practices, strategies and interventions leading to dramatic increases in student achievement
- Review quarterly data submissions with reflections and next steps and discuss needed midcourse adjustments
- Review LEA resource allocation to comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools

Provide ongoing:

- Technical assistance
- Professional learning opportunities
- Systemic Leadership Development
- Coaching and mentoring support
- Monitoring for fidelity, progress of implementation
- Review and reflect on monitoring quantitative and qualitative data to inform improvement, in collaboration with the LEA/school/s.
- Review and revise LEA and /or School Integrated Action Plan in collaboration with the LEA/school/s.
- Strategic Partner (vetted external providers) support based on school specific needs matched with Strategic Partners areas of specific expertise
- Scheduled open office hours
- Ongoing desktop support as needed

Tiered Continuum of Comprehensive Supports to be provided by ADE: School Support and Improvement Unit

- Support provided primarily through the lens of the School Support and Improvement Unit for schools/LEAs currently in improvement status. Support may also leverage a form of cross-program area multidisciplinary collaborative team structure – though not as comprehensive and structured as Cross-Divisional Support.
    - Coordinated Support
        - Support provided involving two or more program areas, based on

school/LEA needs assessment data

- Program Area Support
  - Support provided by one program area, based on school/LEA needs assessment data
- Peer-to-Peer Support
  - Support provided through helping to connect schools / LEAs to other schools/LEAs with similar strengths and/or challenges.
- Self-Empowered Support
  - Resources and tools are provided to schools/LEAs for them to support their own local efforts, independent of ADE. Specific examples of evidenced-based interventions will be analyzed in collaboration with LEA stakeholders including the families of the students served by the LEA and community members.

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

[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.

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 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: (i) incidences of bullying and harassment;
(ii) the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom; and (iii) the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

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.

i. 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 a 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.

   Identifying: As a member of the Identification and Recruitment Rapid Response (IRRC) Consortium, the State Director and ID&R Coordinator work with 13 other states in planning identification strategies and supporting each other's efforts to identify and serve migratory students. 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. Local Education Agencies (LEAs), in their registration enrollment packet, have a survey for families to complete. After this information is completed and submitted to the LEA, families are contacted to determine if a face-to face interview is needed to enroll students in the Migrant Education Program. School-based identification and recruitment is only one-way Arizona identifies students. The LEA Migrant Education Program identifies migrant dropouts, out-of-school youth (OSY) and preschool students through recruitment activities when visiting families and participating in agribusiness

fairs. 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 family completes a needs assessment to determine the migratory students' educational needs as well as homelessness, educational interruption, and eligibility for Priority for Service (PFS). During this process preschool and Out of School Youth (OSY) are also identified.

Planning: In planning migrant student programs and projects, the SEA coordinates efforts with LEAs and local community organizations in order to ensure that the full-range of services are available to all migratory children. The Arizona Migrant Education Program works within the Office of English Acquisition Services and Title III, so it is able to collaboratively train LEAs on how to integrate Title III and Title I-C funds to appropriately meet the needs of migratory children. The Arizona Migrant Education Program joint-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 First Things First and the Early Childhood unit. When planning projects for OSY, the Migrant Education Program will work with the Director of Community Outreach for the agency. The State Migrant Parent Advisory Council (SMPAC) is also consulted and feedback is taken by the State on driving the measurable program objectives and strategies.

Implementation: The SEA will ensure that current information and best practices are communicated to LEA level migrant programs to ensure that services are implemented in the most effective manner possible. This support will be offered through in-person meetings as well as on-line to ensure maximum accessibility. At the LEA level, Migrant Education Programs conducts visits to the home tutoring program for migratory preschool students that operate throughout the regular academic year. The visit to the home program provides an approach from the home, school, and migrant educators to increase migrant students' preparedness for academic success. The OSY are screened using the Graduation and Outcomes for Success profile. The LEA will use this in building services to assist the student. Arizona is a Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) distribution state. Our OSY and high school students are directed to this program for credit recovery. 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. Migrant recruiters provide HSE information to OSY. The SEA facilitates an on-going working relationship at the LEA level with Chicanos Por La Casa for our migratory preschool students to attend preschool at their sites. Adelante Health is a partner who works with our State Migrant Office and LEAs to provide health services to our students and families. The State Migrant Education Program also works with the State Adult Education Office to promote and direct our OSY to HSE programs in the area where they are living.

Evaluation: The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office provides technical assistance and monitors the Migrant Education Program Sites to ensure that the full range of services is available for migratory children. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office evaluates and provides technical assistance and monitors the Migrant Education Program Sites to ensure that the full range of services is available for migratory children. The program works with Title III and Title I-A in annual LEA program monitoring to ensure that integration of federal programs, when allowable, is being utilized to ensure that appropriate services are being provided to migratory students. The Migrant

Education Program will review an LEAs Comprehensive Needs Assessment to evaluate whether or not 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 Office assesses the educational needs of the migratory children during the Comprehensive Needs Assessment. Identified needs are then addressed in the Service Delivery Plan. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office offers technical assistance to Migrant Education Program Sites in meeting the Measurable Program Outcomes (MPOs). Measurable Program Outcomes data is submitted annually to the Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office provides technical assistance and monitors the Migrant Education Program Sites so as to ensure that the strategies and Measurable Program Outcomes in the Service Delivery Plan are being achieved. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office works collaboratively with the Migrant Education Program Sites statewide to reach these outcomes. The SEA established Measurable Program Objectives (MPOs) and Outcomes in response to the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) completed in 2015 for the three-year Service Delivery Plan. The SEA will update these MPOs with a new Service Delivery Plan in 2018. The outcomes of the MPOs are measured by annual LEA surveys, regular monitoring, and SEA/LEA data. MPO #1: Due to various levels of MEP funding and staffing models, at least 75% of migrant parents will indicate having conversations with their children's teachers regarding how to provide educational support at home on the SY2016-2017 Migrant Parent Survey. MPO #2: Based on the needs of Migratory students, six professional development opportunities that address Direct Instruction, Education and Career Action Plan, and Response to Intervention will be provided to MEP instructional staff in SY2015-2016 and each year afterwards. MPO #3: The MEP LEAs will refer migrant parents to at least 4 meetings where academic success strategies are provided, discussed, promoted and practiced in SY2015-2016 and each year afterwards. MPO #4: Interventionists/MEP staff will set goals every quarter for PFS and at risk Migratory students and pull grades to assess progress. MPO #5: The drop-out rate of Migratory students will decrease by 1% for grade 11 and 2% for grade 12 in SY2016- 2017. MPO #6: More than 80% of MEP staff will indicate that the procedures used to identify PFS Migratory students are useful for timely identification of PFS Migratory students on the Migratory staff survey in SY2016-2017. MPO #7: All PFS Migratory students will indicate receiving intervention services on the SY2016-2017 Migrant student survey. MPO #8: According to the SY2015-2016 state assessment data, the academic gaps between PFS Migratory students non-PFS Migratory students will decrease by 2% compared to the SY2014-2015 data. MPO #9: Teachers will engage in no less than quarterly professional development specific to the academic needs of the local CNA of Migratory students in SY2015-2016 and each year afterwards. MPO #10: At least 70% of Migratory students will indicate on the SY2016-2017 migrant student survey that teachers personalize instruction to meet their academic needs. MPO #11: 100% of appropriate LEA staff will obtain resources and guidance from ADE regarding how to communicate the Arizona College and Career Ready Standards to MEP parents in SY2015-2016. MPO #12: At least 80% of migrant parents indicate that the MEP districts delivered information regarding Arizona College and Career Ready Standards to them clearly on the migrant parent survey administered in SY2016-2017. MPO #13: 100% of preschool migrant parents who fill out the SY2016-2017 migrant parent survey will indicate receiving referrals or local agency information regarding preschool programs. MPO #14: In SY2015-2016, increase the number of activities to identify Out of School Youth (OSY) by one activity each year through outreach efforts compared to SY2014- 2015. The number of identified OSY will be recorded in SY2016-2017 Consolidated State Plan Report. MPO #15:

100% of identified OSY reported in the SY2016-2017 Consolidated State Plan Performance Report will receive information about educational services specific to their situation. MPO #16: All Migratory students eligible for a summer program will be identified and referred to a summer program in SY2015-2016 and each year thereafter. MPO #17: MEP will identify 100% of Migratory students prior to the first day of summer school in SY2015-2016 and each year thereafter. MPO #18: The percentage of high school Migratory students who complete P.A.S.S. courses during summer of SY2015-2016 will be higher than that of SY2014-2015. MPO #19: The MEP will provide information regarding P.A.S.S. courses to all eligible migratory high-school students, during the SY2015-2016 school year and each year thereafter.

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 Migrant Education Program Sites ensure the timely record transfer of pertinent school records, including health information of migratory children. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office assists Migrant Education Program Sites if a request for records is made to the Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program works with school staff to locate historical and current records from migratory students transferring to their LEA. 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; the Mexican Consulate; the Arizona Interagency Farmworkers Coalition; Arizona Recruitment efforts extend to migrant work sites which include fields, nurseries, orchards, and dairies. 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 COE to verify migrant eligibility and documentation of all migrant data elements. The Arizona State Director, State ID&R Coordinator and LEA representatives participate in interstate collaboration with sending and receiving states. Arizona and California are continuing to develop interstate collaboration especially the Yuma and Salinas areas.

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 Office has determined Performance Goals, based on the findings from our most recent State Comprehensive Needs Assessment. The following goals are our priorities for the use of Title I, Part C funds in the State. Goal #1: that all migratory students will reach proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics. Goal #2: All English learners will become proficient in English and attain proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics. Goal #3: All migratory students graduate from high school. The Migrant Education Program sets a standard for Migrant Education Program Sites to use as a set of procedures that includes reviewing the grade history and formative and

summative assessment data for each newly identified migratory student. The local level enrollment information is recorded promptly and correctly, and site staff has access to assessment and enrollment data. The Arizona Department of Education Migrant Education Program Office provides training and technical assistance to Migrant Education Program Sites on the prompt identification and documentation of Priority for Service students. The Migrant Education Program Sites identify the Priority for Services students. Once a student of school age is identified as migrant, their "Priority for Service" is determined.
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. Title I, Part C funds are utilized to support Priority for Service migratory students in meeting each of these Performance Goals.

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;
   - Works with state agencies and LEAs 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;
   - 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.
   - Improve transition services by 3 percent.
   - 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 has created and is implementing with LEAs from different geographic regions and school demographics, an Arizona K-12 Academic Standards aligned Student Learning Objective (SLO) process to support the teacher evaluation process and in the end, improve student achievement. An important component of the Student Learning Objective process is the setting and reaching of goals aligned to these standards. Title II-A funds are utilized to support the Student Learning Objective process, including the professional learning involved in the basic knowledge of the process. Continued professional learning supported by Title II-A funds is required during the implementation phase. Additionally, the Arizona Department of Education provides free and low-cost trainings to strengthen teachers' content and instructional expertise to include Family and Community Engagement, Professional Development Roundtables, and Qualified Evaluator Academies are offered to educators and administrators.

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 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.

- **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.

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 Arizona Department of Education Certification Unit also is reviewing the relevant research and the policies of other states to determine the best course of action in developing, implementing and supporting a professional development system that will assist a teacher in identifying and displaying completed professional learning opportunities.

3. 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 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, and models. 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. Examples of these professional development opportunities and trainings include: Teachers' Institute, a conference serving both special and general education teachers grades preK-12; Directors' Institute, a conference serving special education directors in Arizona focusing on updates to federal and state requirements related to special education; Multi-Tier Behavior Supports (MTBS) Readiness Overview, an in-person or webinar that informed participants on the requirements and components of the MTBS implementation training; Assistive Technology training, a capacity building series related to assistive technology (AT); Leading Change, the premier conference for Arizona administrators who leave with important updates, new information, and relevant leadership techniques; LETRS, and intensive professional development opportunity that increases teacher knowledge of literacy so that participants are provided with comprehensive and practical knowledge of how children learn to read, write, and spell and how they can use this knowledge to improve and focus instruction; OELAS Conference, providing meaningful professional development opportunities for educators of ELLs, designed to help meet the unique challenges faced in the Structured English Immersion or mainstream classroom; Balance Writing Instruction for the SEI K-2 Classroom, a workshop focusing on foundational writing instruction in the K-2 Structured English Immersion classroom; Differentiating for ELLs Using an Individual Language Learner Plan, a workshop focusing on the ILLP as a plan to ensure teachers effectively differentiate for ELL students; and the SEI New Teacher Academy, a two-day academy that acquaints new teachers with the requirements of the four hour SEI Models, instructional components, and the English Language Proficiency Standards.

The School Support and Improvement Unit offers ELEVATE, a systemic leadership development program that develops and empowers LEA and school leaders to focus on improving teaching and learning that results in rapid and significant gains in student achievement. It is an evidence-based two-year program designed for LEA and school teams to learn and plan collaboratively. It intentionally develops the skills and competencies of leaders to create an effective instructional infrastructure that includes high quality curriculum; high quality teaching, encompassing MTSS framework, data driven instruction, and observation and feedback; a cohesive, balanced assessment framework with responsive data systems and structures as well as to enhance the culture of learning and high expectations for all and to establish systems of talent management.

Additionally, School Support and Improvement offers professional learning opportunities around the required schools structures including standards and evidence-based curriculum, balanced assessment systems, observation and feedback systems, professional learning communities, multitiered systems of support and instructional pedagogy. Specially designed trainings based on specific identified needs are also available.

4. 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. This year, after analysis of this data, the theme of ADE's Educator Evaluation Summit VIII in June will be "Beyond Ratings: Using Educator Evaluation for Professional Growth and Support."

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. The Title II-A staff conducts quarterly ADE Roundtables in three population center locations addressing the following content areas to seek input on the effectiveness and appropriateness of the activities presented by the agency: Human Resources, Professional Learning, and Educator Evaluation. Participants represent both district and charter LEAs, including teachers, principals, school leaders, LEA leadership, and professional education organizations such as the Arizona School Personnel Administrators Association and the Title I Committee of Practitioners. Examples of topics addressed at these roundtables include retention and recruitment issues and successful practices related to both utilizing Title II-A funds, evidence based, embedded, ongoing, effective professional learning opportunities at all levels, and educator evaluation as it aligns to the Arizona Framework for Measuring Educator Evaluation and is utilized for improving educator growth.

Furthermore, the Title II-A staff conducts "Road Shows" on a variety of topics, including Ensuring Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, Educator Evaluation, Certification and Title I and II updates to gain input from both urban and rural LEAs in the state. Arizona is a very remote state, with many LEAs operating more than five hours from the department's headquarters in Phoenix. These road shows, and the roundtables mentioned in the previous paragraph allow for opportunities to meet face-to-face with stakeholders in rural areas.

5. 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) has assigned Education Program Specialists who assist all eligible entities in utilizing the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) in effective instruction to meet long-term goals of proficiency on the AZELLA.

Professional development, including formative assessments and progress monitoring, is provided to eligible entities to support effective language acquisition programs. In addition, the ELPS are aligned to the State's academic content standards and a cross-walk was developed to assist English learners in meeting these challenging State academic standards.

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 files and paperwork, and classroom language instruction. 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 adjustments, and are monitored again the following year. Any LEA with a corrective action finding is provided technical assistance by SEA Education Program Specialists, including professional learning for staff, teachers and administrators.

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
   - Supporting 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, to include arts education and arts integration programs, accelerated learning opportunities and gifted education programs and services, 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, 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 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 for 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, music and physical education, mentoring, 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. The process has resulted in a 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) completed by the fiscal agent of 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 provides signatures of responsible parties for each category of service provision, management and fiscal oversight, which provides assurance that the capacity to manage a federal grant accountably and in compliance with all requirements and regulations; data collection, evaluation and reporting is in place.
- Private School Consultation Form
- Statement of Assurance of Original Work
- Statement of Assurance of Community Notification

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: 1) Application submitted by the due date and time 2) 40% or higher Free and Reduced Lunch count 3) Complete Application and 4) 4. Correct Application (written to serve students of one school site). Further, based on a rubric, if any of the following criteria are not met, the application may not move on for Peer Review: 1) Charter Board Compliance Check – good standing. This check relates to the charter contract as well as state, federal and local laws; 2) Arizona Grant Management- good standing with fiscal management and reporting, no programmatic holds; 3) 21st CCLC Prior Grant – good standing, compliant with grant requirements and 4) 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 on low standing in Federal and Arizona State Accountability labels for the year prior to application submission.

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.

   Given the purpose of this subpart to address the unique needs of rural school districts that frequently lack the personnel and resources needed to compete effectively for Federal competitive grants, and receive formula grant allocations in amounts too small to be effective in meeting their intended purposes, LEAs participating in the Rural and Low- Income School program will be supported to flexibly leverage funds received through this subpart to locally meet Arizona's identified long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rate, and English language proficiency as outlined in section (A)(4)(iii) for Arizona's school and LEA accountability system.

   The primary program: objective and outcome for the RLIS program will be:

   - All students in participating schools meeting or exceeding challenging state academic standards, as measured by Arizona's statewide accountability system.

     Specific measurable program objectives, outcomes and activities for each participating LEA related to the Rural and Low-Income School program will be driven by local Comprehensive Needs Assessments completed by each participating school and the development of aligned Integrated Action Plans at the school and LEA level. Additional locally identified program objectives, as identified and driven by local the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, may include:

     - All English language learners meeting or exceeding goals for gaining English language proficiency;
     - All students graduating from high school;
     - All students accessing a well-rounded education; and,
     - All students receiving instruction from highly effective, appropriately certified, instructional staff.

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 the development of local plans for the use of funds consistent with ESEA section 5222(a), that may include activities authorized under Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III; Title IV, Part A; and parental involvement activities. Technical assistance will include support for grant programmatic and fiscal application processes, coordination with applicable allowable program areas, support for LEAs regarding effective uses of funds and promising practices and

supporting peer-to-peer collaboration and communication between LEAs with awards under this Subpart.

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 and others.

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.

   Identification of children and youth experiencing homelessness will primarily be the responsibility of local educational agencies, using the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act (per Title IX, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act) definition of homelessness; (A) means individuals who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence (within the meaning of section 103(a) (1)). SEA supports LEA by providing support through annual training, professional development and identification tools, in addition to materials provided by the National Technical Assistance Provider. Upon identification and enrollment, local educational agencies will assess the needs of children and youth experiencing homelessness through a locally developed informal needs assessment tool.

   Specific strategies that will be employed by the SEA include:
   - Provide training to homeless liaisons regarding requirements specific to the McKinney Vento Act using in-person as well as on-line strategies to ensure maximum accessibility to the trainings.
   - Expand training opportunities to include specific needs related to runaways.
   - Monitor LEA implementation of the requirements in the McKinney Vento Act.
   - Ensure that LEAs make school placement decisions based upon the best interests and needs of the homeless children and youth.
   - Monitor to ensure that LEAs follow guidelines related to the immediate enrollment of children and youth who are identified as homeless.
     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 with the purpose of providing an opportunity for the parent/guardian/unaccompanied youth to dispute a local educational agency decision on eligibility, school selection, and enrollment or transportation feasibility. The procedure

ensures a prompt resolution with a full timeline of review and delivery of decision within 14 working days.

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 interim progress

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

A. Academic Achievement

3rd Grade ELA									
Subgroups	**Baseline**	2018	2021	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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

9th Grade ELA									
Subgroups	**Baseline**	2018	2021	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
FAY only 2016	36	43	50	56	63	70	77	83	90
Black or African-American	25	33	41	49	58	66	74	82	90
Hispanic or Latino	25	33	41	49	58	66	74	82	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	15	24	34	43	53	62	71	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	38	45	51	58	64	71	77	84	90
Multiple Races	44	50	56	61	67	73	79	84	90
White (non-Hispanic)	49	54	59	64	70	75	80	85	90
Asian	62	66	69	73	76	80	83	87	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	23	31	40	48	57	65	73	82	90
SPED	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

10th Grade ELA									
Sub Groups	**Baseline**	2018	2021	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
FAY only 2016	30	38	45	53	60	68	75	83	90
Black or African-American	21	30	38	47	56	64	73	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	32	39	47	54	61	68	76	83	90
Multiple Races	37	44	50	57	64	70	77	83	90
White (non-Hispanic)	42	48	54	60	66	72	78	84	90
Asian	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	4	15	26	36	47	58	69	79	90
Economically Disadvantaged	18	27	36	45	54	63	72	81	90
SPED	5	16	26	37	48	58	69	79	90

11th Grade ELA									
Sub Groups	**Baseline**	2018	2021	2024	**2027**	2030	2033	2036	**2039**
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									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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

Algebra 1 (tested prior to HS)									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
FAY only	78	80	81	83	84	86	87	89	90
Black or African-American	64	67	71	74	77	80	84	87	90
Hispanic or Latino	69	72	74	77	80	82	85	87	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	55	59	64	68	73	77	81	86	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	56	60	65	69	73	77	82	86	90
Multiple Races	78	80	81	83	84	86	87	89	90
White (non-Hispanic)	83	84	85	86	87	87	88	89	90
Asian	87	87	88	88	89	89	89	90	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	68	71	74	76	79	82	85	87	90
Economically Disadvantaged	67	70	73	76	79	81	84	87	90
SPED	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90

Geometry (tested prior to HS)									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
FAY only	85	86	86	87	88	88	89	89	90
Black or African-American	69	72	74	77	80	82	85	87	90
Hispanic or Latino	77	79	80	82	84	85	87	88	90
American Indian or Alaska Native	79	80	82	83	85	86	87	89	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	83	84	85	86	87	87	88	89	90
Multiple Races	89	89	89	89	90	90	90	90	90
White (non-Hispanic)	87	87	88	88	89	89	89	90	90
Asian	88	88	89	89	89	89	90	90	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90
Economically Disadvantaged	77	79	80	82	84	85	87	88	90
SPED	60	64	68	71	75	79	83	86	90

Algebra 2 (tested prior to HS)									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
FAY only	78	80	81	83	84	86	87	89	90
Black or African-American	*								90
Hispanic or Latino	*								90
American Indian or Alaska Native	*								90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	*								90
Multiple Races	*								90
White (non-Hispanic)	75	77	79	81	83	84	86	88	90
Asian	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	*								90
Economically Disadvantaged	*								90
SPED	*								90
*** Denotes sub group population less than 10.**									

Algebra 1 (tested in HS)									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
FAY only	29	37	44	52	60	67	75	82	90
Black or African-American	21	30	38	47	56	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	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
Multiple Races	31	38	46	53	61	68	75	83	90
White (non-Hispanic)	39	45	52	58	65	71	77	84	90
Asian	53	58	62	67	72	76	81	85	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	8	18	29	39	49	59	70	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	22	31	39	48	56	65	73	82	90
SPED	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

Geometry (tested in HS)									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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	18	27	36	45	54	63	72	81	90
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	34	41	48	55	62	69	76	83	90
Multiple Races	37	44	50	57	64	70	77	83	90
White (non-Hispanic)	45	51	56	62	68	73	79	84	90
Asian	58	62	66	70	74	78	82	86	90
ELL (Plus FEP 1-4)	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90
Economically Disadvantaged	23	31	40	48	57	65	73	82	90
SPED	6	17	27	38	48	59	69	80	90

Algebra 2 (tested in HS)									
	Baseline	2018	2021	2024	2027	2030	2033	2036	2039
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	2024	2027	2030 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 12^{th} 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	2022 Interim Objective	2024 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%

Appendix B

OMB Control No. 1894-0005 (Exp. 03/31/2017)

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.