



Purpose of the Consolidated Plan

All states must apply to the U.S. Department of Education in order to receive federal funds to serve disadvantaged students. This grant application, called a Consolidated Plan, covers nine program areas and about \$83 million. It does not include federal funds for students with disabilities or for the nutrition programs funded through the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Plan Development

In the past, Idaho's Consolidated Plan application drove development of, and changes to, the state's accountability system. In 2013, the development of the state's accountability system and measures shifted to follow recommendations from the [Governor's Task Force for Improving Education](#), specifically: "Recommendation 5: Revamp the State's Accountability Structure Involving Schools. We recommend the state revamp the accountability structure involving schools. The existing structure that relies on compliance mandates should be replaced with a system that is based on accountability for student outcomes."

Since then, public school accountability in Idaho has shifted away from federal compliance and toward a system designed by Idahoans, for Idaho. The State Board of Education (SBOE), the State Department of Education (SDE), and the Office of the Governor have worked with the Legislature to create the following comprehensive accountability tools focusing on student outcomes for local school districts and charter schools (referred to collectively as local education agencies or LEAs), which include pieces for federal compliance:

- Career Ladder annual evaluation of teachers and pupil personnel with inclusion of student performance goals in those evaluations
- Annual testing including English/language arts and mathematics grades 3-8 and 10; college entrance exam 11th grade; three grade levels for science; high school civics test; and twice yearly reading assessments in kindergarten through 3rd grades
- Local Continuous Improvement Plans that set goals for annual improvement and reviewing student progress
- Local Annual Literacy Intervention Plans
- Local College and Career Advising and Mentoring Plans

In December 2015, the U.S. Congress reauthorized the federal law governing education programs with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), shifting major decision making to states.

Accountability Framework

In January 2016, The State Board of Education tasked the Accountability Oversight Committee (AOC) with "with providing comprehensive recommendations to establish a new K-12 statewide accountability system." Working side by side with the SDE staff, the AOC created an Accountability Framework, drawing on the accountability work under way since 2013, that would be incorporated into the Consolidated Plan for ESSA. The Accountability Framework underwent extensive public review and was finalized in February 2017 by the legislature.



A team at the SDE has been working with the AOC to apply and implement the new framework into the Consolidated Plan. The SDE assembled work groups that included teachers, administrators, and others to shape pieces of the plan to align with the framework and the intent of the AOC. Below is a summary of the major pieces of the Consolidated Plan, which is currently being reviewed by stakeholders as the state finalizes the plan for submission to the U.S. Department of Education in September.

Programs in the Plan

Grant Title	Program	2017 Estimate
Title I, Part A	I-A Grants to Local Educational Agencies	\$58,524,938
Title I, Part C	State Agency Program--Migrant	\$3,342,283
Title I, Part D	State Agency Program--Neglected and Delinquent	\$624,564
Title II, Part A	Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants	\$9,722,812
Title III, Part A	English Language Acquisition	\$2,123,699
Title IV, Part A	Student Support & Academic Enrichment Grants	\$1,940,000
Title IV, Part B	21st Century Community Learning Centers	\$ 5,839,198
Title V, Part B	Rural and Low-income Schools Program	\$647,113
Title IX, Part B	Homeless Children and Youth Education	\$280,330
		\$83,044,937

Title I-A Grants to Local Educational Agencies

This program supports children who are failing or are at risk of failing. States and LEAs receive Title I-A funds based on census data and schools receive funds based on their low-income student percentage. Almost all Title I-A funds are distributed directly to LEAs.

In this section of the plan, beginning on page 5, the state describes how it will hold LEAs and schools accountable for the use of federal funds, including how the state will use indicators to annually review progress toward long-term goals and how the state will identify the 5% of lowest performing Title I schools for additional support, as well as similarly performing non-Title I schools. The major components are:

- [Long-Term Goals](#)
- [Annual Review of All Schools](#)
- [Identification of Low Performing and Recognition Schools](#)
- [Providing Support to Identified Schools](#)



Long-Term Goals *(page 10)*

The new law shifted setting of goals away from the federal government to the states. States must set long-term goals in math, English language arts, graduation rate and English learner proficiency. While the state may determine its method for goal setting, the law requires that the same method be applied to all students and groups of disadvantaged students. Progress toward Idaho's goals will be reviewed each year and shared publicly on the annual report card. The charts below show the long-term goals in the plan set for 2022 using baseline data from 2016.

The plan describes Idaho's goal to reduce the percentage of "non-proficient" students by one-third (33%) over six years. This goal does not replace LEA-level Continuous Improvement Plans, which is the existing progress monitoring tool in Idaho's accountability system.

Math and English/Language Arts Proficiency

	English/Language Arts		Mathematics	
	2016 Baseline	2022 Long-Term Goal	2016 Baseline	2022 Long-Term Goal
Goal: Reduce the percentage of all non-proficient students by one-third over six years.				
All students	53.0	68.6	41.6	60.8
Economically disadvantaged	40.6	60.4	30.3	51.3
Students with disabilities	15.0	43.2	15.2	42.8
English language proficiency	6.9	37.5	7.1	37.7
Minority students (non-white)	37.4	58.9	25.8	49.8

Idaho's graduation rate goal is to reduce the percentage of "non-graduating" students by 75% over six years.

Graduation Rate

	2016 Baseline	2022 Long-Term Goal
Goal: Reduce the percentage of all non-graduating students by half over six years. The baseline year is 2016.		
All students	78.9	92.5
Economically disadvantaged students	72.0	90.0
Students with disabilities	58.4	85.1
English language proficiency	72.3	90.1
Minority students (non-white)	72.3	90.1



Rationale: Long-Term Goals

This goal setting methodology accomplishes three important objectives:

- *Goals are ambitious and achievable. For example, the English/Language Arts achievement goal for the all students group is to increase by 2.6 percentage points annually, whereas historically underperforming groups improve faster in order to close achievement gaps.*
- *All schools and student groups can show improvement, regardless of their baseline achievement level*
- *The graduation rate goal is aligned to the State Board of Education's goal for graduation rates in Idaho.*

The plan also sets long-term goals for English language proficiency, which is a new requirement under ESSA. In 2017, the SDE had just one year of assessment data to use for goal setting, so this goal will be reviewed and possibly revised in the future.

Annual Review of All Schools (page 14)

ESSA requires the state to publicly and annually differentiate between all public schools each year based on annual performance on academic and school quality indicators chosen by the state. The state will publish an annual report card, showing the progress of all public schools on Idaho's Accountability Framework indicators. The report card will display how each school's results compare to other schools in the state using a percentile, and schools will be compared to other schools like them (K-8 schools, high schools, and alternative high schools).

Schools will not be assigned a summative score, such as a letter grade or number of stars. The first report card will be published in 2018-19, and student groups that include 5 students or more will be reported.

Rationale: Annual Meaningful Differentiation

Stakeholder feedback favored using multiple indicators to monitor and differentiate among the state's schools. Using a report card to give a more complete picture of a school, rather than using multiple indicators to create a summative score, will allow the public to look beyond a single rating. Summative ratings mask areas of improvement and success at a school.

Identification of the Lowest Performing Schools (page 23)

ESSA requires the state to identify the lowest performing 5% of schools receiving federal Title I funding. Every three years, the state will use three years of data from some indicators in the Accountability Framework to identify the lowest overall performing 5% of schools, which are called Comprehensive Support and Improvement schools. These schools will receive school improvement grants for the year in which they are identified and the two years following. Non-Title I schools also will be identified, however federal law prohibits the state from offering identical financial support to Title I and non-Title I schools (referred to as supplement-not-supplant). Idaho will use these five indicators for identification:



- Mathematics
- English language arts/literacy
- Graduation rate
- English learner proficiency
- School quality

The Accountability Framework contains several school quality indicators. One of the considerations in using school quality indicators for school identification is that the indicator must be disaggregated by student group. Idaho will use a college and career readiness indicator for identification of high schools and alternative high schools, and a school climate survey for K-8 schools. These indicators may change in subsequent years depending on feedback from educators, parents, and other education stakeholders.

Comprehensive Title I schools will be eligible for additional federal funding, and both Comprehensive and Targeted schools will receive support from the SDE. Whereas student groups with 5 or more students are reported generally, only student groups with 25 or more students will be used for school identification.

After three years, if a Comprehensive school does not show improvement, the superintendent of public instruction will refer the LEA to the State Board of Education. The board will direct the use of the LEA's funds for local school board training toward school improvement leadership.

The state will also annually identify schools as "Targeted Support and Improvement" schools if they have large achievement gaps between historically disadvantaged student groups and their peers or if a specific student group is very low performing. This methodology is described beginning on page 25. If a school with a very low performing student group does not show improvement for three consecutive years, the school moves into Comprehensive identification.

Recognizing School Success *(page 24)*

ESSA does not require the state to identify high performing schools. Under Idaho's plan, schools that are either in the 90th percentile or above for each indicator or that have met their interim progress goals based on the state's long-term goals will be recognized each year by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the indicator or indicators for which a school is in the top 10 percent will be recognized on the school's report card.



Rationale: Identification of Lowest and Highest Performing Schools

In designing Idaho's school identification methodology, the SDE learned lessons from past models, which were confusing to the public and to educators.

Schools should be identified using a calculation that is simple, transparent, and easy to explain and understand for people without advanced degrees in statistics or psychometrics. Prioritizing simplicity comes at a cost. Advanced statistical methods are harder for people other than statistical experts to understand because they attempt to adjust for diverse factors that may skew the results for a school depending on its context. However, in the tradeoff between simple and transparent versus sophisticated and confusing, the SDE is proposing the former.

Idaho's school identification methodology is designed to focus on a specific type of school: a school that is both low achieving and not improving.

Identifying Comprehensive schools every three years empowers identified schools with a realistic timeline to drive sustainable school improvement. In prior, federally required iterations of school accountability, schools were re-identified annually with no opportunity to take a deliberate, planned approach to improvement. ESSA requires that Targeted schools be identified annually.

Recognizing schools that are high achieving, quickly improving, or both is an important component of school accountability. Stakeholder feedback indicated a desire to avoid a summative "Reward" category because the calculation would invariably leave out some schools that deserve recognition. Therefore, Idaho will recognize schools who are top performers on each indicator in the Accountability Framework.

School Improvement (page 28)

Data for all schools will be reported annually. Comprehensive schools will have three years to write an improvement plan and implement their improvement strategies, including selecting from a menu of supports provided by the SDE, which can be found on pages 29-37. The SDE will use data from each school to monitor progress and act as a critical friend to each school as implementation is under way. Idaho also requires LEAs and local school boards to annually monitor all schools every year through local Continuous Improvement Plans. If an identified school does not improve, the state will move to more rigorous interventions found on page 27.

Rationale: School Improvement

ESSA allows the state flexibility to act as a support for schools and LEAs instead of requiring a rigid set of interventions. This allows the SDE to dedicate time and talent to robust progress monitoring and coordination of interventions. The SDE will create a team that includes representatives from the school and LEA as well as diverse state supports to monitor progress and be a support team for each school identified during the three-year improvement cycle. This team will be able to target support to schools based on needs according to the data.



Other Title Programs *(page 43)*

In the past, most dialogue around the Consolidated Plan has focused on Title I-A, where the majority of the funding is received. Most of the other titled programs are highly prescriptive for specific categories of disadvantaged children.

Title I-C: Education of Migrant Children

This federal support for students identified as migrant flows to LEAs serving those students on a formula basis. Migrant students have unique needs and the state and LEAs must ensure that these needs, including those for preschool migrant children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, are identified and addressed through:

- The full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, state, and federal educational programs.
- Joint planning among local, state, and federal educational programs serving migratory children, including language instruction educational programs under the Title III English Language Acquisition and Enhancement Program.
- The integration of services available under Title I, Part C, with services provided by other local, state, and federal educational programs.
- The establishment of measurable program objectives and outcomes.

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

Students who are placed in facilities because of legal issues or neglect need to have educational support while residing in those institutions. This program provides a transition between those facilities and the LEA.

There are four objectives and outcomes within this program:

- Provide for individualization of the instructional experience.
- Ensure that all students accrue school credits to meet state academic content achievement standards.
- Ensure that students have the opportunity to transition to a regular school or educational program operated by a LEA or are able to graduate from secondary school and/or obtain employment after leaving the facility.
- Allow students the opportunity to participate in postsecondary education and job training programs.

Title II-A: Supporting Effective Instruction

Equitable access to effective teachers is essential for a successful educational program. Title II-A funds flow to LEAs and are used to provide professional development for educators to improve student achievement. These funds also include supporting paraprofessionals to become certified teachers and providing mentoring and instructional coaches. Funding at the state level is targeted at these areas:



- Idaho Principal Mentoring Project – Support for new principals.
- School Libraries – Support for a cooperative project with the Idaho Commission for Libraries to train school librarians.
- Instructional Framework – Provide training in the Danielson Framework for Teaching for certified staff across the state.
- Mentorship and coaching – Ensure teacher-to-teacher mentors are well-prepared and contribute to high-quality learning in classrooms.

Title III-A: English Language Acquisition and Enhancement

LEAs receive funds to provide support and instruction in English for students not fluent in English. The state also has developed entrance criteria that ensure that any student who is an English learner is assessed in a timely manner (30 days) following enrollment in school. English language proficiency is progress monitored and exit criteria is developed to inform LEAs when students do not need additional support. These funds are distributed to LEAs with identified English learners based on a formula.

Title IV-A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants

This program provides additional funds to support LEAs in providing equitable access to a well-rounded education for students. Funds may be used to support programs such as increasing access to technology, STEM education, programs to provide drug prevention and ensure safety in schools, as well as programs in the arts. This program is currently slated to begin in 2018-19 and 95% of the funding is distributed to LEAs using a formula.

Title IV-B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Funds for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers help LEAs offer after school programs that allow for academic support to students. Programs also must have an enrichment component. The grants are competitive.

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

This program offers after school opportunities that allow for academic support and enrichment to students in the form of competitive grants. The amount of funds allocated to rural and low-income LEAs can be supplemented by funds from this program. This allows LEAs with small allocations and high needs due to high poverty, or lack of resources due to their rural location, to combine these funds.

Title VII, Subpart B: McKinney-Vento Act Homeless Education

Homeless students have additional challenges and LEAs use these funds to identify those children. This allows the LEAs to monitor their progress so that academically at-risk students can receive extra support. LEAs must ensure that the student's education is as stable as possible and that the student remains in the home school when it is in their best interest.