

Idaho State Department of Education Consolidated State Plan

Draft

November 2016

DRAFT

Contents

Section 1: Long-Term Goals and Measurements of Interim Progress 1

Section 2: Consultation and Coordination 6

Section 3:Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments 9

Section 4: Accountability Support and Improvement for Schools..... 19

Section 6: Supporting All Students..... 59

DRAFT

DRAFT

Section 1: Introduction to the Idaho Consolidated State Plan

Idaho is a unique state. Situated in the northwest, Idaho has two time zones (Mountain and Pacific) and encompasses a land mass larger than all of New England. Idaho is the 13th largest state in terms of land and the 7th least densely populated state in the United States. Idaho is home to only approximately 1.6 million people. More than a third of the population lives in the Boise metropolitan area. Other states may struggle with issues related to urban education, in Idaho the challenge is ensuring students in rural and remote areas of the state have the same educational opportunities as students who live in population centers.

Given the land mass and the limited resources, Idaho is fortunate to have a single State Board of Education (SBOE) that oversees its entire P–20 education system. This promotes consistency and allows for strategic planning across the entire education continuum, from kindergarten through college or career attainment. While SBOE has oversight over the entire system, the Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE), under the direction of the constitutionally elected State Superintendent is responsible for managing the K–12 system. The State Superintendent is part of the State Board and the two agencies are housed in the same building. SBOE’s strategic plan has three goals; (1) well-educated citizenry, (2) innovation and economic development, and (3) effective an efficient educational system. ISDE’s strategic plan supports the vision of SBOE’s (*An Idaho Education: High Potential–High Achievement*) and goals but focuses specifically within the K–12 system. ISDE also has three main goals; (1) all Idaho students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers, (2) all education stakeholders in Idaho are mutually responsible for accountability and student progress, and (3) Idaho attracts and retains great teachers and leaders.

The last time Idaho wrote a State Consolidated plan was in 2002. Idaho has submitted waivers for revisions to its State Consolidated Plan written under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), but the passage of the *Every Student Succeeds Act*, offered an opportunity for Superintendent Ybarra and her staff to re-examine all processes and meet her concept for ISDE as a place of support for LEAs and schools. The Idaho State Consolidated Plan is the result of a year’s worth of work by the staff of ISDE, input and oversight from SBOE and Governor’s Office, as well as from approximately 1,200 stakeholders.

Framework for the Consolidated State Plan

According to guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, all Consolidated State Plans must address the following five components:

1. Consultation and coordination
2. Challenging academic standards and academic assessments
3. Accountability, support, and improvement of schools
4. Supporting excellent educators
5. Supporting all students

Idaho has chosen to create one consolidated plan that reflects the goals of both SBOE and ISDE and includes all programs covered under ESSA as well as programs under Special Education and the State.

Performance Management and Technical Assistance

Under Idaho code, SBOE is the SEA. However, in matters related to K–12 education, ISDE oversees federal programs covered by ESSA. SDE has two distinct functions regarding the implementation of ESSA, (1) ensure that all LEAs and schools are meeting the statutory and regulatory requirements of ESSA and (2) ensure that LEAs and schools in need of additional and differentiated technical assistance based on need.

ISDE has collected feedback from LEAs and worked to ease the burden of monitoring performance by doing consolidated monitoring of federal programs. All LEAs and schools are monitored on a regular basis. A description of the process can be found in the Supporting All Students Section of this plan and a detailed description is available on ISDE’s web site <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/program-monitoring>. Graphic 1 is a visual representation of the process (page break and insert Graphic 1, ISDE monitoring process)

Idaho's ESSA Planning Process

SBOE and ISDE have collected a great deal of concise information from stakeholders in their ESSA planning process. A summary of the process can be found in the Consultation and Coordination section of the State Consolidated Plan. What should be added is how the State's *ESSA Core Leadership Team* used the data over the course of 2016 to create the State's Consolidated Plan. ISDE completed the strategic plan for the agency in 2015. Initial conversations around the implementation of the strategic plan became part of the design process of ESSA. The Core team recognized two mutually dependent parts, the Accountability System and the School Improvement System. Both rely on the meaningful functioning of the other. In a broad philosophical sense the Accountability Systems drives informed decision making, e.g., identification of lowest performing schools, and allocation of resources, and the School Improvement System determines the effectiveness of those decisions (e.g., the productive use of the applied resources).

With those two variables in place, the other parts of the State consolidated plan were considered. It is the belief of ISDE that an effective process for performance management is needed in order to maximize the effectiveness technical assistance provided to LEAs. *Therefore the ESSA Core Leadership Team has and will continue to meet weekly as the plan is implemented with the goal of meeting less frequently as other systems are put into place.* The ESSA Core Leadership Team is comprised of the Chief Deputy Superintendent, Chief Planning and Policy Officer of the State Board of Education, Deputy Superintendent of Academic Performance, Community Relations Officer, Chief Policy Officer, Associate Deputy of Federal Programs, Chief Information Officer, Title I Director, and School Improvement Coordinator. The ESSA Core Team is supported by the Northwest Comprehensive Center and Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. Once schools have been identified the ESSA Core Leadership Team will meet less frequently, but will be replaced by the *State Assistance Team (SAT)*.

SAT will be comprised of the Deputy Superintendent of Academic Performance, Community Relations Officer, Associate Deputy of Federal Programs, Title I Director, Director of Special Education, Director of Title III, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, and School Improvement Coordinator. Depending upon the needs of the schools identified for comprehensive or targeted assistance other specialists will be asked to provide input.

SAT will provide differentiated technical assistance to all LEAs requesting it during the planning phase. In deference to "local control" a LEA may determine that has the capabilities to write it's on unique School Improvement Plan. All LEAs with comprehensive and targeted school will be required to submit the Plan to SAT for review and determination of its comprehensive approach to the identified findings of the Accountability System.

Idaho's SAT System

Step 1: All LEAs with comprehensive and target schools will be required to submit their School Improvement Plans to SAT for evaluation of completeness, and thoroughness. Technical assistance may be provided by SAT, if specifically requested. The assistance may be in the form of providing assistance in drafting a comprehensive plan, defining evidenced based interventions, defining key indicators to measurer and monitor, periodic data collection, evaluation of the data, and necessary correction needed in the interventions. The committee will use the data information contained in the plans as a component in their analysis of school progress.

Step 2: SAT will also be responsible for the periodic collection of monitoring data to demonstrate progress toward improving student outcomes, once again in collaboration with the LEA. Monitoring data should be submitted and evaluated on a defined schedule as established in the LEA School Improvement Plan.

Step 3: SAT in collaboration with the LEA will evaluate and monitor the submitted data to determine if the defined interventions are improving student outcomes. Assessment of the data should be an iterative process, meaning an initial benchmark of student comprehension, delivery of the prescribed intervention, a second assessment of progress, continued intervention, and third assessment. At this point the LEA and the SAT should determine if the defined intervention(s) are producing measurable student progress toward a defined outcome.

Step 4: If the conclusion of SAT and the LEA is that the intervention(s) are producing student progress toward a desirable outcome then it is incumbent on them to continue to monitor for progress and ensure continued technical assistance and resources. If the monitoring of data demonstrates no improvement in student progress toward desired outcome(s) within a specified period of time, SAT in collaboration with the LEA should determine modification to the intervention(s), or a redefinition of intervention. The new or modified intervention should be implemented and the monitoring for success should begin again.

If the school no longer falls in the category of comprehensive support due to the significant increase in achievement and/or growth or it is the conclusion of the SAT that the schools processes and procedures will result in higher levels of student outcomes, ISDE and the LEA will discuss termination of status and a plan for interim measures of progress, student data, and scaffolded support.

Step 5: ISDE through SAT has access to a wide variety of resources, including funding, expertise (such as math and ELA coaches), leadership training, assessment development, indicator definition, planning and implementation. The allocation of these resources would first be applied to those comprehensive and targeted schools.

Given that SAT will have members who are part of ISDE's executive team, ISDE will have an internal system of control with weekly feedback provided to the Superintendent and cabinet. SAT members will also be responsible (Associate Deputy of Federal Programs and Federal Programs Director) for continuing to convene regular meetings of the ESSA Core Leadership Team for their input. Through both the Northwest Regional Education Lab and the Northwest Comprehensive Center, ISDE, SAT, and the Core Leadership Team will have access to technical assistance as well as other states to brainstorm challenges. If needed, NWCC will also connect ISDE with content centers across the country.

The Community Relations Officer will provide regular updates and seek input from the various stakeholder groups such as the Regional Superintendents, Idaho Association of School Administrators, the Idaho Education Association, Idaho School Boards Association, Idaho Business for Education, as well as SBOE and the Idaho Legislature. Individual directors and coordinators (Title I, Indian Education, Migrant, McKinney Vento, Title IV-A, Title III, Migrant, and so on) will include ESSA updates and seek input at all stakeholder meetings.

The Idaho School Boards Association will be a particularly important thought partner to ISDE and LEAs if outcomes do not improve. A goal of ISDE is “collective accountability.”

Idaho has a sophisticated statewide system of support. It includes a range of technical assistance to LEAs and schools, from on-site leadership coaching for district and school teams, to instructional strategies for students with low incidence disabilities. It will be the role of the SAT to ensure priority is given to schools identified for comprehensive support, targeted support, and/or serving high percentages of at-risk students. A principle of Idaho’s state system is to ensure there is a through line from programs created and administered by ISDE into the classroom. The working philosophy is:

You don't change performance without changing the instructional core. The relationship of the teacher and the student in the presence of content must be at the center of effort to improve performance. If you can't see it in the classroom, it's not there.

—Richard Elmore, Harvard University

A description of the services available to schools can be found in the School Improvement Section of this plan or through ISDE’s website, <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/sis/>.

2.1 Timely and Meaningful Consultation

A. Public Notice

Provide evidence of the public notice that the SEA provided in compliance with the requirements under §200.21(b)(1)-(3), of the SEA's processes and procedures for developing and adopting its consolidated State plan.

Appendix A shows the official press release asking for stakeholder input to ISDE's ESSA plan. ISDE endeavors to release communication that is accessible to all stakeholders, and has worked with the relevant agencies to ensure that its materials are available and visible to individuals with special needs.

B. Outreach and Input

For each of the four components of the consolidated State plan listed below, describe how the SEA:

- i. Conducted outreach to and solicited input from the individuals and entities listed above during the design and development of the SEA's plans to implement the programs that the SEA has indicated it will include in its consolidated State plan; and following the completion of the consolidated State plan by making the plan available for public comment for a period of not less than 30 days prior to submission to the Department for review and approval.*

During design and development of the ISDE Consolidated State Plan, stakeholder consultation was solicited during May, June, and July 2016. Opportunities for stakeholders to consult occurred both electronically and in person across the various regions of Idaho. Approximately 1,200 stakeholders participated in consultation engagements during the design and development stages for the consolidated plan. Table 2.1 summarizes Idaho's outreach efforts during consolidated plan design and development. Stakeholder consultation opportunities focused on soliciting input from pertinent stakeholders on one of four major topics (a) Challenging academic standards and academic assessments, (b) Accountability and support for schools, (c) Supporting excellent educators, and (d) Supporting all students. In some instances, such as consultation with Native American tribes, the input was classified as Consultation and Coordination since input was sought on all areas of the plan. Appendix B gives more detail by identifying, for each engagement activity, the date of the stakeholder consultation, method of stakeholder engagement, and types of stakeholders who were involved.

Table 2.1: Summary statistics on initial stakeholder input

Types of stakeholders consulted	The governor or appropriate officials from the Governor’s Office, members of the state legislature, members of the state board of education, LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, parents and families, community based organizations, civil rights organizations (including those representing students with disabilities), English learners and other historically underserved students, institutes of higher education, employers
Number of pre-draft sessions held	44
Number of stakeholders involved	More than 1,200

Following development of the draft Idaho consolidated plan stakeholder feedback was collected in two ways. First an online feedback form was developed and posted on the [Idaho Department of Education ESSA homepage](#), and advertised via press release (see Appendix A). Secondly, four feedback forums were held in strategic regional locations in Idaho (see Appendix B). Each forum consisted of a live overview of the draft plan and a collection of in-person stakeholder feedback. Stakeholders were asked to present feedback in a systematic method aligned with a specific set of criteria (see Appendix B). A summary of how the SEA addressed the concerns and issues raised through these described public forums and any changes the SEA made as a result is described below.

Stakeholder Consultation on the Draft Plan

- ii. *Took into account the consultation and public comment, including how the SEA addressed the concerns and issues raised through consultation and public comment and any changes the SEA made as a result of consultation and public comment.*
 - a. *Challenging Academic Standards and Academic Assessments*
 - b. *Accountability and Support for Schools*
 - c. *Supporting Excellent Educators*
 - d. *Supporting All Students*

2.2 Coordination

Instructions: Each SEA must coordinate its plans for administering the included programs and other programs, consistent with §299.15 (b). The programs must include the following: other programs authorized under the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA; the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; the Rehabilitation Act; the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; the Head Start Act; the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990; the

Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002; the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act; and the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.

- A. Plan Coordination.** *Describe how the SEA is coordinating its plans for administering the programs under this consolidated application and the programs listed above.*

DRAFT

3.1 Challenging State Academic Standards

*Instructions: Each SEA must provide evidence that it has adopted challenging State academic standards, including challenging academic content standards and aligned academic achievement standards; as applicable, alternate academic achievement standards; and English language proficiency standards, in compliance with section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. Note: In general, the evidence referenced here will be provided through the Department's peer review process; consequently, a State is required to submit evidence for section 3.1, only if it has made changes to its standards **after** the peer review process.*

A. Challenging Academic Content Standards and Aligned Academic Achievement Standards

Provide evidence at such time and in such manner specified by the Secretary that the State has adopted challenging academic content standards and aligned academic achievement standards in the required subjects and grades consistent with section 1111(b)(1)(A)-(D) of the ESSA.

The Idaho State Legislature adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in both English language arts and literacy and mathematics in January 2011 in their entirety. The adoption of CCSS was built on the State's desire to have academic standards that are rigorous and clear to educators and prepare students for postsecondary/career readiness.

ELA/Literacy Standards

The legislative effort and the CCSS standards represented a paradigm shift toward higher cognitive expectation in these key disciplines. In ELA/Literacy the standards were based on assumptions that students must be able to read, analyze, and synthesize complex texts and express that understanding by writing, presenting, and convincing others using text based evidence.

The CCSS standards asked that students read, write, speak, and listen in each class during the school day. This ownership of literacy across content areas is a key element that ties the standards to the creation of a literacy rich environment, a direct answer to the well documented problem of inequality in literacy foundations when the strong correlation of socio economic status and student achievement is considered.

Mathematics

In mathematics, a focus on shortcuts and memorizing of formulas were replaced with renewed emphasis on building deep conceptual knowledge and student ability to have command of math concepts and numeracy and the ability to solve complex, real world problems in unique situations. Chief among these expectations were standards that provided focus, coherence and rigor on par with the standards employed in the highest achieving country in the world. As is stated on pages six through eight of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics

[http://www.corestandards.org/wpcontent/uploads/Math_Standards1.pdf], the Mathematical Practices are

important additions to understanding in how students should grow in proficiency and use math knowledge to model with mathematical, reason abstractly and quantitatively, make sense of problems and persevere in solving them, construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others, and look for and make use of structure. Thus the practices when combined with the actual standards provided a clear description of the metacognitive expectations of students related to how they internalize and use their growing command of numeracy.

Idaho Core Standards

In 2015, the Idaho Legislature required the ISDE to undertake a review of both the English language arts/literacy standards and the mathematics standards and report changes to the Idaho State Board of Education. [House Bill 314](#) passed by the Idaho Legislature in the 2015 session mandated “The state department of education shall begin to review the Idaho's standards for learning of math and English language arts (ELA) in 2015. Idaho's content standards of learning are intended to reinforce our commitment to maintaining a college and career ready standard.”

Stakeholders in Idaho were given the opportunity to voice their approval, or disapproval, of all standards and provide actionable comments from *August 12, 2015 to December 15, 2015* via an online platform. Many avenues were utilized to elicit the maximum number of reviews statewide including radio and TV ads reaching across Idaho. Once the period for comment ended, all comments provided about specific standards were evaluated by a team of Idaho educators and stakeholders. This team was composed of stakeholders including K–12 teachers, administrators, higher education institutions, Idaho Parent Teachers Association representative, parents, and business and industry. The committee was selected from applications that were available statewide on the *Idaho Challenge* home page by a team of stakeholders and ISDE personnel. The criterion for selection of members was based on expertise, grade span experience, and regional and stakeholder representation.

The team reviewed all actionable comments in face-to-face meetings on December 16 and 17, 2015. Subsequently, the committee recommended 21 revisions or additions to the English Language Arts/Literacy standards and two revisions to the Mathematics standards. The online comment results ranged from between 85 percent and 90 percent approval of the standards with the overriding conclusion that the standards are widely validated and accepted as standard practice in both the educational setting and the public sector. These revisions were taken to the Idaho State Board of Education in August 2016 and were approved as pending rule. Next, they will be taken to the Idaho Legislature in the 2017 session for final approval. For more information on the Idaho Challenge results, visit the site:

<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/idaho-challenge/index.html>

Idaho is committed to high academic standards in science as well. Currently the department is engaged in formulating a new set of standards that will be college and career ready. The working committee of teachers and stakeholders is slated to bring a draft set of standards to the Idaho State Board of Education in December 2016. Should they be approved, they move to an immediate 21 day public comment period, followed by final approval at the February 2017 Board meeting. The final step in the process would be approval by the Idaho Legislature in the 2017 session. Following, the approval the Idaho State Department of Education can move forward with ongoing and sustained professional learning for educators, a curriculum adoption that includes high quality OER materials, and the building of a high

quality, aligned assessment with item types, such as performance tasks, which evaluate complex, high cognitive demand skills.

B. Alternate Academic Achievement Standards

If the State has adopted alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, provide evidence at such time and in such manner specified by the Secretary that those standards meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESSA.

Idaho’s alternate achievement standards define how well students need to perform on the content to be considered proficient. Components of alternate achievement standards include:

- Levels (Provide descriptive labels or narratives for student performance – proficient, advanced, and so on)
- Performance-level descriptors (Reflect both the content assessed and the expectations for students. Describe how different performance levels on a test reflect specific skills and knowledge in content being assessed)

Performance-level descriptors (PLD) provides information to teachers, parents and the community to see not only what grade-level content a student should know and do to be proficient, but also how well the student needs to perform – what depth, breadth and complexity is an appropriate. PLDs show how one level of achievement differs from another level. In doing so, PLDs also show the specific content, skills, or knowledge that are the next steps in learning continuum.

C. English Language Proficiency Standards

Provide evidence at such time and in such manner specified by the Secretary that the State has adopted English language proficiency standards that meet the following requirements:

- i. Are derived from the four recognized domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing*
- ii. Address the different proficiency levels of English learners*
- iii. Align with the State’s challenging academic standards*

ISDE analyzed the linguistic demands of the Common Core State Standards through its adoption of the WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design in Assessment) Standards in 2013-2014. WIDA includes the use of speaking, listening, reading, and writing. These standards also address proficiency levels 1.0 to 6.0. These new English Language Development (ELD) standards will ensure English language learners (ELLs) have the opportunity to achieve Idaho’s college- and career-ready standards on the same schedule as all students. The WIDA ELD standards were aligned to the Common Core in 2011 through an alignment study that examined the linguistic demands of the Common Core State Standards.

IDAPA 08.02.03.02 <https://adminrules.idaho.gov/rules/current/08/0203.pdf>

3.2 Academic Assessments

Instructions: Each SEA must identify its high-quality student academic assessments consistent with section 1111(b)(2) of the Act. Note: In general, the evidence referenced here will be provided through the Department's peer review process; consequently, a State is required to submit evidence for section 3.2.B only if it has changed its high-quality student academic assessments after the peer review process.

A. Student Academic Assessments

Identify the student academic assessments that the State is implementing under section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, including the following:

- i. High-quality student academic assessments in mathematics, reading or language arts, and science consistent with the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)*

Idaho has high quality student academic assessments in English/Language Arts, mathematics and science. Our English/Language Arts and mathematics assessments were developed by the Smarter Balanced Consortium. Our assessments in ELA and Math were submitted for Peer Review in June 2016. Idaho is currently awaiting feedback on this review. The science assessment in grades 5 and 7 were specifically designed for Idaho's science standards. Science assessments in grades 5 and 7 were submitted and received Peer Review approval in 2009. Our high school science assessment transitioned in 2015 to an end of course assessment in biology or chemistry, and administered to students in grades 10–12. Students participate in either EOC at the completion of the aligned course. Although students are only required to take one EOC assessment, students can take both EOC's. The End of Course Biology and Chemistry assessments were submitted for Peer Review in 2016 and we are still awaiting feedback.

- ii. Any assessments used under the exception for advanced middle school mathematics under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(iii) of the Act*

Idaho does not currently have an assessment for advanced middle school mathematics. LEAs offer advanced learning opportunities through locally developed and administered end of course assessments at various grade levels. Students in grade 8 will participate in the on grade level ISAT assessment, regardless of the course enrollment.

- iii. Alternate assessments aligned with the challenging State academic standards and alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities*

The NCSC developed assessments were administered in 2015 as an operational field test. The Alternate Assessments in ELA and Math were submitted for peer review in 2016 and Idaho is still awaiting feedback/approval.

- iv. The uniform statewide assessment of English language proficiency, including reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills consistent with §200.6(f)(3)*

The uniform statewide assessment of English language proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and listening skills is the WIDA ACCESS 2.0. In 2002 an EAG grant provided initial funding for the

organization that would become WIDA. Three states were involved in the grant: Wisconsin (WI), Delaware (D), and Arkansas (A), so the acronym WIDA was chosen for the name. At the last minute, however, Arkansas dropped out, and World-class Instructional Design and Assessment was created to fit the acronym. As WIDA grew, however, the original name no longer adequately described its mission. Recently WIDA decided to stop using the acronym definition. Now WIDA just means WIDA. The mission of WIDA is to advance academic language development and academic achievement for children and youth who are culturally and linguistically diverse through high quality standards, assessments, research, and professional learning for educators.

ACCESS 2.0 was administered in Idaho for the first time in 2016 and will be submitted for Peer Review in the next cycle.

- v. *Any approved locally selected nationally recognized high school assessments consistent with §200.3*

While the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) is not part of Idaho's Accountability system, the state provides an opportunity for all juniors in high school to take the exam at no cost. In addition, students have opportunities to take other nationally recognized high school assessments such as the ACT on national test dates. The state will continue to use the high school assessment developed by Smarter Balanced, and administered to students in Idaho in grade 10 as our accountability assessment.

B. State Assessment Requirements

Provide evidence at such time and in such manner specified by the Secretary that the State's assessments identified above in section 3.2.A. meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.

Idaho is part of a consortium of states using the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA). The consortium provides Idaho with a variety of reports and opportunity to provide input on the assessment.¹

In addition to reports provided by SBAC, Idaho holds regular meetings with the Technical Assistance Committee (TAC) for the state assessment system. The TAC provides guidance on technical assessment matters pertaining to validity and reliability, accuracy, and fairness. Members of the TAC are highly regarded national experts who have been widely published in their fields. Areas of expertise include: assessment design; computer adaptive testing (CAT); assessment accommodations; uses of tests; mathematics, and English language arts/literacy.

¹ http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2013-14_Technical_Report.pdf
https://www.smarterbalanced.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/2014-15_Technical_Report.pdf

C. Advanced Mathematics Coursework

Describe the SEA's strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C) and §200.5.

Idaho encourages LEAs to provide advanced opportunities in math during middle school. However the state does not have statewide end of course assessments. LEAs have the option of creating their own district-wide assessments

D. Universal Design for Learning

Describe the steps the SEA has taken to incorporate the principles of universal design for learning, to the extent feasible, in the development of its assessments, including any alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards that the State administers consistent with sections 1111(b)(2)(B)(xiii) and 1111(b)(2)(D)(i)(IV) of the Act.

The application of Universal Design (UD) principles was a key factor in Idaho's selection of the Smarter Balanced assessments. Several articles have been written on the robust list of accommodations and learning supports provided by SBAC. Idaho's science assessment, (ISAT Science at grades 5 and 7 and the end of course assessments in Biology and Chemistry) were also designed to meet the principles of UD. The ISAT Science and End of Course Assessments were submitted and approved by the United States Department of Education.

E. Appropriate Accommodations

Consistent with §200.6, describe how the SEA will ensure that the use of appropriate accommodations, if applicable, do not deny an English learner (a) the opportunity to participate in the assessment and (b) any of the benefits from participation in the assessment that are afforded to students who are not English Learners.

The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium has created Usability, Accessibility, and Accommodations Guidelines² which describe the variety of universal tools (available for all students), designated supports (available when indicated by an adult or team) and accommodations (available for students with a documented IEP or 504 plan) included within the assessment guidance.

Because use of designated supports involves individual, team or school-level decision making around appropriate use based on student need, ISDE will ensure that all school principals and district and school assessment coordinators receive training on how to effectively use the designated supports and to ensure that all students who may need such supports (e.g., text to voice software or translation glosseries) have access to them.

² <http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Usability-Accessibility-Accommodations-Guidelines.pdf>

Idaho’s English Learners are able to take WIDA’s ACCESS 2.0 with accommodations. ACCESS 2.0 was designed utilizing the principles of Universal Design. If an English Learner has an IEP, any accommodations outlined in his/her IEP to be used on assessments will be utilized in ACCESS 2.0.

F. Languages Other Than English

Describe how the SEA is complying with the requirements in §200.6(f)(1)(ii)(B)-(E) related to assessments in languages other than English: Provide the SEA’s definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” consistent with paragraph (f)(1)(iv) of §200.6, and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

In Idaho the only other language that is spoken at a “significant extent in the participating student population” is Spanish. All assessments for accountability are provided in Spanish as well as English.

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

Idaho administers the assessment developed by Smarter Balanced in grades 3–8 and 10. The state follows the guidelines set forth by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium related to translation, including translated test directions in a students’ native language. Currently our ISAT by SBAC offers translated test directions available in 14 languages. In addition to test directions, the ISAT by SBAC is available to EL students with translation in Spanish, the most prominent second language in Idaho. The Science assessments are also translated in Spanish and delivered electronically to students in grades 5, 7, and high school

- ii. Indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the State, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed;*

In addition to English, only Spanish is spoken by a significant portion of the population of the state.

- iii. Describe how the SEA 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 paragraph (f)(1)(iv) of §200.6;*

Table 3.1

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Review of student demographics within Idaho	Annual disaggregation of EL students	Part of data collection system
Annual agenda item for TAC Committee	July 2017 and then annually through 2022	Assessment Funds

- b. *A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, and other stakeholders; and*

Given the current demographics of Idaho, assessments in languages other than English have not been an area of concern for educators, parents and families of English learners and other stakeholders, with the exception of Spanish speakers.

- c. *As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.*

This is not currently an area of need in Idaho.

G. Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

Describe how the State will use formula grant funds awarded under section 1201 of the ESEA to pay the costs of development of the high-quality State assessments and standards adopted under section 1111(b) of the ESEA or, if a State has developed those assessments, to administer those assessments or carry out other assessment activities consistent with section 1201(a) of the ESEA.

Idaho Department of Education will utilize these funds to provide the Idaho State Achievement Test to students in grades 3-8 and once in high school. We will be setting aside a certain amount of funds to develop a new science assessment and science – alternate assessment once the standards are approved. Science standards will be going to the State Board of Education in December of 2016 and if approved to the Idaho State Legislature for consideration during the 2017 legislative session. Once the standards are approved we will begin the process of designing assessments.

3.3 Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans regarding challenging State academic standards and academic assessments consistent with §299.14 (c). The description of an SEA's system of performance management must include information on the SEA's review and approval of LEA plans, collection and use of data, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance specific to the implementation of challenging State academic standards and academic assessments. If a table is provided below, the SEA's description must include strategies and timelines.

A. System of Performance Management

Describe the SEA's system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans for Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments.

ISDE provides substantial technical assistance and support to LEAs and schools with respect to ensuring that the Idaho Core Standards are being used to design instruction. State funds are used to support districts and schools in implementing the ELA and mathematics standards by providing regional and onsite support to educators. Please see *Section 4.3 B- Evidence-Based Interventions* for school improvement for more information about how the statewide system of support helps to ensure effective implementation of Idaho’s standards.

ISDE also provides extensive training on the administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments and on the use of the data for performance improvement.³

B. Review and Approval of LEA Plans

Describe the SEA’s process for supporting the development, review, and approval of LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements, including a description of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with the specific needs of the LEA and the State’s strategies described in its consolidated State plan for implementation of Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments.

Support is offered to all LEAs for implementing the state’s challenging state academic standards. For schools identified as needing comprehensive or targeted support, specific assistance structures (State Assistance Team, Regional School Improvement Coordinators, Capacity Builders) are required or encouraged. Please see Section 4 for more information about these services.

C. Collection and Use of Data

Describe the SEA’s plan to collect and use information and data, including input from stakeholders, to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes for the included programs related to implementation of Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

D. Monitoring

Describe the SEA’s plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of the included programs using the data in section 3.3.C to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements for implementation of Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

³ <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/assessment/assessment-info/files/adea/ADEA-User-Guide.pdf>

E. Continuous Improvement

Describe the SEA's plan to continuously improve implementation of SEA and LEA strategies and activities that are not leading to satisfactory progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes for implementation of Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

F. Differentiated Technical Assistance

Describe the SEA's plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies for implementation of Challenging State Academic Standards and Academic Assessments.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

Section 4: Accountability Support and Improvement for Schools

4.1 Accountability System

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with §§ 200.12-200.24, §299.17 and with section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include any documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

A. Indicators

Describe the measure(s) included in each of the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, and School Quality or Student Success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in §200.14(c)-(e) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA for all students and separately for each subgroup of students used to meaningfully differentiate all public schools in the State. The description should include how each indicator is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State. For the School Quality or Student Success measure, the description must also address how the indicator is supported by research that performance or progress on such measures is likely to increase student achievement and graduation rates and aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools by demonstrating varied results across all schools in the State.

The Accountability Oversight Committee's (AOC) framework was approved in August 2016, and includes the full range of Idaho's structure for ensuring that students are college and career ready. Idaho believes defining success requires going beyond statewide test scores, and should illustrate multiple measures reflecting the many facets of our students. The indicators that Idaho will publicly report reflect state values, and will further empower educators and families to make good decisions about their children.

Title I school ratings are just one part of the larger accountability picture that will include measures of school climate, academic achievement, and teacher engagement as they become available. The purpose of Title I school ratings is to guarantee that schools with the most need receive support from the Idaho State Department of Education. Therefore, the elements that comprise the school-rating model for this specific purpose are intentionally aligned with the supports and interventions provided by the Department. Further, it is critical for school ratings to be transparent and clear so that all stakeholders understand why a school is or is not designated to receive support.

Indicators described in this section are only those included in the identification of Title I Comprehensive and Targeted support schools, and do not reflect the multiple indicators that will be shown on Idaho's report card.

Table 4.1.

Indicator	Measure	Description
Academic Achievement	Idaho Student Achievement Test (ISAT) 3-8 Mathematics	These measures represent the statewide mathematics and ELA/Literacy tests. For more information, please see the Assessment section of this plan. In the school identification system, Academic Achievement is the current year percentage of students scoring proficient or above within a school.
	ISAT 3-8 English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy	
	ISAT High School Mathematics	
	ISAT High School ELA/Literacy	
Academic Progress	ISAT 3-8 Mathematics	Academic progress on the ISAT will be measured by the difference in percentage of student scoring proficient or above in the current year of testing and either the percent proficient in the prior year (for schools with only two years of data), or the percent proficient two years in the past (for schools with three years of data or more).
	ISAT 3-8 English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy	
	ISAT High School Mathematics	
	ISAT High School ELA/Literacy	
Graduation Rate	The 4-year cohort graduation rate	The percent of students graduating using the 4-year graduation cohort rate calculation within a school reported ⁴ in the current school year.
Graduation Rate Progress	The 4-year cohort graduation rate	The difference between the percent of students reported graduating in the current year and the prior year (for schools with only two years of data), or the percent reporting graduating two years in the past (for schools with three years of data or more).
Achievement in Achieving English Language Proficiency	ACCESS 2.0	English proficiency achievement on ACCESS 2.0 will be the percentage of students within a school scoring proficient or above.
Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency	ACCESS 2.0	English proficiency progress on ACCESS 2.0 will be measured by the difference in percentage of student scoring proficient or above in the current year of testing and either the percent proficient in the prior year (for schools with only two years of data), or the percent proficient two years in the past (for schools with three years of data or more).
School Quality or Student Success	Idaho will be working towards a school quality indicator but does not have data available at this time that is appropriate for school identification. The indicator will be supported by research, and will be incorporated slowly so that the department has had appropriate time in which to prepare and budget for the additional resources necessary to ensure quality.	

⁴ Graduation rate lags by one school year.

B. Subgroups

- i. Describe the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group, consistent with §200.16(a)(2)*

Within Idaho’s accountability system, all federally required historically underperforming subgroups are included in both federal reporting as well as Comprehensive and Targeted school identifications:

1. Economically disadvantaged are students with a free or reduced-price lunch status.
2. English learners are those who have not yet tested as English proficient.
3. Minority students are those who are not white.
4. Students with disabilities are all students that meet criteria outlined in Idaho’s eligibility evaluation. This is further described in the Idaho Special Education Manual⁵.

- ii. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedures for:*

- a. Former English learners consistent with §200.16(b)(1)*

This section is pending data modeling and additional collection of stakeholder feedback. Currently, any English learner that has tested proficient on the English proficiency exam (ACCESS 2.0 through the WIDA consortium) can count as an English learner for accountability purposes for up to two years after. Under ESSA, a student may be counted as an English learner for up to four years after testing proficient. Additional information is needed to determine the best course of action for Idaho.

- b. Recently arrived English learners in the State to determine if an exception is appropriate for an English learner consistent with section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and §200.16(b)(4)*

English learners (EL) students enrolled in their first year of school in the United States may take Idaho’s English language proficiency exam (ACCESS 2.0) in place of the ELA/Literacy assessment. First-year EL students will still be required to take the state’s mathematics assessment (ISAT 2.0) and will be counted as participants for the 95 percent participation target for accountability purposes. In the following year, EL students will participate in both the ELA and mathematics ISAT 2.0 assessments, and for growth purposes on the state accountability assessments, EL students will be counted the subsequent year after a baseline score is determined.

C. Minimum Number of Students

- Describe the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with §200.17(a)(3).*

Under Idaho’s No Child Left Behind Waiver, the minimum number of students required for a given group to be included in the school identification accountability system was $N \geq 25$. This minimum number is required for the “all students” group as well as all subgroups of students. If this number is changed, the decision will be made through use of data modeling together with stakeholder feedback.

⁵ <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/shared/2016-Special-Education-Manual.pdf>

Describe the following information with respect to the State's selected minimum number of students:

- i. How the State's minimum number of students meets the requirements in §200.17(a)(1)*

This section will be completed pending data modeling and stakeholder feedback.

- ii. How other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State's uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each student subgroup under §200.16(a)(2)*

Further described in the process for meaningful differentiation of schools, Idaho will be using the longest allowable duration of years (three) to be included in the school identification index.

- iii. A description of the strategies the State uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA*

Idaho ensures that no single student is identifiable either through reporting, where the minimum $N \geq 10$ or in Title I school rating processes. The minimum N has not yet been determined for Title I school identifications, but will be larger than the reporting minimum N ($N \geq 10$).

- iv. Information regarding the number and percentage of all students and students in each subgroup described in §200.16(a)(2) for whose results schools would not be held accountable in the State accountability system for annual meaningful differentiation under §200.18*

Performance of student groups that are too small to be included in the Title I school identification will still be reported on the state website so long as the group has ten or more students. Enrollment numbers and percentages will be displayed so long as there is at least one student within the subgroup.

- v. If applicable, a justification, including data on the number and percentage of schools that would not be held accountable for the results of students in each subgroup under §200.16(a)(2) in the accountability system, that explains how a minimum number of students exceeding 30 promotes sound, reliable accountability determinations.*

The minimum number of students will not exceed 30 students. The minimum number of students to be included in the school identification methodology has not yet been determined.

D. Meaningful Differentiation

Describe the State’s system for meaningfully differentiating all public schools in the State, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

The following example of a proposed model for Title I school rating methodology is simplified for the purpose of outlining the basic idea behind the process. Should we move forward with this methodology, there are many decisions that will still need to be made such as weighting of indicators and choosing a growth model. The philosophy behind the method is to create a system that identifies schools that are both the lowest-performing in the state and not improving.

This addresses the following issues with any model that requires a school to be both high-performing and growing in order to not be identified for interventions:

- Growth Ceiling Issue: Within the star rating system, it was possible for very high-performing schools to receive low ratings due to lack of growth, despite there being little room available for progress
- Low Baseline Issue: Previously, even if schools were growing at a fast rate, they could receive poor ratings due to low baseline performance

Consider a simplified identification model with only four indicators:

1. Mathematics (state-wide test)
2. English Language Arts/Literacy (state-wide test)
3. Graduation Rate
4. English Learner Proficiency

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

Table 4.2. School X math performance

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

Achievement is the percentage of students proficient or advanced in the current year.

School X’s math *achievement* is 75.

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

School X’s math *growth* is 75 – 55, or 20.

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

Table 4.3. Math achievement rank

	Achievement	Rank
School P	99	1
School F	98	2
School AA	96	3
School S	94	4
•		
•		
•		
School X	75	197
•		
•		
•		
School G	32	378

School X's math *achievement* was about in the middle relative to other schools in the state, ranking 197th out of 378 schools.

There are 161 schools with lower *achievement* than School X, and 196 that have higher *achievement* than School X.

Table 4.4. Math growth rank

	Growth	Rank
School T	22	1
School X	20	2
School C	12	3
School L	11	4
•		
•		
•		
School P	0	378

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

The percentile rank is a simple calculation: divide the number of schools below School X by the total number of public schools in the state. This number is then multiplied by 100.

Table 4.5. Achievement percentile rank

Number of schools below School X (161)	* 100 = 42
Total number of schools (378)	

Table 4.6. Growth percentile rank

Number of schools below School X (376)	* 100 = 99
Total number of schools (378)	

Step 4: Choose the highest of either *Growth* or *Achievement* percentile ranking to represent the indicator in the final school rating.

Because 99 is higher than 42, **99 will represent the score for School X’s math indicator.** 42 will NOT be used to determine whether the school will receive comprehensive support.

Step 5: Repeat for all indicators, and take average.

Table 4.7. School X’s indicator scores

Math	Reading	Graduation Rate	EL Proficiency	Average
99	Highest of either <i>Growth or Achievement</i> percentile ranking	Highest of either <i>Growth or Achievement</i> percentile ranking	Highest of either <i>Growth or Achievement</i> percentile ranking	Weighting not yet determined.

Step 6: Repeat for all public schools in the state, and rank schools from highest to lowest.

Step 7: Choose bottom 5% as Comprehensive schools.

- i. *Describe the distinct levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under §200.18(b)(3) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;*

There are five distinct levels for school performance in the system:

1. Reward Progress (top 5% of Title I schools in terms of the progress index on all available indicators)
2. Reward Achievement (top 5% of Title I schools in terms of the achievement index on all available indicators)
3. Comprehensive (bottom 5% of schools in terms of the school rating index)
4. Targeted (yet to be determined, but will reflect a percentage of schools who are bottom performing in terms of the school index within each of the four historically underperforming subgroups)
5. Intermediate (any school that is not Reward, Comprehensive, or Targeted)

- ii. *The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with §200.18(c) and (d).*

The weighting of indicators has not yet been decided and is pending data modeling.

- iii. *The summative ratings, and how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under §200.18(b)(4).*

Summative ratings are calculated using the same methods as above.

E. Participation Rate

Describe how the State is factoring the requirement for 95 percent student participation in assessments into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of schools required under §200.15, including if the State selects another equally rigorous State-determined action than those provided under §200.15(a)(2)(i)-(iii) that will result in a similar outcome for the school in the system of annual meaningful differentiation and will improve the school's participation rate so that the school meets the applicable requirements.

They way in which participation rate will factor into the final rating is pending data modeling.

F. Data Averaging

Describe the State's uniform procedure for averaging data across school years and combining data across grades as defined in §200.20(a), if applicable.

In order to receive a school rating index, a school must have at least two years of data. In the school rating methodology, up to three years of data will be used to determine a school rating (to determine growth), but data will not be averaged across years.

Data will, however, be combined across grade levels within a school to obtain proficiency rates for mathematics, ELA/Literacy, and English proficiency.

G. Including All Public Schools in a State's Accountability System

If the States uses a different methodology than the one described in D above, describe how the State includes all public schools in the State in its accountability system including:

- i. Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the State is not required to administer a formal assessment to meet this requirement*

Only schools with tested grade levels will receive a school index score.

- ii. Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools);*

Any school with grade 12 is considered a high school in the school identification methodology for purposes of determining a school index score. All other schools will remain in the K-8 pool (regardless of whether or not they serve grades 9-11) for purposes of determining school indices.

- iii. Small schools in which the total number of students that can be included on any indicator under §200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under §200.17(a)(1), consistent with a State's uniform procedures for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable;*

In order for a school to be identified for Comprehensive or Targeted support, the school must have a minimum number of students (to be determined in data modeling). For schools with less than minimum number of students within indicators, information will be included on the report card so long as there is a minimum of ten students ($N \geq 10$). All other information will be suppressed in order to protect individual student information.

- iv. *Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings, students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, students enrolled in State public schools for the blind, recently arrived English learners)*

This is yet to be determined pending data modeling.

- v. *Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State's uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable.*

In order for a school to be identified for Comprehensive or Targeted support, the school must have a minimum of two years of data, and up to three years of data. For schools with less than two years of data, all available indicators will be included on Idaho's report card, but they will not receive a school index score.

4.2 Identification of Schools

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools

- i. *Describe: The methodologies by which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the Act and §200.19(a), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2) schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.*

After applying the procedure to meaningfully differentiate schools by determining a school's index, the 5 percent of the lowest school indices within the three school groupings (K–8, high school, and alternative schools) will be identified as Comprehensive schools.

- ii. *The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the State under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Act and consistent with the requirements in §200.21(f)(1), including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.*

The identification of Comprehensive schools will take place once every three years. If a Comprehensive school is not re-identified in the subsequent identification process, it will exit Comprehensive status.

B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools

Describe:

- i. *The State’s methodology for identifying schools with “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including the definition and time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance, under §200.19(b)(1) and (c).*

The method for targeted schools is yet to be determined, but will reflect a percentage of schools who are bottom performing in terms of the school index within each of the four historically underperforming subgroups:

- Economically disadvantaged
- English learners
- Minority
- Students with disabilities

- ii. *The State’s methodology for identifying additional targeted schools with low-performing subgroups of students under §200.19(b)(2)*

Idaho will be choosing the maximum percentage of Targeted support schools that the state department can reasonably support. Therefore, there will be no additional methodology to identify additional schools.

- iii. *The uniform exit criteria for schools requiring additional targeted support due to low-performing subgroups established by the State consistent with the requirements in §200.22(f)*

The identification of Targeted schools will take place once every three years. If a Targeted school is not re-identified in the subsequent identification process, it will exit Targeted status.

4.3 State Support and Improvement of Low-Performing Schools

A. Allocation of School Improvement Resources

Describe the SEA's process for making grants to LEAs under section 1003 of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements of §200.24 to serve schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans under section 1111(d) of the Act and consistent with the requirements in §§ 200.21 and 200.22

Schools identified as needing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement deserve the state’s attention. ISDE has an immense responsibility to the lowest performing schools and to schools with achievement gaps, to help determine the root cause of each school’s difficulty and to help plan supports and interventions for improving practices.

ISDE through SAT has access to a wide variety of resources, including funding, expertise (such as math and ELA coaches), leadership training, assessment development, indicator definition, planning and implementation. The allocation of these resources would first be applied to those comprehensive and targeted schools.

The following timeline describes the process and timeline for making school improvement grants. As part of the state’s support, all comprehensive support and improvement schools will participate in an external diagnostic evaluation. Following the diagnostic evaluation, the LEA will work with stakeholders to develop a comprehensive support and improvement plan for the school to improve student outcomes. The plan will include measurable objectives linked to the State’s determined long-term goals, and will address any resource inequities.

Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement will apply for funds through the Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA) process. After ISDE staff reviews the CFSGA, the contact person designated in the plan will be notified by e-mail that the review is complete and will be directed to review the ISDE comments. Upon satisfactory completion of any suggested changes to the school improvement plans, the ISDE will send the LEA an award letter, stating the school improvement grant approval. School improvement plans will be made publically available by the LEA no later than 30 days after being approved by the ISDE.

Table 4.8

August 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) and targeted support and improvement (TSI) schools are identified. These are the schools that will receive the state’s most support. • LEAs with comprehensive support and improvement and targeted support and improvement schools are notified. Notification includes information for an external diagnostic review for the comprehensive support and improvement schools.
September–December 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 90 days of notification of identification from the State, the LEA notifies parents of students enrolled in a comprehensive support and improvement school. • Training is provided for leadership staff from all CSI schools and LEA leadership. • Training is provided for reviewers participating as a diagnostic evaluation team member. • CSI schools plan for their diagnostic evaluation with support from LEA. • Diagnostic evaluations are conducted and LEAs and schools receive final report from the State school improvement coordinator.
January, February, March 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools, with support from their LEA, write a school improvement plan based on the results of the diagnostic evaluation. The plan reflects interventions, strategies, and system changes based on the needs of the school as identified from the diagnostic evaluation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LEAs and schools receive support from the State in writing the plan, if needed. ○ Each LEA approves the school’s plan prior to it being sent to the State for approval (required by ESSA). • LEA applies on behalf of its school, through a grant application process, for Title I-A school improvement funds to help implement the interventions, strategies, and system changes identified in the plan. • The school improvement plan and grant application are submitted to the State by March 31, 2018. ESSA requires the State to approve the plans.

On or before May 1, 2018	Plan approval and grants are awarded
--------------------------	--------------------------------------

B. Evidence-Based Interventions

Describe: the State’s process to ensure effective development and implementation of school support and improvement plans, including evidence-based interventions, to hold all public schools accountable for student academic achievement and school success consistent with §§ 200.21 through 200.24, and, if applicable, the list of State-approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans.

Idaho has a sophisticated Statewide System of Support (SSOS). It is designed to pair local issues with local solutions and draws from a variety of resources and programs to build the capacity of schools and districts for continuous and sustainability improvement. The SSOS is managed and coordinated by the Idaho State Assistance Team (SAT), which is responsible for overseeing all school improvement grants for targeted and comprehensive schools. The SAT works with LEAs and the Idaho Capacity Builders to ensure that improvement plans are evidence-based and managed for high performance.

As shown in Table 4.9 below, the SSOS includes a breadth of strategies and activities that districts and schools can select based on need. Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement will likely need to draw on multiple strategies, whereas schools identified for targeted support and improvement may apply focused resources on meeting the needs of particular groups of students, such as drawing on the English Learner Program to support English learners or providing extended learning time to help accelerate learning for specific groups of students. All funded activities and programs are evaluated regularly for evidence of effective implementation and to assess the degree to which services and activities are evidence-based. Programs draw on guidance from the US Department of Education “What Works Clearinghouse” and expertise from the Northwest Regional Comprehensive Center and Regional Education Laboratory program.

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

Table 4.9.

Strategy	Activity	Provider/program	Funding source
Management of comprehensive and targeted school improvement	Diagnostic evaluation/needs assessment to determine key challenges and root causes	ISDE or approved vendor	Title IA School improvement funds
	Comprehensive school improvement and leadership coaching	Idaho Capacity Builders or approved vendor	
Improving leadership effectiveness	Leadership coaching	Idaho Building Capacity Network	School improvement funds
	Mentoring and support for principals	Idaho Principals Network Idaho Principal Mentoring	Title II A

Strategy	Activity	Provider/program	Funding source
		Project	
	Mentoring and support for superintendents	Idaho Superintendents Network	School improvement grant
Aligning Curriculum and Improving Instruction	Professional development and technical assistance in curriculum and standards development and alignment, and research-based instructional improvement	Approved vendors; state regional mathematics or ELA specialists	School improvement funds and State funds
	Core literacy coaching	Idaho Core Literacy Coaches	
	Training on the Idaho Core State Standards and technical assistance with how to align curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.	Idaho Core Literacy Coaches, Idaho Math Centers	
	Educator evaluation training and coaching	ISDE Educator Effectiveness Coordinator	State funds
	Training in Idaho's instructional management system as a support for data utilization and curricular planning	ISDE Educator Effectiveness Coordinator	
	Training to the school or district regarding the Smarter Balanced Consortium Assessments	ISDE	
Supporting English learners	Technical assistance with ELL program design	Idaho English Learner Program	
	Training on WIDA standards and technical assistance on aligning WIDA standards with RTI practices	Idaho English Learner Program	
Multi-tiered Systems of Support and Special Education	Response-to-intervention training and coaching	Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA)	State funds, Special Ed funds
	Training on intensive interventions, assessments and strategies related to special education	Idaho Center on Disabilities and Human Development	Special Education funds
Extended learning time	Technical assistance on how to redesign the school day using extended learning and/or other opportunities (e.g., 21st Century Community Learning Centers)	ISDE or external vendor	
Family and community engagement	Technical assistance in the inclusion of families and the community in the school improvement planning and implementation process	ISDE- Family Engagement Coordinators	State funds
	Access to and support with the Family Engagement Tool (FET)		

Strategy	Activity	Provider/program	Funding source
Fiscal management	Technical assistance on the alignment of State funds (e.g., technology funds, dual credit, etc.) and the policies necessary to ensure their success	ISDE	State funds

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

Management of comprehensive and targeted school improvement

Districts and schools need guidance and support in conducting needs assessments, prioritizing goals and needs and in developing improvement plans that are actionable and effective. The ISDE partners with local and regional organizations to provide this assistance.

External diagnostic evaluation and action plan: As part of the State’s support, all comprehensive support and improvement schools will participate in an external diagnostic evaluation. The evaluation will include an examination of four key components of each school: climate and culture; student engagement, leadership, and stakeholder perspectives and experiences. Data will be collected and analyzed using key performance and improvement indicators for school quality and learner outcomes. Areas of improvement will include a root cause analysis to determine appropriate solutions. The diagnostic evaluation team will prioritize the improvement areas based on the information collected to help the LEA guide the school in writing its comprehensive support and improvement plan and to help the State Assistance Team (SAT) provide ongoing support assistance.

Action plans from the diagnostic evaluation will address the why, who, what, when, and resource allocation for making improvement changes. A vision for the school will be developed and the school’s strategic direction, setting short term (one year) and long term (3-5 years) goals, will be identified. An important component of the plan will include external stakeholder involvement in the development process and during the implementation of the plan. External stakeholders will include, at a minimum, the principal and other school leaders, teachers, and parents. The LEA will address in the plan how it will monitor and oversee the plan’s implementation, as well as how they will evaluate the effectiveness of the plan. The diagnostic evaluation will be funded by State level Title I-A school improvement funds. Additionally, grant funds will be available for all schools identified as comprehensive support and improvement for the purpose of implementing system changes, strategies, and interventions as identified in the school’s improvement plan based on the results of the diagnostic evaluation.

Idaho Building Capacity Network: Central to the strategy of providing assistance with the management of school improvement is the Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Network. The network began in 2008 and is now a cornerstone of Idaho's Statewide System of Support and approach to school improvement. Idaho Capacity Builders (CBs) are experienced educators who have in-depth knowledge of school improvement processes and demonstrated experience implementing change processes. All schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support will receive support from a CB. CBs coach leaders and leadership teams through the tasks of improvement with monthly training and assist in promoting alignment among the various parts within the school or district system. Capacity Builders are provided with a toolkit of evidence-based school improvement resources, and, in partnership with school and district leaders, help

create and implement a customized school improvement plan. The Idaho capacity builders are managed by regional school improvement specialists at Boise State University, Idaho State University and the University of Idaho.

Improving Leadership Effectiveness

The SSOS includes several activities aimed at increasing the effectiveness of district and school leadership. The following activities draw on the strengths and assets of Idaho's educators while providing focused support to leaders of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

Idaho Principals Network (IPN): The IPN brings school principals together in a professional learning community that is singularly focused on improving outcomes for all students by improving the quality of instruction in all schools. Through the IPN, principals participate in a balance of content, professional conversation, and collegial instructional rounds related directly to instructional leadership, managing change, and improving the overall effectiveness of the instructional core. For example, the network has worked on improving classroom observations, building turnaround leadership competencies, and instructional rounds. For schools in Comprehensive Support and Improvement and Targeted Support and Improvement status, the IPN provides coaching and support unique to the leadership needs of each principal.

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

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

Aligning Curriculum and Improving Instruction

Professional development and technical assistance from state regional content specialists: Idaho has a network of local teacher leaders and content specialists who provide high quality professional development across the state. In partnership with Idaho State University, the regional mathematics centers provide support to K–12 teachers, schools, and districts. They work directly with schools and teachers to create individualized support plans, including in-class feedback and modeling of lessons, school-wide workshops, and guidance on creating professional learning communities. The Idaho Core Literacy Coaches are a group of over 600 teacher leaders who provide professional development on the Idaho Core, along with lessons, units and assessments aligned to the Idaho Core. For schools identified as in need of comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, regional mathematics and literacy specialists provide job-embedded coaching.

Educator Effectiveness Coordinators: Educator Effectiveness is a system that provides districts with standards, tools, resources and support to increase teacher and principal effectiveness in order to increase student achievement. Educator effectiveness coordinators are experienced master educators integrate educator effectiveness policies and resources within Idaho’s statewide system of support. Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement may utilize the educator effectiveness for: integrating observation and evaluation into continuous school and district improvement; technical assistance and professional development on effective instructional strategies and interventions; and creating school and district improvement plans that integrate educator observation and evaluation practices with resources, strategies, assessments, and evaluation procedures that will adequately address the needs of all learners.

Supporting English learners

Schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement may serve disproportionately high percentages of English learners compared with other schools in the state. The ISDE is part of the WIDA Consortium and provides.

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

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

Multi-Tiered Systems of Support and Special Education

The ISDE promotes the use of multi-tiered systems of support and response-to-intervention. For more information about how the state provides support to students with special educational needs, please see Section 6: Supporting all Students.

Response to Intervention: Response to Intervention (RTI) is a framework originally advocated by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education. RTI is a systemic approach that schools can use to better meet the needs of all learners, but it is also well suited for students with disabilities who have a Specific Learning Disability (SLD). Idaho has intentionally increased use of RTI as a framework for continuous school improvement. RTI integrates assessment, intervention, and curriculum planning responsive to student data within a multi-level prevention system in order to maximize achievement for all students. With RTI, schools use data to identify students at risk for poor learning outcomes, monitor students' learning progress, provide evidence-based interventions depending on a student's responsiveness, and identify students with learning or other disabilities, as defined by State law. Additionally, schools use the data gained to determine the effectiveness of intervention and core program instructional practices. Therefore, the feedback loop is able to be completed at all levels within a school: individual students, small intervention groups, whole class performance, whole grade level performance, and whole school performance. In addition to the historical development of RTI, in the past Idaho has partnered with the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI) to fine-tune and scale up implementation of RTI practices.

Extended Learning Time

Adjusting dosage and intensity of interventions can be facilitated by the provision of extended learning time for students and educators. ISDE will encourage LEAs to assess school schedules for efficient use of available time, and to ensure that available time is effectively used for instruction and academic intervention. LEAs will be encouraged to determine how—within existing frameworks and resources—schools can provide interventions and supports beyond scheduled instructional time, and how they might use school improvement funds to extend learning time beyond the school day. Additionally, LEAs will be encouraged to evaluate and determine how extended professional learning time can be made available for educators within schools identified for comprehensive improvement.

Family and Community Engagement

ISDE believes family and community engagement is essential for student success and for creating effective, quality schools. LEAs and schools are expected to include family and community engagement strategies in their improvement plans. ISDE provides the following resources to support LEAs/schools in taking an evidence-based approach to involving families and the community in improving student outcomes.

Family Engagement Coordinator: ISDE has built a system to engage parents within the improvement process as well. The Family and Community Engagement Coordinator identifies, plans, and implements methods that would support district leaders and their schools in engaging families and the community at large in the discussion of continuous school improvement.

Family Engagement Tool: Idaho has partnered with the Academic Development Institute (ADI), the parent organization for the Center on Innovation and Improvement (CII), to provide the Family Engagement Tool (FET) as a resource to all Idaho schools. The FET guides school leaders through an assessment of indicators related to family engagement policies and practices. The resulting outcome is a set of recommendations that can be embedded in the school's improvement plan. As described on the

FET website (www.families-schools.org/FETindex.htm), the tool provides: a structured process for school teams working to strengthen family engagement through the school improvement plan; rubrics for improving district and school family engagement policies, the home-school compact, and other policies connected to family engagement; documentation of the school's work for the district and state; and a reservoir of family engagement resource for use by the school.

Fiscal Management

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

Use of External Vendors

LEAs may contract with external vendors to provide school improvement services. External vendors are carefully vetted through a structured process for scoring the applications of all vendors. Two reviewers within the LEA review each request. The scoring rubric is used to determine the scores for each submission which contains five parts: Part I: Cover Page, Part II: Intro Letter about the firm, Part III: Detailed descriptions of how the professional development meets the five criteria outlined in the Eligibility Requirements Section, Part IV: Details about the firm's effectiveness with past projects and one page resume of each proposed consultant, and Part V: Letter of reference from a customer you have served in the last two years and that is specific to the request's content (literacy or math). Scores that span three levels (superior, good, fair, fail) require a conversation regarding scoring through evidence found in the application. If the scores are unable to be reduced to spanning only two levels, then a third reviewer is needed to narrow the gap between the two scores. The scores are then averaged. The average must be 510 or greater to be on the successful list of providers. The final decision for use of approved external providers will be made by the LEA on or before the start of the school year. Once final decisions are made, approved external providers will be sent to the SEA.

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

If a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement fails to meet the ISDE's exit criteria after 3 years, the ISDE will require a state-led Comprehensive and Integrated Field Review (CIFR). A CIFR is a review to determine existing capacity. CIFR collects evidence of practices associated with substantial school improvement. An external team of reviewers collects data. The external team may observe 100 percent of the teachers, including teachers of special populations. Observational data are collected for a subset of the indicators that coincide with our statewide teacher evaluation. A protocol linked to indicators of successful schools may be used to interview individuals (at least 60 percent of the certified teaching staff and all administrators) and identify recurring themes. Group interviews may be conducted in each school for parents, students, non-certified staff (e.g., cooks, custodians, paraprofessionals), and teachers. All data are then analyzed and triangulated to describe the practices of the system. CIFRs are conducted to maintain a balance of positive support and pressure and to help

determine further state supports and/or interventions. Since the protocol is linked to the state approved school improvement plan, recommendations directly tie back to school and district improvement plans and processes, which enhance ongoing assistance efforts. Recommendations will also include connections to programs, technical assistance, and training opportunities that match the needs of the school or district.

In addition to the system-wide recommendations that can be made, the CIFR provides a diagnostic review that gives district leadership the information necessary to make school-wide changes. The CIFR provides a depth and breadth of information about district leadership capacity as well. This may assist with the State's determinations about the potential need for changes in district leadership, and the degree to which intervention from the state is required. Due to the complexities of local control, special consideration is given to the needs of district leadership. At times, districts are in need of improvement due to governance issues that can be changed through coaching of the superintendent and/or local school board. For this, the SEA may utilize support mechanisms to provide coaching. In other contexts, district leaders (e.g., superintendents or local school board) may not have the capacity or may be unresponsive to external support. In this situation, the SEA may work directly with the local board of trustees to make recommendations regarding staffing. Recommendations may be paired with positive or negative incentives for change, such as providing extra grant funding to solve specific concerns or withholding funding until conditions are met. In rare cases, district leaders have sufficient capacity and are responsive to supports, but they are restrained by decision making and policies of the local school board.

In severe circumstances, the ISDE may work directly with the community to inform stakeholders about the needs of their district since only the local community can facilitate a change in trustee membership. Under these conditions, the ISDE may reserve the right to withhold any or all federal funding for use in providing services directly to the students, families, and community of that school district in a manner that will ultimately result in turning around the performance of the district.

Such services may include, but are not limited to:

- Contracting services, such as before and after school tutoring for students
- Providing transportation of students to other school districts
- Enrolling students in a virtual charter school and redirecting funds to that school
- Reserving a percentage of funds for the State to conduct public meetings, provide public notices, and work with the public to make necessary decisions about yearly school board elections

Possible additional improvement actions the ISDE may recommend include:

- LEA school board coaches
- Prescribe specific evidence-based interventions
- Reorganizing a school to implement a new instructional model
- Replace school leadership
- Change school governance
- Closing a school

D. Periodic Resource Allocation Review

Describe the State's Process for periodically reviewing and addressing resource allocation to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA and the

State serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement and in each LEA serving a significant number of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

An ISDE school improvement team will annually review each LEA that has a school in comprehensive or targeted support and improvement to ensure that resource allocations are sufficient to serve the number of schools identified. In addition to reviewing the amount of funds granted to each LEA, other areas that will be reviewed will include how the funds are being spent and whether they align with comprehensive/targets support and improvement plan, whether there is there sufficient funding for other SEA intervention programs (e.g., IPN and ISN), whether the LEA and/or school is using a Capacity Builder and/or is there sufficient funding for the IBC program.

E. Other State-Identified Strategies

Describe other State-identified strategies, including timelines and funding sources from included programs consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, as applicable, to improve low-performing schools.

4.4 Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Accountability, Support and Improvement of Schools

A. System of Performance Management

Describe the SEA's system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans for Accountability, Support, and Improvement for schools.

The Statewide Assistance Team (SAT) will provide a network approach to improving instruction and achievement for each school identified as comprehensive support and improvement. The SAT will be comprised of the Deputy Superintendent of Academic Performance, Community Relations Officer, Federal Programs Director, Associate Deputy of Federal Programs, Director of Special Education, Director of Title III, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, and School Improvement Coordinator. Depending upon the needs of the schools identified for comprehensive or targeted assistance other specialists will be asked to provide input.

The SAT will meet no less than once per quarter. Meetings will include part face-to-face and part web-based, depending on where team members are located. The State school improvement coordinator will develop the agenda with input from SAT member stakeholders and will facilitate the meetings. One of the key responsibilities of this group will be to review data to inform strategies for improvement. Data from each of the stakeholders will be provided to the SAT members ahead of the meeting time. The purpose of the meeting will be to review progress from the last meeting and identify action plan supports and next steps for the following meeting. All stakeholder members are mutually responsible for the improvement of the school.

Given that the SAT will have members who are part of ISDE's executive team, ISDE will have an internal system of control with weekly feedback provided to the Superintendent and cabinet. SAT members will also be responsible (Associate Deputy of Federal Programs and Title I Director) for

continuing to convene regular meetings of the ESSA Core Leadership Team for their input. Through both the Northwest Regional Education Lab and the Northwest Comprehensive Center, ISDE, SAT, and the Core Leadership Team will have access to technical assistance as well as other states to brainstorm challenges. If needed, NWCC will also connect ISDE with content centers across the country.

The Community Relations Officer will provide regular updates and seek input from the various stakeholder groups such as the Regional Superintendents, Idaho Association of School Administrators, the Idaho Education Association, Idaho School Boards Association, Idaho Business for Education, as well as SBOE and the Idaho Legislature. Individual directors and coordinators (Title I, Indian Education, Migrant, McKinney Vento, Title IV-A, Title III, Migrant, etc.) will include ESSA updates and seek input at all stakeholder meetings.

The Idaho School Boards Association will be a particularly important thought partner to ISDE and LEAs if outcomes do not improve. A goal of ISDE is “collective accountability.”

B. Review and Approval of LEA Plans

Describe the SEA’s process for supporting the development, reviewing, and approving the activities in LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements, including a description of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with the specific needs of the LEA and the State’s strategies described in its consolidated State plan for implementation of Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools

All LEAs with comprehensive and targeted school will be required to submit the Plan to SAT for review and determination of its comprehensive approach to the identified findings of the Accountability System.

- i. LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans. Describe the SEAs process to approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans that include evidence-based interventions consistent with the requirements in section 1111(D)(1)(B) of the Act and §200.21(e).*

C. Collection and Use of Data

Describe the SEA’s plan to collect and use information and data, including input from stakeholders, to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes related to Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

The SAT will be responsible for the periodic collection of monitoring data to demonstrate progress toward improving student outcomes, also in collaboration with the LEA. Monitoring data should be submitted and evaluated on a defined schedule as established in the LEA School Improvement Plan.

D. Monitoring

Describe the SEA’s plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of included programs using the data in section 4.4.C to ensure compliance with statutory and

regulatory requirements related to Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

The SAT in collaboration with the LEA will evaluate and monitor the submitted data to determine if the defined interventions are improving student outcomes. At this point the LEA and the SAT should determine if the defined intervention(s) are producing measurable student progress toward a defined outcome.

Table 4.10.

Strategy	Timeline
School Assistance Team reviews plans	Annually: 2018–2022
Review resource allocations and inequities and identify strategies to address the needs.	Annually: 2018–2022
Conduct comprehensive monitoring visit	Every two years: 2018–2022

E. Continuous Improvement

Describe the SEA’s plan to continuously improve implementation of SEA and LEA strategies and activities that are not leading to satisfactory progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes for Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

The SAT will use the LEA and school improvement plans as a component of their analysis of school progress. The SAT will work with LEAs to examine school data continuously, in an iterative process, meaning an initial benchmark of student comprehension, delivery of the prescribed intervention, a second assessment of progress, continued intervention, and third assessment.

If the conclusion of the SAT and the LEA is that the intervention(s) are producing student progress toward a desirable outcome then it is incumbent on them to continue to monitor for progress and ensure continued technical assistance and resources. If the monitoring of data demonstrates no improvement in student progress toward desired outcome(s) within a specified period of time, the SAT in collaboration with the LEA should determine modification to the intervention(s), or a redefinition of intervention. The new or modified intervention should be implemented and the monitoring for success should begin again

If the school no longer falls in the category of comprehensive support due to the significant increase in achievement and/or growth or it is the conclusion of the SAT that the schools processes and procedures will result in higher levels of student outcomes, ISDE and the LEA will discuss termination of status and a plan for interim measures of progress, student data, and scaffolded support.

F. Differentiated Technical Assistance

Describe the SEA’s plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee

strategies for implementation of Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

Technical assistance on plan implementation and management may be provided by the SAT, if specifically requested by the LEA or school. The assistance may be in the form of providing assistance in drafting a comprehensive plan, defining evidenced based interventions, defining key indicators to measure and monitor, periodic data collection, evaluation of the data, and necessary correction needed in the interventions.

Table 4.11.

Strategy	Timeline
Provide technical assistance on creating a school-level needs assessment	2018–2022
Provide technical assistance on the development of comprehensive and targeted support and improvement plans	2018–2022
Provide technical assistance on evidence-based practices and appropriate guidelines for vendor selection	2018–2022
Provide technical assistance on effective school boards	2018–2022

Section 5: Supporting Excellent Educators

5.1 Systems of Educator Development, Retention and Advancement

Instructions: In the section below, each SEA must describe its systems of educator development, retention, and advancement.

A. Educator Development, Retention, and Advancement Systems

Consistent with 2101 and 2102 of the ESEA, describe the State's educator development, retention, and advancement systems, including at a minimum:

- i. *The State's system of certification and licensing of teachers and principals or other school leaders;*

Educator certification in the state of Idaho is a clearly defined within the Idaho Administrative code (IAC). This code puts forth rigorous expectations for teachers, principals, and superintendents who are prepared by both Idaho and out-of-state institutions of higher education. The IAC ensures that educators are prepared not only with the necessary knowledge gained through course work, but through clinical field experiences as well. Alternative routes of certification are also clearly defined and available to those who wish to enter the education profession through non-traditional means. The IAC specifically outlines alternative routes to ensure all educators within Idaho, regardless of certification route, are prepared to the fullest extent. In addition the certification process is reviewed annually by the Idaho Professional Standards Commission in an effort to continuously maintain rigor and improve upon current practice.

Specifics within the IAC detailing specific requirements for educator certification are described in the following paragraphs:

A Standard Elementary Certificate requires: A minimum of 24 semester credit hours, or 36 quarter credit hours, in the philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations and in the professional subject matter of elementary education, which shall include at least 6 semester credit hours, or 9 quarter credit hours, in developmental reading and its application to the content area. [IAC [08.02.02 \(18\)](#)]

An Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education Blended Certificate requires: A minimum of 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours, in the philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations, in instructional technology, and in the professional subject matter of early childhood and early childhood-special education. The professional subject matter of early childhood and early childhood-special education shall include course work specific to the young child from birth through grade 3 in the areas of child development and learning; curriculum development and implementation; family and community relationships; assessment and evaluation; professionalism; and, application of technologies.

A Standard Secondary Certificate requires: A minimum of 20 semester credit hours, or 30 quarter credit hours, in the philosophical, psychological, and methodological foundations, instructional technology, and in the professional subject matter of secondary education, which must include at least 3 semester credit hours, or 4 quarter credit hours, of reading in the content area. [IAC [08.02.02 \(20\)](#)]

Clinical Requirements

The [Idaho Administrative Code](#) articulates clinical requirements for teacher candidates. There are no specific state requirements with regard to preservice teaching experience in diverse settings or with special student populations.

For elementary education, at least 6 semester credit hours, or 9 quarter credit hours, of elementary student teaching or two years of satisfactory experience as a teacher in grades K–8. [IAC [08.02.02 \(018\)](#)]

For Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education, the required 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours, shall include not less than 6 semester credit hours, or 9 quarter credit hours, of early childhood student teaching. [IAC [08.02.02 \(019\)](#)]

For secondary education, the required credit hours must also include at least six semester credit hours, or nine quarter credit hours, of secondary student teaching or two years of satisfactory experience as a teacher in grades six through twelve. Preparation in at least two fields of secondary teaching:

- A first teaching field of at least 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours.
- A second teaching field of at least 20 semester credit hours, or 30 quarter credit hours.
- Preparation of not less than 45 semester credit hours, or 67 quarter credit hours, in a single subject area may be used in lieu of the first teaching field or second teaching field requirements.

[IAC [08.02.02 \(020\)](#)]

Administrator certification requires at least 30 semester credit hours, or 45 quarter credit hours of graduate study in school administration. The program must include the competencies of the Idaho Foundation Standards for School Administrators.

Alternative Routes to Certification

When a professional position cannot be filled by a district with someone who has the correct endorsement/certification the district may request an alternative certification occur. Alternative certification in this area is valid for up to three years and is nonrenewable.

Prior to application, a candidate must hold a Bachelor’s degree, and a valid Idaho teacher certificate without full endorsement in content area of need. The school district must provide supportive information attesting to the ability of the candidate to fill the position.

Alternative Route Preparation Programs

Teacher to New Certification/Endorsement. Candidates will work toward completion of the alternative route preparation program through a participating college/university, and the employing school district. Candidates must complete a minimum of nine (9) semester credits annually to be eligible for extension of up to a total of three (3) years. The participating college/university shall provide procedures to assess and credit equivalent knowledge, dispositions, and relevant life/work experiences. Additionally, Teachers may earn alternative authorization by earning National Board certification in content specific areas teachers may gain endorsement in a corresponding subject area or by obtaining a graduate degree in a content specific area, candidates may add an endorsement in that same content area to a valid. Two pathways are

also available to some teachers, depending upon endorsement(s) already held. Pathway 1 - Endorsements may be added through state-approved testing and a mentoring component. The appropriate test must be successfully completed within the first year of certification in an area closely compatible with an endorsement for which the candidate already qualifies and is experienced. Additionally requires the successful completion of a one-year state-approved mentoring component. Pathway 2 – Endorsements may be added through state-approved testing in an area less closely compatible with an endorsement for which the candidate already qualifies and is experienced. The appropriate test must be successfully completed within the first year of the certification. Additionally requires the successful completion of a one-year state-approved mentoring component and passing a final pedagogy assessment

Alternative certification: Content specialist

The purpose of this alternative certification is to offer an expedited route to certification for individuals who are highly and uniquely qualified in a subject area to teach in a district with an identified need for teachers in that area. Alternative certification in this area is valid for three years and is not renewable. Prior to application, a candidate must hold a bachelor's degree. The candidate shall meet enrollment qualifications of the alternative route preparation program. Upon entry a consortium comprised of a designee from the college/university to be attended, and a representative from the school district, and the candidate shall determine preparation needed to meet the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. This preparation must include mentoring and a minimum of one classroom observation per month until certified.. Prior to entering the classroom, the candidate completes 8 to 16 weeks of accelerated study in education pedagogy.

Content Knowledge, Pedagogy and Performance

As per [IDAPA Rule 08.02.02 Rules Governing Uniformity](#), all certification and endorsement areas require the candidate to demonstrate content knowledge, pedagogy and performance. The state approved assessment for demonstration of content knowledge is the Praxis II assessment. Candidates must have a passing score on the Praxis II assessment for the content area they are seeking certification and endorsement.

Teacher Standards

All Idaho teacher preparation programs are guided by the *Idaho Core Teacher Standards* (see Table 5.1). These standards provide guidelines for what all Idaho teachers must know and be able to do.

Foundation and Enhancement Standards

Foundation and Enhancement Standards refer to additional knowledge and performances a teacher must know in order to teach a certain content area. The Foundation and Enhancement Standards, therefore, further "enhance" the Core Standard.

In this way, the Idaho Core Teacher Standards, Foundation Standards and Enhancement Standards are "layered" to describe what a teacher in the content area must know and be able to do in order to be recommended to the state for initial certification.

Pupil Personnel and Administrator Certification Standards

There are several certification standards for pupil personnel professionals and school administrators that are also addressed through the Idaho teacher certification processes.

- School Administrators
- School Counselors
- School Nurses
- School Psychologists
- School Social Workers

Because of the unique role of these professionals, their standards are independent of the Core Standards but are still written in the same performance-based format: Knowledge and Performances.

Table 5.1: Idaho core teaching standards

Standard category	Standard number and title	Standard description
The Learning and Learning	Standard 1: Learner Development.	The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
	Standard 2: Learning Differences.	The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
	Standard 3: Learning Environments.	The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
Content Knowledge	Standard 4: Content Knowledge.	The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
	Standard 5: Application of Content	The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Instructional Practice	Standard 6: Assessment.	The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
	Standard 7: Planning for Instruction	The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross- disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
	Standard 8: Instructional Strategies.	The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
Professional Responsibility	Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.	The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.
	Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration.	The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Current Work Regarding Certification of Educators

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

- Bring current certification practices in alignment with Idaho statute and administrative code. In those areas where current practice is best practice amend administrative code to align with practice. Areas where current practice is not aligned with state law:

- Individuals teaching outside of grade ranges authorized by certificate (certificate limits the grade level range individuals can teach in, regardless of the endorsement).
 - Active certificates with attached endorsements that are not authorized in administrative code.
 - Positions reported as pupil service staff that no corresponding endorsement exists for (e.g. physical therapist).
 - Alternate routes to certification. (Are they adequate? Do they provide flexibility when standard certificated candidates are not available while still assuring we have qualified individuals in the class room that are capable of advancing student learning?)
 - Mechanism for individuals with specialized skills (or from industry) could “teach” one or two classes (this could be under the supervision of a certificated individual).
 - Para-professional requirements/standards need to be added to administrative code.
- ii. *The State’s system to ensure adequate preparation of new educators, particularly for low-income and minority students*

The official vehicle for the approval of teacher education programs is the approved [Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel](#), which is based upon the accepted national standards for the accreditation of educator preparation and includes state-specific, core teaching requirements. The State Department of Education will transmit to the head of each Idaho College or department of education a copy of all revisions to the Idaho Standards for the Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. Such revisions will take effect and must be implemented within a period not to exceed two (2) years after notification of such revision.

Idaho maintains a partnership agreement with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), a national accreditation council. This partnership agreement provides for concurrent on-site educator preparation unit accreditation reviews along with state program approval for certification reviews of each area of the certification and content endorsements offered by the college/university. During a concurrent visit, a national accreditation council team and a state team collaborate to conduct the review. Both teams, however, submit separate reports. Final unit approval rests with the national accreditation council once state program approval is granted through the State Board of Education.

When an institution is seeking national accreditation, the national accreditation council determines if the unit charged with professional educator preparation meets the accepted national standards. If the institution is seeking national accreditation, the state team uses the data gathered by the national team in addition to their own data to evaluate the institution’s compliance with the national standards and state-specific requirements. If the institution chooses not to seek national accreditation, state team members will be assigned to review the institution’s compliance with the accepted national standards in addition to state-specific requirements. State team members reviewing the national standards will have appropriate training.

The state of Idaho will follow a national council accreditation model by which institutions shall pursue continuing approval through a full program review every seven years. The full program review shall be based upon the Idaho Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. The state of Idaho will additionally conduct focused reviews of state-specific, core teaching requirements in the interim, not to exceed every third year following the full program review.

iii. The State's system of professional growth and improvement, which may include the use of an educator evaluation and support system, for educators that addresses induction, development, compensation, and advancement for teachers, principals, and other school leaders if the State has elected to implement such a system. Alternatively, the SEA must describe how it will ensure that each LEA has and is implementing a system of professional growth and improvement for teachers, principals, and other school leaders that addresses induction, development, compensation, and advancement.

As detailed above, Idaho Educator Preparation Programs must meet the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards and the Idaho State Standards for Initial Certification of Professional School Personnel. Both sets of standards include preparation for diverse students, including minority and low-income students.

Within the five CAEP standards, there are two cross-cutting themes: Diversity and Technology and Digital Learning. The following is the section from the [2013 CAEP Accreditation Standards](#) detailing the Diversity cross-cutting theme and how it applies through the CAEP Standards.

The standards recommended by the Commission have embedded aspects of diversity within them, extending across learning disabilities, language learners, gifted students and students from diverse racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds. For example:

- Standard 1 emphasizes that “all students” should be the focus of educator preparation and that completers should demonstrate skills and commitment that provide all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career ready standards. Standard 1 endorses the Interstate Teacher and Support Consortium (InTASC) teacher standards in their entirety, and the performances, knowledge and dispositions that are extensions of those standards contain literally scores of references to cultural competence, individual differences, creativity and innovation and working with families and communities.
- Standard 2 on clinical experiences again is cast in terms of preparing candidates to work with “all students” and calls for diversity in clinical experiences.
- Standard 3 on candidate quality insists that providers must undertake positive outreach efforts to recruit a more able and more diverse candidate pool.

In addition to the CAEP Diversity cross-cutting theme, the Idaho Core Teaching Standards contain specific standards for preparation of teachers for low-income, minority students, and learning differences.

5.2 Support for Educators

A. *Resources to Support State-level Strategies*

Describe how the SEA will use Title II, Part A funds and funds from other included programs, consistent with allowable uses of funds provided under those programs, to support State-level strategies designed to:

- i. Increase student achievement consistent with the challenging State academic standards;*
- ii. Improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers and principals or other school leaders;*
- iii. Increase the number of teachers and principals or other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools; and*
- iv. Provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders consistent with the provisions described in the State's plan for educator equity.*

Needs Assessment

Idaho Equity Plan

ISDE created a cross agency work group in 2015 to study the equitable distribution of educators across the state. ISDE worked with Northwest Regional Education Lab (NWREL) to analyze educator preparedness (inexperienced), content knowledge (teaching outside of field) as well as need (grade spans or content area). While the data analysis did not point to disparities in terms of the distribution of personnel in terms of low income or minority students, it did identify a shortage of personnel across all areas, including areas not previously identified. The findings became part of Idaho's Equity Plan submitted to the USDOE (insert date) and sparked a statewide effort to study recruitment and retention.

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

These findings have led ISDE to make *recruitment and retention of effective educators*, a cornerstone of both school improvement (using state funds and supplemented by Title I-A school improvement dollars) as well as Effective Educators (Title II-A set aside funds). The goal is to support educator at every level of the system.

Support for the LEA: Idaho Building Capacity (IBC)

The Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) Project, began in 2008, is a cornerstone of Idaho's School Improvement for Idaho schools and districts that are in need of substantial improvement. Cultivation of leadership in rural and remote areas within Idaho is a key focus. The State partners with Boise State

University, Idaho State University, and the University of Idaho to serve more than 10 percent of all schools, more than 30 percent of schools in improvement status, and more than 30 percent of the districts in the State. ISDE has delivered this assistance to more than 60 schools in more than 40 districts each year throughout every region of the State. This project has the capacity to serve more than just the lowest performing 5 percent, but will target and prioritize targeted support and improvement schools.

The IBC project hires highly distinguished educators trained by the State to assist school and district leaders. Capacity Builders (CBs) are assigned to all participating schools and districts within the IBC network. CBs coach leaders and leadership teams through the tasks of improvement with monthly training and assist in promoting alignment among the various parts within the school or district system. Capacity Builders are provided with a toolkit of school improvement resources, and, in partnership with school and district leaders, help create and implement a customized school improvement plan.

Support for Superintendents: Idaho Superintendents Network (ISN)

ISN was created in 2008 by ISDE as a voluntary program for superintendents with schools in needs improvement. The purpose of ISN was to explore leadership's role in improving teaching and learning. The objective is to support the work of district leaders in improving outcomes for all students by focusing on the quality of instruction. ISDE acts as a resource and provides the necessary research, experts, and planning to bring superintendents from across the State together to discuss self-identified issues. ISN has explored a range of topics, including:

- Improved Outcomes for Students
- Working with Stakeholders
- Creating and Supporting District and Building Level Leaders Transforming District Central Offices for Learning Improvements
- Analyzing Teaching and Learning through Data
- Balancing Political Forces
- Value, Ethics and Beliefs: Moral Purpose of Leadership

ISN also serves as a resource for superintendents in districts with schools that are in the Comprehensive Support and Improvement and Targeted Support and Improvement status in order to support and build their capacity in specific aspects of leadership. Participation in ISN will be part of the School Improvement Grant application.

Given the critical nature of recruitment and retention of educators within the state, ISDE is responding to the collective need of superintendents by focusing ISN's efforts on expanding the pipeline of effective educators and ensuring retention. Forty-eight district superintendents and Charter LEA directors convened in October of 2016 to discuss the challenges and brainstorm solutions. Joining the group were representatives from all three public universities as well as one private college. The group devised specific strategies that will pursue during the 2016-17 school year. The group will convene again in December of 2016 and in February of 2017. In addition to ISDE staff, Legislators and State Board members will be asked to participate.

Beginning in the fall of 2017, the focus of ISN will be on aligning state and district level efforts to increase the number of effective educators, as well as customizing programs to meet the individual needs of the communities.

Support for Principals: Idaho Principals Network (IPN)

The IPN project was developed by ISDE to support the work of building level administration in improving outcomes for all students by focusing on the quality of instruction. IPN is a professional learning community structured for building level administration to provide a learning environment focused on increasing the effectiveness to the Instructional Core. Principals participate in a balance of content, professional conversation, and collegial instructional rounds related directly to instructional leadership, managing change, and improving the overall effectiveness of the Instructional Core.

Strands of study include activities such as:

- Evaluating Leadership Frameworks and Turnaround Leadership Competencies
- Supporting Instructional Rounds and Classroom Observations.
- Implementing personal professional growth plans based on self-evaluations.
- Networking with collegial conversation, collaboration and relationship building.

IPN serves as a resource for principals in schools in Comprehensive Support and Improvement and Targeted Support and Improvement status in order to support and build their capacity in specific aspects of leadership. Whereas participation in IBC requires a three-year commitment to developing the leader and leadership team capacity for improvement in a school related to the specific context of the school's needs, IPN provides training unique to the principal regarding higher level perspectives on leadership.

Support for New Leaders: Idaho Principal Mentoring Project

The Idaho Principal Mentoring Project (IPMP) is new and designed for early career principals in Idaho. The project is voluntary and will provide another level of support to those entering a leadership position. While participation is voluntary, in schools eligible for comprehensive or targeted support it will be an expectation that their leadership takes advantage of the program.

While Idaho Building Capacity (IBC) is designed to build local capacity at a systems level, IPMP is designed to provide one-on-one mentorship to new leaders. The mentors are highly distinguished principals and/or superintendents trained by the State to mentor school leaders. Principal mentors are assigned to principal mentees based on need and experience. Mentors coach leaders through the tasks of improvement with bi-monthly visits and bi-weekly high-performance phone calls. Each mentor/mentee team will create a customized mentoring plan that focuses on developing the skills and dispositions in four critical areas of school level leadership; interpersonal and facilitation techniques, teacher observation and feedback, effective school-level practices and classroom-level practices, and using data to improve instruction.

The objectives of the program are two-fold. The first is to increase the rate of effectiveness of new administrators and the second is to see a decrease in turnover among rural and struggling schools.

Support for Teachers – Recruit and Retain

Recruit: Grow Your Own

Idaho is experiencing teacher shortages in all areas of the state and most especially in rural areas. To ensure that LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support are fully staffed by effective educators ISDE will use Title II-A funds to develop two programs. The first will facilitate local agencies to build *Grow Your Own* programs. Grow Your Own programs will include active recruitment of current classified staff (para professionals) with strong ties to the community and demonstrated ability to provide high quality assistance to struggling students into the teaching profession. Title II-A funds will be used by ISDE to create model programs between LEAs and Institutes of Higher Education to provide virtual coursework to paraprofessionals interested in pursuing their certification.

Another part of Grow Your Own is outreach to high school students. Idaho currently provides financial support for concurrent high school and college credit. Currently no courses are offered in education. In partnership with public universities, Idaho Digital Learning Academy, and LEAs, undergraduate courses in education will be offered to secondary students. ISDE is researching scholarship possibilities for students who are willing to commit to teach in high need areas.

Retain: Mentorship and Coaching

Due to rural nature of the state, many of the neediest schools are located far from population centers. While universities and state supported opportunities exist for ongoing support and professional development, access is an issue. The State will use part of the Title II-A state funds to recruit and train mentors within LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support. The goal of the mentors will be to build on the knowledge of skills of teachers within their area, provide mentorship and coaching to new teachers, and to create a community of practice within their LEA.

LEAs will apply to ISDE for their teacher leaders to be part of the Mentorship Program. A performance agreement with expectations for the mentor, the building principal, the LEA, and ISDE will be developed. Mentors will receive training in: instructional coaching, working with adult learners, data literacy, teacher led instructional rounds, differentiating instruction, and cultural responsive teaching.

See Table 5.2 for a summary of proposed programs.

Table 5.2: Support for educators

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Idaho Building Capacity Network	July 2017 to Fall 2022	Title I: School improvement
Idaho Superintendents	July 2017 to Fall 2022	Title I: School improvement
Idaho Principals Network	July 2017 to Fall 2022	Title I: School improvement
Idaho Principal Mentoring Project	July 2017 to Fall 2022	Title II A
Grow Your Own	July 2017 to Fall 2022	Title II A
Mentorship Program	July 2017 to Fall 2022	Title II A

B. Skills to Address Specific Learning Needs

Describe how the SEA will improve the skills of teachers, principals, or other school leaders in identifying students with specific learning needs and providing instruction based on the needs of such students consistent with 20101(d)(2)(J) of the ESEA, including strategies for teachers of, and principals or other school leaders in schools with: low-income students; lowest-achieving students; English learners; children with disabilities; children and youth in foster care; migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school; homeless children and youths; neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children identified under title I, part D of the ESEA; immigrant children and youth; students in LEAs eligible for grants under the Rural and Low-Income School Program; American Indian and Alaska Native students; students with low literacy levels; and students who are gifted and talented.

Rationale for Selected Strategies. Describe the SEA’s rationale(s) for the strategies provided in the table below.

Click here to enter text.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

C. Evaluation and Support Systems

If the SEA or its LEAs plan to use funds under one or more of the included programs for this purpose, describe how the SEA will work with LEAs in the State to develop or implement State or local teacher, principal, or other school leader evaluation and support systems consistent with section 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) of the ESEA.

Rationale for Selected Strategies. Describe the SEA’s rationale(s) for the strategies provided in the table below.

Click here to enter text.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

D. Education Preparation Programs

If the SEA or its LEAs plan to use funds under one or more of the included programs for this purpose, describe how the State will improve education preparation programs consistent with section 2101(d)(2)(M) of the ESEA.

Rationale for Selected Strategies. Describe the SEA’s rationale(s) for the strategies provided in the table below.

Click here to enter text.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

5.3 Educator Equity

Instructions: For each item below, each SEA must describe how it will meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. Each SEA may add additional rows to each table as needed.

A. Definitions

Provide the SEA’s different definitions, using distinct criteria so that each provides useful information about educator equity and disproportionality rates, for the following key terms:

Key term	Definition
Out-of-field teacher	A teacher who is not appropriately certificated or endorsed for the area in which he/she is teaching.
Inexperienced teacher	A teacher in his/her first year of practice.
Low-income student	Student comes from economically disadvantaged families as outlined by the federal child nutrition program.
Minority student	Student identified as a member of a minority race or ethnicity (e.g., African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander/Alaskan Native).

Rates and disproportionalities analysis planned procedures

Idaho does not currently collect student-level information that links students to the characteristics of the teachers that serve them and the Title I status of their school as would be necessary to conduct the analysis of educator equity disproportionalities specified in 5.3.B. The following method will be used to examine disproportionalities.

- For each school, we will calculate the percent *low-income* students in the school, the percent *minority* students in the school, the percent *out-of-field* teachers in the school, and the percent *inexperienced* teachers in the school.
- With schools as the unit of analysis, we will calculate whether student characteristics (percent *low-income* and *minority*) correlate with the teacher characteristics (percent *out-of-field* and *inexperienced*). Disproportionality will be detectable based on the sign and strength of the correlation between student and teacher characteristics.⁶ For example, a positive correlation between percent *low-income* students and percent *out-of-field* teachers indicates evidence of inequitable distributions of educators in that schools serving higher percentages of *low-income* students also tend to have more teachers that are *out-of-field*. In contrast, a negative correlation would indicate the opposite – that schools serving higher percentages of *low-income* students actually have fewer teachers that are *out-of-field*. No correlation would indicate that the percent of *low-income* students at a school is not related to the percent of *out-of-field* teachers at that same school.
- The correlations between student characteristics and teacher characteristics will be calculated separately grouping schools by Title I status (schoolwide Title I vs. targeted Title I vs. non-Title I). This will be done to examine whether inequitable educator distributions are more or less prevalent depending on Title I status.

Sample table shells

Percent <i>Inexperienced</i> Teachers			
	<i>Title I</i> Schools	<i>Targeted</i> Schools	<i>Non-Title I</i> Schools
Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =
Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =

Percent <i>Out-of-Field</i> Teachers			
	<i>Title I</i> Schools	<i>Targeted</i> Schools	<i>Non-Title I</i> Schools
Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =
Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =	<i>r</i> =

⁶ Statistical significance does not imply practical significance, given that even very small effects can be statistically significant when sample sizes are large enough. Thus, we will consider effect size and statistical significance in evaluating whether the strength of the correlations indicates inequitable distribution of teachers.

		Teacher characteristics		
		Student characteristics	Percent <i>Inexperienced</i> Teachers	Percent <i>Out-of-Field</i> Teachers
School type	<i>Title I</i>	Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
		Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
	<i>Targeted Title I</i>	Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
		Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
	<i>Non-Title I</i>	Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
		Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>

		Teacher characteristics		
		Student characteristics	Percent <i>Inexperienced</i> Teachers	Percent <i>Out-of-Field</i> Teachers
School type	<i>Title I Targeted Title I</i>	Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
		Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
	<i>Non-Title I</i>	Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>
		Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	<i>r =</i>	<i>r =</i>

		Teacher characteristics		
		School type	Percent <i>Inexperienced</i> Teachers	Percent <i>Out-of-Field</i> Teachers
Student characteristics	Percentage <i>Low-Income</i> Students	Title I		
		Targeted Title I		
		Non-Title I		
	Percentage <i>Minority</i> Students	Title I		
		Targeted Title I		
		Non-Title I		

B. Rates and Disproportionalities

C. Public Reporting

D. Root Cause Analysis

Click here to enter text.

E. Identification of Strategies

Each SEA that demonstrates that low-income or minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under title I, part A of the ESEA are taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers must provide its strategies, including timelines and funding sources, to eliminate the disproportionate rates demonstrated in section 5.3.B that are based on the root cause analysis and focuses on the greatest or most persistent rates of disproportionality demonstrated in this section, including by prioritizing strategies to support any schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement under §200.19 that are contributing to those disproportionate rates.

Click here to enter text.

Root cause	Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Click here to enter text.			
Click here to enter text.			
Click here to enter text.			
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

5.4 Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Supporting Excellent Educators

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans regarding supporting excellent educators, consistent with §299.14 (c). The description of an SEA’s system of performance management must include information on the SEA’s review and approval of LEA plans, collection and use of data, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance. If a table is provided below, the SEA’s description must include strategies and timelines.

A. System of Performance Management

Describe the SEA’s system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans for supporting excellent educators.

B. Review and Approval of LEA Plans

Describe the SEA’s process for supporting the development, reviewing, and approving the activities in LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements, including a description of how the SEA will determine if LEA

activities align with the specific needs of the LEA and the State’s strategies described in its consolidated State plan for supporting excellent educators.

Click here to enter text.

C. Collection and Use of Data

Describe the SEA’s plan to collect and use information and data, including input from stakeholders, to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes related to supporting excellent educators.

Strategy	Timeline
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.

D. Monitoring

Describe the SEA’s plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of included programs using the data in section 5.4.C to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements related to supporting excellent educators.

Strategy	Timeline
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.

E. Continuous Improvement

Describe the SEA’s plan to continuously improve implementation of SEA and LEA strategies and activities that are not leading to satisfactory progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes related to supporting excellent educators.

Strategy	Timeline
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.

F. Differentiated Technical Assistance

Describe the SEA’s plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies for supporting excellent educators.

Strategy	Timeline
----------	----------

Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
<Add rows as necessary>	Click here to enter text.

Section 6: Supporting All Students

6.1 Well-Rounded and Supportive Education for Students

- A. Each SEA must describe for (i)-(vii) below, its strategies, rationale for selected strategies, timelines, and how it will use funds under the programs included in the consolidated State plan, and support LEA use of funds, in combination with State and local funds, to ensure that all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging State academic standards and career and technical standards, as applicable, and attain, at a minimum, a regular high school diploma. The description must address, at a minimum:*
- i. The continuum of a student’s education from preschool through grade 12, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to postsecondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out*

Increasing Opportunities and Outcomes for College and Career

Idaho is fortunate to have a single State Board of Education (SBOE) that oversees its entire P–20 education system. This promotes consistency and allows for strategic planning⁷ across the entire education continuum, from kindergarten through college attainment. The SBOE sets benchmarks for the percentage of Idaho students graduating from high school, attending postsecondary institutions, and either completing college and/or being ready to assume careers. Examples of the implementation of these goals include the support for dual-credit opportunities (with specific goals for the percentages of students completing dual credit), Next Steps Idaho, which provides web-based guidance through the admissions process and funding streams, and efforts at the high school level, such as Idaho College Application Week.⁸

Transition to School

Idaho does not currently offer state-sponsored prekindergarten, although some districts use their Title I and local dollars to support this effort. Transitions from prekindergarten to kindergarten are clearly articulated in the *State Special Education Manual*.⁹ for students with the disabilities. The process and procedures are well To facilitate student progress through the grade continuum the foundational needs of Idaho elementary student are also an area of focus. Idaho assesses all K–3 students on foundational literacy skills at least twice per year. Any student who is identified as “at risk” must receive a minimum of the 30 hours (if slightly below grade level) or 60 hours (if below grade level) of additional intervention. The intervention must meet the standard of evidence-based and districts must write plans and identify

⁷ https://boardofed.idaho.gov/policies/documents/strategic_plan

⁸ <https://nextsteps.idaho.gov/>

⁹ <https://www.sde.idaho.gov/sped/shared/2016-Special-Education-Manual.pdf>

progress annually to the state. During the 2016 Idaho State Legislative session, funding for the intervention was increased from approximately \$2 million to \$9.3 million.

Middle Level

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

High School

ISDE supervises K–12 education and has identified priorities that are aligned with the vision of SBOE. The first goal of ISDE’s plan is ensure that all Idaho students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers.¹⁰ Every high school student is required to take (fill in graduation requirements) and has the opportunity to take a nationally recognized college admission assessment. The current assessment that is offered to all Idaho Juniors is the Scholastic Aptitude Test. The cost of the SAT is absorbed by the state.

Next Steps

Even with all of the purposeful alignment from preschool to college, the state recognizes the need for additional supports at critical transitions such as elementary to middle school and middle school through high school. During the 2017–18 school year a task force comprising LEA leaders with transition plans in place, SBOE staff, and ISDE program coordinators will be convening to provide guidance to all districts, schools, and families on creating systems of support for all students.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Dual credit in secondary schools		
Next Steps Idaho		
Idaho college application week		
Transition task force	August 2017–May 2018	Title IV-A State Administrative Funds

- ii. *Equitable access to a well-rounded education, in subjects such as English, reading/language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, physical*

¹⁰ <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/topics/legislative/files/SDE-Strategic-Plan-Summary.pdf>

education, and any other subjects, in which female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, and low-income students are underrepresented

While there are many opportunities to expand access to a high-quality, well-rounded education, and the components reflected in this section are ambitious and inclusive, it should be noted that the estimated allocation dedicated to Title IV-A in Idaho is \$2 million statewide. When the formula is applied, the resources will not be sufficient to meet the needs of all Idaho students. Therefore, ISDE will emphasize the review of local data to determine to most effective allocation of funding to support students most in need and to leverage other funding sources to expand the reach of Title IV-A programs.

We know that learning happens everywhere. Title IV-A funds will be used to support programs that benefit the whole child during the day, and Title IV-B funds will be used to support that beyond the school day. ISDE has given carefully consideration to how best to align all of the programs serving our most fragile students. The program directors and coordinators work closely with each other and LEAs to resource map options for local leaders. In the following section, ISDE provides information on each of the specific programs (Title IV-A, Title IV-B, Special Education services, EL support, Migrant programs, Rural Education, Neglected and Delinquent and Homeless) It should be noted that LEAs have the opportunity to work with the State Assistance Team and/or their assigned Capacity Builder to ensure resources are aligned to student and family's needs.

Title IV-A Current Status

As a result of the Idaho's slow recovery from the economic recession, LEAs have eliminated many programs (e.g., elective courses, afterschool programs) that contribute to a robust, well-rounded education. ISDE will support LEA use of funds to ensure all children have a significant opportunity to meet challenging standards and have access to a well-rounded education by providing guidance and supporting title IV-A expenditures in the following ways:

Professional Development

LEAs may use Title IV-A funds to expand professional development for instructional staff and administrators around aligning instruction to Idaho's content standards based on the Common Core State Standards. State funds currently support a cadre of instructional coaches (Regional Math Centers¹¹ and Idaho Core Literacy Coaches¹²) who provide embedded professional development and coaching for LEA staff. LEAs may use Title IV-A funds to expand this model to reach more teachers and administrators within their district.

Middle-Level Credit System

LEA may choose to use Title IV-A funds to expand or enhance their middle-level credit system.

Alternative Schools

¹¹ <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/academic/math/>

¹² <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/academic/ela-literacy/>

Idaho's alternative school focus is geared to meeting the needs of the students and helping them find success through a personalized approach. The supports and flexibility provided to alternative schools emphasizes the specific needs of the identified at-risk students. The alternative schools specifically work with students who are transitioning from elementary to middle/junior high and middle/junior high to high school in order to help them be successful at the next level.

Students enrolled in alternative schools in Idaho receive additional support not always found in the traditional secondary schools. The academic instruction is designed to meet the needs of the at-risk students. This may include assigning fewer classes per day, instruction specific to students' individual needs, and the use of a variety of instructional techniques. Students are provided the opportunity to attend summer school in order to make-up credits or work ahead. In addition to the academic requirements, alternative schools are required to provide services based on student needs. They include day care centers for students who are parents and direct social services such as social workers and specialized counselors or psychologist.

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

Title IV-A funds may be used to enhance or expand any of these services to students. Specific examples of allowable expenditures include:

- Special programs (support groups, parenting classes, alternatives to suspension/expulsion, drug/alcohol prevention, peaceful conflict resolution programs, cognitive behavioral therapy, trauma informed disciplinary/instructional practices, restorative justice, diversion, school based problem-solving courts, tutoring, mentoring).
- Professional development for alternative school staff (based on any of the above programs).
- Expansion of course offerings (electives based on student input).
- Digital literacy/digital citizenship
- Expansion of music/art courses and activities

Curriculum Expeditions

Title IV-A funds can be used for field trips that involve students in learning experiences which cannot be duplicated in a classroom setting. These *curriculum expeditions* provide hands-on activities that encourage students to experiment and ask questions. *Curriculum expeditions* must also appear as a part of the teacher's lesson plans, which should include activities that prepare students for the expedition and follow-up activities that allow students to summarize, apply, and evaluate what they learned from the trip.

Examples of appropriate curriculum expeditions include:

- Curricular academic activities focused on math, science, and technology, such as service learning, internships, UIL competitions (robotics, math), or science and technology fairs.
- Trips to a river, archaeological site, or nature preserve that might include contracting with local science centers, American Indian Natural Resource departments, museums, zoos, and horticultural centers for visits and programs.
- Trips to the local library to increase access to high-interest reading materials
- Visits to colleges and universities to encourage interest in the pursuit of higher education.

Art Education

Exposure to the arts is an important component of a well-rounded education. As such, LEAs may establish or expand arts education through the purchase or rental of instruments for underserved populations that provide unique music opportunities to for those who have not been exposed to music education. The purchase of curricula, supplemental materials and arts materials (in areas of dance, theatre, visual and media arts) for whole class instruction are also suggested for students with limited access to arts instruction. ISDE will encourage LEAs to utilize existing arts faculty to develop specific courses aimed to draw in underprivileged youth through out of school-time programs school programs. Resources to assist LEAs in this area included developing partnerships with Idaho Commission on the Arts and Artist in Residency projects and the use of funds to create a match for grants, expansion of program activities. Art education supports from ISDE are based on findings from Project Zero; 2009 publication: The Qualities of Quality: Understanding Excellence in Arts Education. ISDE will assist in facilitating these partnerships.

Physical Education

All students should have access to highly effective health and physical education programs to support their academic achievement, physical and mental health, and social and emotional learning and development. Research indicates that participating in physical activity and physical education improves student attendance, participation and enthusiasm for other academic subjects and motivation to learn, and reduces discipline referrals. Title IV-A funds can be used to establish or expand LEA physical education activities.

Health Education

Evidence shows that effective health education reduces the health risks of students, including lowering smoking, heavy drinking, school misbehavior and violence (citation?). Additionally, health education can increase student's health literacy and health skills to meet the state standards for health education. Title IV-A funds can be used to establish or expand LEA health education activities such as coordinated school health, nutrition education, drug prevention, healthy living curricula, and so on.

Advanced Opportunities

Advanced Opportunities are defined in State Board Policy¹³ as the following: dual credit, professional technical education, Advanced Placement, and International Baccalaureate programs. State funding has been appropriated for students to participate in these opportunities (Idaho Code 33-4602). These state funds will be leveraged to establish comprehensive support for students taking advanced coursework.

¹³ <https://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/>

In an effort to widen access to Advanced Opportunities for Idaho students, Title IV-A funds can be used for activities such as student advising, mentoring, career counseling; promotion, implementation, and communication with stakeholders, parents, and students about the opportunities available in their school district; college campus visits; hiring Advanced Opportunities support staff and efforts to increase the availability of dual credit, PTE, AP, and/or IB programs, such as incentives for teachers to become certified to teach dual credit courses.

Activities should be focused on promoting smooth transition into career opportunities for students, strengthening communication and establishing partnerships with vested stakeholders. ISDE will leverage existing personnel and resources to support LEA activity in this area including an annual Advanced Opportunities conference and local trainings.

ISDE will leverage an additional \$5 million appropriation from the Idaho Legislature in 2016 focused on college advising and career mentoring.

Cultural Integration

Access to a well-rounded education includes integrating a broad cultural lens and recognizing the diverse cultural backgrounds of students in Idaho. As such, LEAs will be prompted to articulate how cultural needs are being met and will be offered support from the ISDE's office of Indian Education and English Learner/Migrant Education programs. Additionally, in the pursuit of providing a safe and a respectful school climate for all students, public schools are expected to have an open dialogue with appropriate local Idaho tribes to discuss opportunities to implement accurate tribal histories, appropriate use of cultural artifacts and symbols, and other areas that promote cultural and/or tribal synchronicity within the curricula. ISDE will encourage LEAs to incorporate cultural understandings in professional development activities.

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

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

Students with Disabilities

The ISDE Special Education Department works collaboratively with districts, agencies, and parents to ensure students with disabilities receive quality, meaningful, and needed services. The department has

program coordinators for dispute resolution, funding, program monitoring, results-driven accountability, special populations, secondary transition, and data management. The department also works collaboratively with the Special Education Support and Technical Assistance (SESTA) project through the Boise State University. SESTA provides statewide professional development, training and support to districts leaders, teachers and paraprofessionals who support students with disabilities in the schools.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Instructional coaches	July 2017	Title IV-A
Middle-Level Credit System	May 2007, ongoing	Title IV-A
Alternative School Enhancement	July 2017	Title IV-A
Idaho Mastery Network	January 2015, ongoing	Title IV-A
Curricular Expeditions	July 2017	Title IV-A
Flexibility for LEAs in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art education • Health education • Physical education 	July 2017	Title IV-A
LEA provision of advanced opportunities, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student advising • Mentoring • Career counseling • Promotion, implementation, and communication with stakeholders, parents, and students about the opportunities available in their school district • College campus visits • Hiring of advanced opportunities support staff and efforts to increase the availability of dual credit, PTE, AP, and/or IB programs 		
Collaboration with ISDE's office of Indian Education and English Learner/Migrant Education programs	July 2017	Title-IV-A

- iii. School conditions for student learning, including activities to reduce:*
- a. Incidents of bullying and harassment*
 - b. The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom*
 - c. The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety*

Existing state supports will be leveraged to increase the impact of Title IV-A funds. After multiple years of stakeholder organizing and working with the Idaho legislature, a law was passed during the 2015 session that increased the requirements of LEAs to address bullying and harassment including:

- Ongoing professional development for all staff at the school building level
- The expectation that all staff intervene when bullying/harassment occurs
- Implementation of a graduated series of consequence for policy violators
- The annual reporting of bullying incidents to the SEA

The legislature has also appropriated \$4 million (ongoing) in formula funds to establish safe and drug free schools. These funds can be leveraged to establish optimal conditions for learning, improve school climate, implement special programs and explore alternatives to suspension and expulsion. In an effort to maximize these resources and assist LEAs in implementing best practices, ISDE hosts an annual conference focused on the prevention of risk behaviors, out of school time programs and family/community engagement called the *Idaho Prevention and Support Conference*. Approximately 550 school counselors, teachers, administrators (including charter and alternative), school resource officers, juvenile probation, judiciary representatives and other stakeholders attend every year. Recent conference themes include addressing bullying/harassment and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES). ISDE has focused heavily on ACES as this research makes a strong case for trauma-informed disciplinary policy and practice.

Additionally, ISDE won a Garret Lee Smith grant focused on youth suicide prevention from SAMHSA and has implemented Sources of Strength (best practice youth suicide prevention program) in select schools from 2014 through 2016. The grant comes to a close on September 30, 2016, and partially as a result of this effort the Idaho Legislature establish the first ever Office of Suicide Prevention in the Department of Health and Welfare with an appropriation of \$1 million and four new FTE positions. A component of this effort is the continuation of Sources of Strength implementation in schools. This program has demonstrated efficacy in not only preventing suicide, but also preventing a range of risk behaviors as it focuses on internal strengths (grit/resilience), hope, help and connectedness.

These supports will be used to increase the impact of Title IV-A funds appropriated for LEA and ISDE efforts to address bullying and harassment, and the overuse of disciplinary practices that remove students from the classroom. The following programs/strategies have a presence and existing supports in Idaho and ISDE will encourage LEA use of Title IV-A funds for these purposes if local data merits the need.

- Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (schoolwide, systemic approach to improved culture and supports based on data)
- Restorative Justice Practices
- Mentoring programs such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters
- Alternatives to suspension/expulsion (special programs)
- Sources of Strength (secondary level)
- Good Behavior Game (primary level)
- Suicide Prevention Gatekeeper Training
- Youth Mental Health First Aid (mental health awareness)
- Mental Health assessment and referral

- Crisis response/de-escalation training for school staff
- School nurse position with accompanying student health room
- Wellness programs (Coordinated School Health)

ISDE will also utilize, and encourage LEAs to utilize, the expertise of the regional Equity Assistance Center funded by the U.S. Department of Education to focus race, gender and national origin equity to public schools in an effort to promote equal access to educational opportunities.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Idaho Prevention and Support Conference	Spring 2017	Title IV-A
Support LEAs with existing initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (schoolwide, systemic approach to improved culture and supports based on data) • Restorative justice practices • Mentoring programs such as Big Brothers, Big Sisters • Alternatives to suspension/expulsion (special programs) • Sources of Strength (secondary level) • Good Behavior Game (primary level) • Suicide Prevention Gatekeeper Training • Youth Mental Health First Aid (mental health awareness) • Mental Health assessment and referral • Crisis response/deescalation training for school staff • School nurse position with accompanying student health room • Wellness programs (Coordinated School Health) 	Ongoing	Title IV-A

iv. The effective use of technology to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students

Due to the varied needs of LEAs in Idaho and the students they serve, ISDE provides a framework based upon the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) for activities focused on the effective use of technology in instruction and to advance the digital literacy of students. The framework includes specific performance based standards for administrators¹⁴ and teachers¹⁵ that include such areas as; leadership, digital age learning culture, excellence in professional practice, digital citizenship, and so on.

¹⁴ <http://www.iste.org/standards/standards/standards-for-administrators>

¹⁵ <http://www.iste.org/standards/standards/standards-for-teachers>

In addition to the ISTE standards, ISDE emphasize adherence to Idaho's Information and Communication Technology Content Standards.¹⁶ These standards are based upon the ISTE framework and emphasize digital literacy, digital citizenship, creativity, and knowledge creation using technology.

Title IV-B

Title IV-B, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, provides the opportunity for LEAs to expand access to high quality, well-rounded education through academic enrichment activities and a broad array of additional activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (such as before and after school or during summer recess) (Sec. 4201(b)(A)). The Idaho State Education Agency (ISDE) receives an allotment of approximately \$5 million, depending on the appropriation by the Secretary under section 4206. ISDE reserves:

- Not less than 93 percent of the allotment for awards to eligible entities, which is awarded through a competitive grant application based on three categories: (1) needs assessment (as referenced in §299.19(a)(2)(i), Sec. 4202(c)(1), Sec. 4201(b)(3) and Sec. 4204(i)), (2) project design (§299.19(a)(1) and Sec. 4205), and (3) assurances (Sec. 4204(b);
- Two percent of the allotment is for State Administration, which is focused on efforts to establish and implement a grant competition, rigorous review process and other administrative duties (Sec. 4202(c)(2); and
- Five percent of the allotment is for State Activities, which the SEA utilizes to monitor and evaluate LEAs, conduct comprehensive evaluations, provide technical assistance and training, work with local community and stakeholders to improve state policies and practices (Sec. 4202(c)(3).

In order to establish Community Learning Centers that provide well-rounded education and rigorous coursework, the ISDE allows LEAs to offer a variety of academic enrichment activities and a broad array of additional activities, which focuses on activities that complement the regular academic program, targeted to the students' academic needs and align with State academic standards (Idaho Core Standards):

- Academic Activities
 - STEM - Activities that contribute to the development of science, technology, engineering or mathematics skills. STEM helps “students understand how the academic disciplines of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics impact their world and prepare them for the workforce of tomorrow. STEM is multidiscipline based, incorporating the integration of other disciplinary knowledge into a new whole... [STEM is] a process for teaching and learning, rather than learning isolated bits and pieces of content. Furthermore, STEM is utilizing interdisciplinary strategies in order for students to make informed decisions, create new products and process, and solve problems.
 - Literacy - Activities that support students gain ability to identify, understand, interpret, create and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts.
 - Tutoring - Provide one-on-one or small group instruction to a student that (1) aligns with State academic standards and/or local academic standards and (2) designed to improve student academic achievement.

¹⁶ <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/academic/shared/instructional-tech/Information-Communication-Technology-Outline-Grades-K-12.pdf>

- Homework Help - Offers students the time, resources, and tools to accomplish assigned work from the school day teacher.
- English Language Learner Support - Delivers instruction and support for students that come from non-English speaking homes and backgrounds.
- Enrichment Activities
 - Entrepreneurship – Arranges opportunities for students that increase knowledge, skills, and motivation to encourage entrepreneurial success in a variety of settings. Activities may include: financial literacy, economics, profit potential, risk management, business management, human resource management, and conflict resolution.
 - Arts & Music - Comprehensive and sequential education in separate and distinct artistic disciplines, which may include subjects such as dance, music, theater, drawing, painting, sculpture, design works, photography, film, animation, and culture.
 - Parenting Skills - Activities that teach parenting skills.
 - Physical Activity – Activities that produce body movement and requires energy expenditure. Also includes activities that teach healthy living and lifestyles such as nutrition education.
 - Community & service learning – Creates community service opportunities for the benefit of his or her local community. Service-Learning activity is a teaching method that combines meaningful service to the community with standards-based learning. Service-Learning challenges students, as part of their curriculum, to identify, research, propose and implement solutions to real needs in their school or community and by which students improve academic learning and develop personal and career skills.
 - Mentoring - Activity that connects students to another individual in a one-on-one relationship. The mentor provides the student support and advice in dealing with day-to-day challenges.
- Character Education
 - Drug Prevention -Provide students instruction, awareness, and skills to prevent the onset of drug use.
 - Counseling Program – Gives students one-on-one, small group, or whole group instruction to promote and enhance the learning process, which may focus on any of the development of the whole child: physical, emotional, academic, and social.
 - Violence Prevention - Evidence-based instruction, awareness, and skills to prevent the onset of violence.
 - Truancy Prevention - Evidence-based to strategies to create awareness of the importance, and skills to improve school attendance. Truancy may include an excused or unexcused absence depending on the district definition.
 - Youth Leadership - Activity that promotes and allows youth to exercise authority over themselves and/or others. Activities focus on youth development to lead civic engagement, education reform, and community organizing activities.
- College & Career Readiness - Activity that provides students with the knowledge and skills consistent for both college readiness and career readiness. Furthermore, prepares students to enroll and succeed, without remediation, in a credit bearing course at a postsecondary institution or a high quality certificate program with a career pathway to future advancement; also includes activities that partner with in-demand fields of local workforce or build career competencies and career readiness (Sec. 4205).

Title IV-B allows for LEAs to establish character education programs that address the issues of school conditions for student learning. Programs are required to utilize grant funds to provide training and professional development to: (1) improve and increase afterschool staffs' knowledge of evidence-based practices for out-of-school time programming (Sec. 4204(J)); (2) part of a broad school wide and district wide education improvement plan; (3) allow personalized plans for each staff to address the educator's specific needs; and (4) improve classroom management skills; (5) provide opportunities for staff to develop knowledge, skills and techniques in social-emotional learning (Sec. 8101(42)).

v. Parent, family, and community engagement

Idaho offers a wide variety of supports for families and communities and multiple opportunities to engage in their child's learning. Under the direction of the Title IV B Coordinator and Family and Community Engagement Coordinator, ISDE offers conferences devoted to improving engagement and understanding potential barriers, Idaho State Achievement Participation toolkit (a resource for Idaho schools/districts and parents regarding state assessments in English and Spanish), The Family Engagement Tool (FET) is a web-based resource to assist in the development and/or enhancement of a district/school family engagement plan. FET was created by the Academic Development Institute and customized for Idaho.

Title IV-B allows for LEAs to establish character education programs that address the issues of school conditions for student learning. Programs are required to utilize grant funds to provide training and professional development to: (1) improve and increase afterschool staffs' knowledge of evidence-based practices for out-of-school time programming (Sec. 4204(J)); (2) part of a broad school wide and district wide education improvement plan; (3) allow personalized plans for each staff to address the educator's specific needs; and (4) improve classroom management skills; (5) provide opportunities for staff to develop knowledge, skills and techniques in social-emotional learning (Sec. 8101(42)).

To help in providing a well-rounded education, parent, family, and community engagement is an objective for Title IV-B; LEAs are required to "offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for active and meaningful engagement in their children's education, including opportunities for literacy and related educational development" (Sec. 4201(a)(3)). LEAs offer two types of family engagement and parental involvement opportunities:

- (1) Family Literacy Services (Sec. 8101(24)) - Services provided to families that are of sufficient intensity in terms of hours, and of sufficient duration, to make sustainable changes in a family, and that integrate the following activities:
 - a. Interactive literacy activities between parents and their children
 - b. Training for parents regarding how to be the primary teacher for their children and full partners in the education of their children
 - c. Parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency

- (2) Parental Involvement Opportunities (Sec. 8101(39)) - Participation of parents in regular, two-way and meaningful communication involving student academic learning and other school activities, including ensuring:
 - a. That parents play an integral role in assisting their child's learning

- b. That parents are encouraged to be actively involved in their child’s education in afterschool and school
- c. That parents are full partners in their child’s education and are included, as appropriate, in decision making and on advisory committees to assist in the education of their child

Type	Category	Examples may include	Potential partners
Family Literacy Services	Parent and Children Learning Together Time (PACTT)	Math & Literacy Nights; Family Nutrition Class; Physical Activity Class; <i>Lights On Afterschool</i> .	Content Specific Instructors; Dance/Gym Studios; 4-H Extension; Eat Smart Idaho; Idaho Fish & Game
	Parent Education	<i>Love & Logic; Five Love Languages; How to Help Your Child with Homework; Substance, Bully, and Risky-Behavior Awareness; Helping Your Child Succeed in School; Grade Level Advancement Preparation; Resources for Parents; and College Nights.</i>	School District; Universities/Colleges 4-H Extension; Boy Scouts of America; Health & Welfare; Family Doctors; Dentists.
	Adult Education	General Education Development (GED) & Remedial Education; English & Foreign Language; Financial Literacy; CPR/First Aid; Job Skill Development; Public Speaking; Technology; Business Literacy; and Hunting/Fishing Classes.	School District; Universities/Colleges; Banks; Insurance Companies; Tax Companies; Local Businesses.
Parent Involvement	Leadership Opportunities	Advisory Board; Planning Committees; Focus Groups.	
	Child Education Investment Opportunities	One-on-One Conferences.	
	Volunteer Opportunities	Volunteer and participate in afterschool program activities.	

ISDE also provides *Military-Connected Student Self-Identifier*, a partnership with the Idaho National Guard. Through the partnership, ISDE will be able to assist the 10,000 military connected students with opportunities and benefits available, as well as assist LEAs with identifying students and military families.

In partnership with Idaho Digital Learning Academy (IDLA), ISDE will develop a web-based statewide resource center for parents. The goal of the portal is to be user-friendly and practical to meet the needs of parents/families. The portal will be organized by each age-growth mile stone. Some of the topics that will be addressed are as follows: how to register my child for kindergarten, what skill is my child expected to know by first grade, how to fill out the FASA form for college enrollment, and where and how to find scholarships for college.

The Superintendent’s Parent Advisory Council (PAC) will be established to examine important processes, policies, and initiatives to ensure that the needs of parents and their families are included in the decision-making process by the SDE. The PAC will be comprised of parent representatives from various communities across Idaho. There will be in-person and virtual meetings to assist the needs of council members in rural and urban areas throughout the state. Federal Program Directors at each school district

will designate a point of contact for a parent council member to have access to the technology component of each virtual meeting.

Special Education Family Engagement

The Family and Community Engagement Coordinator is also an integral member of the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP). The responsibilities of Idaho’s SEAP include, advising ISDE on unmet educational needs for students with disabilities, providing public feedback on proposed regulations by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities.

In addition, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is a multi-year effort supported by the U.S. Department of Education and the Office of Special Education Programs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The ISDE Special Education Department has used a thorough review of data and infrastructure to determine that the area of highest need in Idaho is improved practices and outcomes in literacy, as measured by a structured evaluation plan and students’ scores on the state summative assessment. The team identified four improvement strands, that when implemented effectively, will positively impact literacy practices in districts and schools and ultimately increase student success. *One of the identified improvement strands is Family and Community Involvement.* The SSIP team is identifying evidenced-based practices that will increase the connection between schools and families in an effort to expand the supports available to students with disabilities. Currently those practices are being identified and implemented in a cohort of seven districts. Once the plan is evaluated and adjusted as needed, it will be scaled-up statewide.

vi. The accurate identification of English learners and children with disabilities.

Rationale for Selected Strategies

All Idaho LEAs must administer a Home Language Survey (HLS) to all incoming students to identify whether the student comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant. Students who may be potential ELs are screened for language proficiency using Idaho’s English language proficiency screener assessment (ACCESS 2.0 Screener) for determining a student’s level of English language proficiency and EL program eligibility. Language proficiency assessment scores are additionally used for appropriate language instruction educational program placement and/or EL supports based on language needs. Students scoring exceptionally high on the language proficiency screener assessment are “screened out” of EL program eligibility and are not identified as English learners. The Idaho State EL and Title III Program, along with an EL advisory committee, is revising manuals, resources, and sample documents on statewide entrance/exit criteria processes and procedures for LEAs to uniformly implement across Idaho.

Beginning in school year 2016–2017 the Idaho State EL and Title III program implemented a secure application called Idaho’s English Learner Management System (ELMS). The ELMS application provides direct access to English language proficiency records by district EL personnel to determine immediate EL programmatic decisions and save both teachers and students the time of screener assessment administration in the event the student has already been EL identified and/or have already been administered a language proficiency screener assessment in a previous school year and/or school district in Idaho. Students who have been previously identified as EL are able to continue their EL services without delay, which alleviates over testing and maintains consistency in a student’s status if they move from one district to another.

vii. Optional: Other state-identified strategies

Students in Foster Care

ISDE has designated the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) coordinator to act at the Idaho State Foster Care Liaison. The FACE Coordinator will be the designated point of contact for child welfare agencies to oversee the implementation of state responsibilities under the Title I educational stability provisions for children in foster care. The roles and responsibilities of the coordinator include:

- Coordinating with the corresponding state and tribal child welfare agency POCs to issue joint state guidance for the implementation of the Title I provisions
- Establishment of uniform criteria around the best interest determination factors
- Establishment of guidelines for transportation procedures. Including how transportation will be addressed across district and state lines and what should be included in local transportation procedures
- Monitoring LEAs to ensure compliance with Title I requirements at the local level
- Providing professional development opportunities and technical assistance for LEA POCs and other personal regarding school stability and educational supports for children in foster care, as needed

Native Students

The Idaho Department of Education supports activities that strengthen education opportunities and improve education outcomes for all students, including our American Indian students.

State Tribal and Education Partnership (STEP grant) is a competitive grant sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education STEP Program purposes:

1. To promote collaboration between tribal education agencies (TEAs) and the SEAs and LEAs that serve students from the affected tribes,
2. To build the capacity of TEAs to conduct certain administrative functions under certain Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) formula grant programs for eligible schools, such as Title I-A, School Improvement, Title II-A.

The U.S. Department of Education has awarded the STEP grant to five tribes in the nation. Two of those tribes are from Idaho.

Nez Perce Tribe STEP Grant. Through the SEA-TEA partnership, Idaho is committed to helping build the capacity of its Nez Perce TEA with Lapwai District and Kamiah Joint District. Both of these public school districts are located on reservation land. The Federal Programs Department of the IDE has provided extensive training and supports through the Title I-A, School Improvement, Title II-A professional development, and Family and Community Engagement programs. It has not been a one-way relationship. SEA and LEA staff have benefited from hearing stories and legends of the Nimipu people and learning about tribal history, culture, language, and the government of the Nez Perce people.

The Nez Perce Tribe was part of the three year 2012 STEP grant pilot and the Tribe was refunded again in 2015 for four years. The primary goal of this grant is to significantly improve the academic achievement of American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) students through collaboration, capacity building, and culturally-responsive strategies. The project’s overarching motto is to “understand the difference between teaching culture and teaching culturally.”

Coeur d’Alene Tribe STEP Grant. The Coeur d’Alene Tribe was awarded the STEP grant in 2015. Its overarching goal is to strengthen and support the cultural identify of Coeur d’Alene tribal youth and improve achievement and graduation rates of the American Indian students on the reservation as measured by local and state assessments. Central to this goal, is the idea of *identity safe schools and classrooms*. Students who feel their social identity is an asset in the classroom rather than a barrier are more confident and successful. Learning happens more readily in an environment where students feel welcomed, supported, and valued no matter what their background. These students are able to preserve in life to be ready for college or careers.

The Coeur d’Alene Tribe is in its first year planning stage in partnership with the SEA and the Plummer-Worley Joint District and the Coeur d’Alene Tribal school. Collaborations are planned to increase the TEA’s knowledge in the Title I-A program, Title II-A professional development program, and with Family and Community Engagement practices for the purpose of supporting the Tribe’s role in educating its students.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources
Family and community engagement coordinator		
STEP grants		

- B.** *Each SEA must describe how it will use title IV, part A and part B, and other Federal funds to support the State-level strategies described in section 6.1.A and other State-level strategies, as applicable, and to ensure that, to the extent permitted under applicable law and regulations, the processes, procedures, and priorities used to award subgrants under an included program are consistent with the requirements of this section.*

6.2 Performance Management and Technical Assistance for Supporting All Students

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans regarding supporting all students, consistent with §299.14 (c) and §299.19. The description of an SEA’s system of performance management must include information on the SEA’s review and approval of LEA plans, collection and use of data, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance. If a table is provided below, the SEA’s description must include strategies, timelines, and rationales.

A. System of Performance Management

Describe the SEA’s system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans for supporting all students.

B. Review and Approval of LEA Plans

Describe the SEA’s process for supporting the development, reviewing, and approving the activities in LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements, including a description of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with the specific needs of the LEA and the State’s strategies described in its consolidated State plan related to supporting all students.

The State Assistance Team is responsible for ensuring that all LEAs receiving Title I funds are developing and implementing plans consistent with the strategies described.

- i. Use of Information and Data to Inform Review and Approval of LEA Plans. Describe how the SEA will use the information and data on resource equity collected and reported under §§ 200.34 and 200.27 and section 1111(h) of the ESEA, including a review of LEA-level budgeting and resource allocation related to (1) per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds; (2) educator qualifications as described in §200.37; (3) access to advanced coursework; and (4) the availability of preschool to inform review and approval of LEA applications.*

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

- C. Collection and Use of Data.** *Describe the SEA’s plan to collect and use information and data, including input from stakeholders, to assess the quality of SEA and LEA implementation of strategies and progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes related to supporting all students.*

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

D. Monitoring

Describe the SEA's plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of included programs using the data in section 6.2.C to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements related to supporting all students.

The SAT will review on a regular basis a sample of LEAs regardless of improvement status. Title I monitoring ensures compliance, the SAT system will ensure effectiveness. Priority will be given to LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive improvement, targeted support, and those serve high percentages of students with low socio-economic status.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

E. Continuous Improvement

Describe the SEA's plan to continuously improve implementation of SEA and LEA strategies and activities that are not leading to satisfactory progress toward improving student outcomes and meeting the desired program outcomes related to supporting all students.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

F. Differentiated Technical Assistance

Describe the SEA's plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other subgrantee strategies related to supporting all students.

- i. Use of Information and Data to Inform Differentiated Technical Assistance.**
Describe how the SEA will use the information and data on resource equity collected and reported under §§200.34 and 200.27 and section 1111(h) of the ESEA, including a review of LEA-level budgeting and resource allocation related to (1) per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds; (2) educator

qualifications as described in §200.37; (3) access to advanced coursework; and (4) the availability of preschool to inform its differentiated technical assistance in the implementation of local plans.

Strategy	Timeline	Funding sources

DRAFT

6.3 Program-Specific Requirements

A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies

- i. *Each SEA must describe the process and criteria it will use to waive the 40 percent schoolwide poverty threshold under section 1114(a)(1)(B) of the Act submitted by an LEA on behalf of a school, including how the SEA will ensure that the schoolwide program will best serve the needs of the lowest-achieving students in the school.*

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

- i. *Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will establish and implement a system for the proper identification and recruitment of eligible migratory children on a Statewide basis, including the identification and recruitment of preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and how the State will verify and document the number of eligible migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing in the State on an annual basis.*

A schoolwide waiver will be considered for any eligible school with 35.0 to 39.9 percent low-income families. The school meeting this low income level may submit a waiver for a Schoolwide Program to the SEA. Upon submitting an *Intent to Move to Schoolwide* notification to ISDE, the school will develop a Schoolwide Plan.

The plan will be approved by the LEA, or another district if there is only one school in the LEA. The school will need to demonstrate in the Schoolwide Plan that moving from a Targeted Assistance School to a Schoolwide Program will best serve the needs of the students in the school served in improving academic achievement and other factors.

The school will continue to operate as a Targeted Assistance School until the Schoolwide Plan is approved by the LEA and acknowledged by the SEA with a Schoolwide Acknowledgement Letter stating all requirements for the schoolwide plan have been satisfied. At that point, the school can begin operating as a Schoolwide Program under the Schoolwide waiver.

The Migrant Education Program (MEP) is a federal program designed to provide supplementary education and support services to highly mobile children up to and through age 21. Eligibility for the MEP is determined by the lifestyle of the parents/guardian (i.e., moving across school district, county, or state boundaries for the purpose of seeking or obtaining temporary or seasonal work in agriculture or commercial fishing activities). Children must move with the parent/guardian or join the parent/guardian within 12 months of a qualifying move. Children who are determined to be eligible may remain eligible for up to 36 months without another qualifying move.

The State Migrant Education Program (ISDE) and LEAs identify, recruit, and serve migrant children, including those who are preschool and those who have dropped out of school. As part of these efforts

ISDE and LEAs practice quality control procedures and report accurate data regarding migrant students, families, and services.

The state of Idaho and MEP-funded districts are responsible for the proper and timely identification and recruitment of all eligible migrant children, including securing pertinent information to document the basis of a child's eligibility. Recruiters obtain data by interviewing the parent or guardian of the child, or the child in cases where the child moves on his or her own. The Idaho MEP is responsible for implementing procedures to ensure the accuracy of eligibility information.

Identification and recruitment of migrant children is a state and district shared responsibility. The process of identification and recruitment is a critical part and requirement of the program for educating migrant children; therefore, the program is justified in committing a significant portion of its resources to this task. "Identification" means determining the location and presence of migrant children, achieved by actively looking for and finding migrant children and youth. "Recruitment" refers to making contact with migrant families and youth, explaining the MEP, securing the necessary information to determine the child's eligibility for program services, and recording the basis of the child's eligibility on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Only fully trained and authorized personnel are permitted to conduct this task. Upon successful recruitment of a migrant family, eligible children are enrolled in the program and provided services.

School- and Community-Based Recruiting

The Idaho MEP provides semi-annual training of LEA family liaisons and directors and six regional ID&R coordinators. These trainings always include strategies and opportunities for collaboration among LEAs regarding recruiting migrant families, both school-based recruiting strategies and community-based recruiting strategies and approaches. Ensuring that family liaisons have training and support in finding "hard to find" families such as out of school youth and those with only preschool age children is a high priority of ISDE training. In addition, six regional ID&R coordinators work with districts to ensure that effective methods of identification and recruiting are taking place. They help school districts to fine tune school-based recruiting practices, including a referral processes from all staff in schools so that every potential migrant student in school is identified. They also provide direct modeling by participating in recruiting activities in the community through agencies that serve migrant families and by visiting places where migrant families work, live and shop and sharing information about the migrant program. Creating a network of community partnerships between organizations and agencies, school migrant staff, and agricultural employers greatly increases the LEAs ability to recruit new families into the migrant program.

Annual Residency Verifications

LEAs do annual residency verifications of each and every migrant student every year and provide the date of the contact through the Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) to ISDE. For newly identified families, the date the COE was signed serves as the verification date. For returning students, family liaisons contact the family and complete and Annual Residency Verification form. This process serves to both ensure that the child is resident in the state, but also the larger purpose of ensuring contact with families to determine that necessary services are being provided. Any child's whose whereabouts cannot be determined are not included in the active migrant list of students in Idaho.

- ii. *Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will assess the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school.*

State Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process

As part of the continuous improvement cycle, Idaho has just completed a new Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) based on the Office of Migrant Education Comprehensive Needs Assessment Toolkit. This process included stakeholders, SEA and LEA migrant staff and parents. Results of the needs assessment surveys for staff, parents, and secondary students provided a snapshot of perceived needs from the stakeholders most directly involved in the education of migrant children and from the children themselves. Intensive analysis of student performance data also informed the process. Finally, Parent Advisory Council (PAC) feedback throughout the process provided ongoing parent insight into student and family needs, especially those of preschool students and out of school youth. The CNA is the base of the Service Deliver Plan (SDP) and its Measurable Program Objectives (MPOs).

LEA Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process and Toolkit

The SEA provides tools to the LEAs for performing local needs assessments. The Idaho needs assessment surveys, suggestions for conducting a local CNA, and strategies for collecting and reporting needs data are found in the Idaho LEA MEP Comprehensive Needs Assessment Toolkit (ISDE, Fall 2012). Districts are provided with technical assistance in performing the CNA process and are monitored to ensure that local needs assessments are taking place.

- iii. *Describe how the SEA and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will ensure that the unique educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in 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.*

Idaho School districts have received extensive training in Response to Intervention (RtI) and it is the practice to provide integrated services drawing on whichever programs are appropriate to meet student needs through child study teams or grade level team collaboration. Migrant family liaisons and directors receive training at the SDE semi-annual training regarding providing general migrant services through advocacy of migrant children. Further, in instructing migrant staff, SEA staff stress that migrant services must supplement rather than supplant other services that are available to migrant students.

Ongoing efforts to improve services to migrant preschool children and out of school youth include participation in SOSOSY and the PI Consortium and using the tools developed by both. Through these grant consortium efforts, the SDE has provided training to districts on providing services to children who are not enrolled in school and who would otherwise not receive services. Some LEAs also provide

migrant preschool services directly through site-based or home-based programs. Others provide referrals to local organizations that provide preschool services. For out of school youth, LEAs provide referrals to the HEP program and other educational services that are available in the community through agencies and organizations. Community partnerships are part of the current year's SEA training focus, providing speakers and information regarding potential community partners with whom the local migrant programs can collaborate.

On the whole, the Seven Areas of Concern provide a foundation for a comprehensive assessment of needs. Data in each of these areas was examined by Idaho's CNA Committee and the data summarized to look at the state's overall need indicators at three levels: migrant students, migrant staff (and school staff that work with migrant students, as appropriate), and program systems, which include policies, school environment, and availability and use of resources (e.g., availability of funds and resources from other Federal programs, state programs, and local sources).

- iv. Describe how the State and its local operating agencies, which may include LEAs, will use funds received under Title I, Part C to promote interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migratory children, including how the State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including information on health, when children move from one school to another, whether or not such move occurs during the regular school year.*

ISDE continues to participate in the MSIX Data Quality Initiative and is continuing to improve the quality of data reported to MSIX. Ensuring that accurate and complete records are being uploaded to MSIX allows liaisons everywhere to access up to date information on the student's academic risk and progress. Further, training has been provided and will continue to be provided in using MSIX information to better serve migrant students.

As part of the consolidated plan that is submitted by each migrant funded LEA, the LEA is now asked to "Describe the district's coordination efforts with other agencies, including the timely transfer of student records." As part of this question, districts must describe "How does the district ensure that students who move are served right away in their new districts. (i.e., MSIX, phone calls, etc.)" Acceptable responses must include both MSIX notifications and direct communications with receiving districts. For migrant children who move in Idaho, the receiving district can access the student's record, including immunizations and health alerts through the Idaho Migrant Student Information System (MSIS). In addition, LEAs are encouraged to use MSIX to receive more information on course history and move history.

Migrant funds are to be used for programs that result in high-quality and comprehensive education programs for migratory children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves. Programs are to ensure that migratory children who move among the states are not penalized in any manner by disparities among the states in curriculum, graduation requirements, and state academic content and student academic achievement standards.

- v. *Describe the unique educational needs of the state’s migratory children, including preschool migratory children and migratory children who have dropped out of school, and other needs that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school, based on the state’s most recent comprehensive needs assessment.*

Based on the 2015–16 CNA, we have identified the following needs in four goal areas:

Goal Area 1: English Language Arts Achievement

- The proficiency level of migrant students in grades K–3 needs to increase to be comparable to nonmigrant peers.
- The percentage of migrant students in grades 3–12 scoring proficient in ELA needs to increase by 31 percent.
- Migrant students need targeted support to increase student engagement.
- A greater percentage of migrant families need to have access to the resources needed to support ELA academic development in the home environment.

Goal Area 2: Mathematics Achievement

- The achievement gap between migrant students scoring proficient or advanced on ISAT and all sub-groups of students needs to decrease.
- Migrant parents need assistance with math knowledge/homework to be able to support their children.

Goal Area 3: School Readiness

- Migrant parents need to receive more information about the importance of developing and maintaining their home language.
- Migrant parents need to have more access and opportunities to learn about school readiness strategies.
- Migrant parents need more access to community resources to meet their health needs.
- Migrant parents need more educational resources to assist their children in the home.

Goal Area 4: High School Graduation

- The percentage of migrant students graduating high school needs to increase by 12 percent.
- The percentage of secondary migrant students receiving instructional services needs to increase by 63 percent.
- Migrant students need more opportunities to form meaningful connections as they transition into a new school.
- The number of migrant parents and students who receive information about graduation requirements and school systems needs to increase.
- Migrant students need more access to health services.

- vi. Describe the current measurable program objectives and outcomes for Title I, part C, and the strategies the SEA will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve such objectives and outcomes.*

Idaho is currently revising our Measurable Program Objectives based on our 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment; we are on track to complete that process by April 2017.

- vii. Describe how the SEA will ensure there is consultation with parents of migratory children, including parent advisory councils, at both the State and local level, in the planning and operation of Title I, Part C programs that span not less than one school year in duration, consistent with section 1304(c)(3) of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA.*

Idaho State Parent Advisory Council

ISDE conducts state PAC meetings twice per year in three locations to facilitate the widest participation by parents. Dates, times, and locations for state PAC meetings are also scheduled based on parent feedback at previous PAC meetings. LEAs assist in inviting parents to participate and food and childcare are provided at the meetings. The role of the parents is explained at every PAC meeting so that parents are aware that they should express any concerns regarding planning, implementation, and evaluation of the program. Parents receive information on how Idaho distributes migrant funds and the programs that are available using these funds in various districts. Parents are kept apprised of the progress being made on work for the CNA, SDP, or evaluation each year and their feedback on these efforts is actively sought.

In addition, the state PAC meetings include sharing information that may be of use to parents based on the survey results of the CAN or parent feedback from the previous PAC meeting. For example, information may be shared on state graduation requirements, or speakers may present on topics such as the US school system, High School Equivalency Program (HEP), or College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP).

Local Parent Advisory Councils

As part of the annual consolidated plan process districts answer the following question
LEA Migrant Parent Advisory Council (PAC)

Include the following in the description of the LEA's Migrant PAC:

- Who serves on the Migrant PAC
- How often the Migrant PAC meets
- What the purpose of the Migrant PAC is
- Any other LEA specific information regarding the Migrant PAC

Local districts provide information regarding their PAC. In order to be acceptable, districts must both solicit parent concerns and share information. District PAC meetings are at least twice per year, but many are more frequent.

viii. Describe the SEA's processes and procedures for ensuring that migratory children who meet the statutory definition of "priority for services" are given priority for Title I, Part C services, including:

a. The specific measures and sources of data used to determine whether a migratory child meets each priority for services criteria

To receive priority for services, migrant students must meet at least one area in sections A and B. See explanations below. There is a spreadsheet available to help make these determinations.

Section A: Academic Risk

- Migrant students who did NOT score proficient on the W-APT or ACCESS assessments or sub-tests or
- Migrant Out-of-School Youth who are recovery youth. or
- Migrant students receiving the indicated scores on at least one of the state content assessments below are failing or "at-risk" of failing to meet the state's academic content standards: 1 or 2 on the Idaho Reading Indicator, 1 or 2 on the Idaho Standards Achievement Test in mathematics, English language arts, or science

Note: If no test scores are available, the following are acceptable:

- Loss of credits or failing grades in core academic subjects (progress reports/report cards)
- Failing or "at-risk" scores on district assessments
- Failing or "at-risk" scores from other state's assessment—can be viewed in MSIX

Section B: Educational Interruption

1. A move during the regular school year defined as the period from the first day of the academic calendar to the last day of the academic calendar of a specified academic year or excessive absence (10 or more days) from school due to a migratory lifestyle
2. The delegation of responsibilities for documenting priority for services determinations and the provision of services to migratory children determined to be priority for services

The migrant team in each district makes the Priority for Services determination following SEA guidance (above). In order to facilitate this process, ISDE has provided extensive training to family liaisons and directors. Starting in 2016-2017, LEAs have a downloadable worksheet in the Idaho Migrant Student Information System (MSIS) that provides the names of all eligible migrant students and their most recent Idaho test scores. This has simplified the process for LEAs to make decisions based on Idaho MEP guidance. The migrant team and others in the school then make decisions regarding the services the identified child will receive to meet his/her needs. In the consolidated plan completed each year, LEAs describe their plan for identifying PFS students, including when and who will do it and how they will serve these students first. PFS status for regular and summer sessions are indicated in MSIS by LEA migrant staff. The detailed documentation for determining individual PFS student status is examined when an LEA is monitored for federal programs.

b. The timeline for making priority for services determinations, and communicating such information to title I, part C service providers.

LEAs make PFS determinations in the fall as migrant staff and students return to school and spring test scores are available. For students that are new to the district in the fall and throughout the year, LEAs make determinations as students arrive. Since these students may not have Idaho assessments, there are alternative options for making the determination as soon as the child arrives. Because one half of the requirement for PFS includes a move in the last 12 months during the regular school year, LEAs are instructed to be especially careful to make this determination as soon as possible when students start in the district after the beginning of the year. LEAs share their PFS lists with administrators, teachers, and staff as they are updated. A list of current PFS students can be printed out of MSIS at any time.

C. Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students

- i. Describe the SEA’s standardized entrance and exit procedures for English learners consistent with section 3113(b)(2) of the ESEA, as amended by ESSA. These procedures must include valid and reliable, objective criteria that are applied consistently across the State. At a minimum, the standardized exit criteria must:
 - a. Include a score of proficient on the State’s annual English language proficiency assessment*
 - b. Be the same criteria used for exiting students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes*
 - c. Not include performance on an academic content assessment*
 - d. Be consistent with Federal civil rights obligations**

Idaho is working with our EL workgroup to revise Idaho’s exit procedures. Idaho has always implemented standardized procedures for exiting English Learners in Idaho. Since 2006, Idaho has administered the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA). In spring 2016, Idaho’s English Learners were administered the ACCESS 2.0 assessment. This is the first year that our students have taken the ACCESS 2.0 online assessment. When students score proficient on the English language proficiency assessment, district staff members redesignate students to “exited year 1” status in their school information systems. LEAs also complete an exit form that is shared and explained to parents/families in a language they can understand to the extent practicable. As in years past, Idaho will continue to use the same criteria under Title III for Title I reporting and accountability. Idaho’s EL working group would like to remind ED that district and school teams such as response to invention (RtI) and Multiple Disciplinary Teams (MDT) make decisions about children using multiple sources of data points over a specific period of time. The use of a single test score to determine eligibility for exiting is problematic and high stakes for children. Idaho would like for ED to reconsider this decision. What if an EL student scores proficient or advanced on the statewide academic assessment, but for whatever reason did not score proficient or were not enrolled in any Idaho school during the ACCESS 2.0 testing window? May Idaho’s LEAs continue with the exiting process for the student?

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

- i. Provide the SEA’s specific measurable program objectives and outcomes related to activities under the Rural and Low-Income School Program, if applicable.*

The majority of Idaho’s districts, schools, and Charter LEAs meet the state’s definition of rural (113 out of 153). The goal for students in rural schools is the same for all students – Achieve at the same level of proficiency and have access to higher education resources to be successful after high school.

In order to achieve equity for rural students, the state has designated staff to support Rural and Low-Income School programs, and state plan (<http://www.sde.idaho.gov/federal-programs/rural/index.html>). The plan was created in consultation with LEAs and Charter schools. The process for grant applications includes an online reporting system named Consolidated Federal and State Grants Application (CFSGA) for LEA’s to submit an application that includes budget, selected activities for use of funds, and measurable goals. The state also has an electronic evaluation report that is due in June of each year.

The state coordinator collaborates with Title I, Title II, Title III, family and community coordinator, charter school coordinator, and 21st Century Learning Center division to ensure program alignment and access to resources as well as in-person training at least twice per year with LEA technical assistance as needed.

In addition Idaho rural districts have the opportunity to be part of **NW RISE**.¹⁷ NW RISE is a multi-state project that creates learning communities among schools in the rural northwest. Educators from Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington participate. The project is part of the Northwest Comprehensive Center and includes two face-to-face meetings per year as well as monthly opportunities for members to collaborate through video conference and a dedicated social media account through Schoology.

In addition, consultation and technical assistance is provided through the state’s system of support which includes both onsite support through projects like Idaho Building Capacity, Math Centers, Idaho CORE ELA Coaches, and opportunities to network with peers through the Idaho Superintendents Network, and Idaho Principals Network.

E. McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program

- i. Describe the procedures the SEA will use to identify homeless children and youths in the State and assess their needs.*

All LEA are required to have a board approved homeless policy that describes how they will implement the following; definitions, identification, school selection, enrollment, transportation, services, disputes, free meals, eligibility for Title I services, training, coordination and preschool.

To ensure that public notice of the education rights of homeless children and youth is disseminated where such children and youth receive services, ISDE provides free brochures and posters. The state coordinators contact information is listed on each poster to provide technical assistance regarding enrollment, identification, and other issues effecting students in homeless situations. Liaisons are also provided with NCHE’s toll-free help line.

¹⁷ <http://nwcc.educationnorthwest.org/nw-rise-network>

ISDE requires a Student Residency Questionnaire in which the nighttime living status of every student is assessed by enrollment documentation. This living status form is disseminated twice a year. Each LEA has an identified liaison responsible for conducting the assessment. Once the liaison verifies eligibility of the child or youth they are reported in the district student management system that uploads to the Idaho System for Educational Excellence (ISEE) K–12 longitudinal data management system. **Is the survey available from the web site? If not we should include in appendix.**

ii. Describe the SEA’s programs for school personnel (including liaisons designated under section 722(g)(1)(J)(ii) of the McKinney-Vento Act, 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 youths, including such children and youths who are runaway and homeless youths.

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

iii. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths are promptly resolved.

- ISDE has a dispute resolution policy that all LEA liaisons are familiar with. It is posted on the ISDE web site include link.
- All LEAs must have a dispute resolution policy that aligns with the state policy. This is monitored through our federal programs monitoring visits and LEAs submit assurances when they submit their Consolidated Federal and State Grant Application (CFSGA)
- All LEAs must have a written notice of decision, also part of our monitoring process. Sample letters are provided on the state web page
- Homeless children and youth are provided all services during the dispute resolution process

iv. Describe the SEA’s procedures to ensure that that youths described in section 725(2) of the McKinney-Vento Act and youths separated from the public school are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youths described in this paragraph from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies.

- ISDE’s Student Residency Questionnaire (nighttime living status of every student) includes question about siblings in the family and assists with students eligible for secondary education who may not be currently identified.
- LEA liaisons collaborates with various agencies and service providers who work with homeless youth and youth separated from the public schools, such as the H & W, Salvation Army, several

area shelters, and Community Action to make them aware of protections available to homeless, unaccompanied youth.

- LEA liaisons collaborate with service providers to advocate on behalf of these children and youth to ensure that the students have the opportunity to return to school and participate in these programs.

v. *Describe the SEA's procedures to ensure that homeless children and youths:*

- a. *Have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or by LEA, as provided to other children in the state*
- b. *Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities*
- c. *Who meet the relevant eligibility criteria, are able to participate in Federal, State, and local nutrition programs*

- ISDE has a policies remove barriers, and through the requirement of local board policy and the efforts of Liaisons, every effort is made to include students in all academic and extracurricular activities
- LEAs have policy's to ensure homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities
- ISDE is actively working on communication with state athletic associations to ensure access and opportunity for students

vi. *Describe the SEA's strategies to address problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays and retention, consistent with section 722(g)(1)(H) and (I) of the McKinney-Vento Act.*

- Idaho state and local policies prohibits LEAs from denying a child enrollment for lack of records and include short timelines for obtaining needed records, certifications, and other documents.
- LEA's are required to set aside a minimum of a quarter of 1 percent of their Title I allocation for homeless students. This can be used for all the above, as needed. For all subgrants and beginning in 2016–17, a needs assessment must be done for the set aside.
- ISDE and LEA use the results of surveys, focus groups, and training evaluations to identify additional barriers caused by enrollment delays.
- ISDE disseminates information and provide technical assistance about how to remove barriers to school access throughout the state in its resource documents, trainings, and articles for publication.
- ISDE encourage LEAs to seek aid from local service or charitable organizations to help provide assistance that help meet these needs.

Appendix A

Public Notice of Stakeholder Input

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

www.sde.idaho.gov

Media Contact

Jeff Church

Chief Communications Officer

(208) 332-6934

jchurch@sde.idaho.gov

DEPARTMENT MOVES FORWARD WITH WORKING GROUPS AND PUBLIC INPUT ON THE ESSA CONSOLIDATED PLAN

(BOISE) – Following the signing of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) on December 10, 2015, the Idaho State Department of Education began establishing working groups and gathering public input in developing the state Consolidated Plan as required by ESSA.

Under the new law, each state is required to submit a State Plan articulating how the law will be implemented. The department, under the direction of Superintendent Ybarra, is committed to developing a thoughtful consolidated state plan that reflects both the new ESSA requirements and department's strategic plan goals in supporting schools and students to achieve, which are:

- All Idaho students persevere in life and are ready for college and careers
- All education stakeholders in Idaho are mutually responsible for accountability and student progress
- Idaho attracts and retains great teachers and leaders

Developing the State Plan requires meaningful consultation with stakeholders representing a diverse cross-section of district and school representatives, professional organization representatives, and state leadership members.

The first step of the ESSA implementation is to complete Idaho's Consolidated State Plan, which is required by the law. In March 2016, department staff convened several workgroups to begin gathering stakeholder input for the plan. This input will aide department staff as they develop the contents of Idaho's plan and how the state will implement changes under the ESSA. Initially configured differently, the workgroups now mirror the required structure of the plan:

- Consultation and Coordination
- Challenging Academic Standards and Academic Assessments
- Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
- Supporting Excellent Educators
- Supporting All Students

Moving forward, the department will continue to work with stakeholders and gather public input with a goal of having a draft consolidated plan available for further review by stakeholders in October 2016.

This draft will then move forward for review and approval by board members of the State Board of Education and the Governor's office.

For more information about work that has been conducted on the state’s consolidated plan, please visit the [ESSA Consolidated Plan webpage](#). Questions and comments may be directed to Jeff Church at (208) 332-6934 or by email at jchurch@sde.idaho.gov.

DRAFT

Appendix B

Log of pre-draft stakeholder engagement

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
Supporting All Students	June 9, 2016 External stakeholder meeting	Face to face/webinar	Members of the state board, charter school leaders, community-based organizations, institutes of higher education
Supporting Excellent Educators	June 2, 2016 Title II-A stakeholder webinar	Webinar	Members of the state board, LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel
Supporting Excellent Educators	June 22, 2016 Title II-A stakeholder webinar	Webinar	Members of the state board, LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders
Supporting Excellent Educators	July 5, 2016 Title II-A stakeholder review/planning	Email/face-to-face	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel
Supporting Excellent Educators	May 17, 2016 Excellent educators 1: Equity plan meeting	Face-to-face	Members of the state board, LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders
Accountability and School Improvement	June 24, 2016 External stakeholder webinar	Webinar, email sent with webinar attachment	LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders,

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
			paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, parents and families
Accountability and School Improvement	July 7, 2016 Internal stakeholder meeting	Internal stakeholder meeting, face-to-face, email	The governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's Office
Accountability and School Improvement	July 14, 2016 External stakeholder webinar	Webinar, email sent with webinar attachment	LEAs, including rural LEAs Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, parents and families, civil rights organization, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students
Accountability and School Improvement	September 1, 2016 Internal stakeholder meeting	Internal Stakeholder meeting, face to face, email	The governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's Office
Supporting All Students	May 25, 2016 Conference call (web meeting), ESSA State Plan overview	Conference call (web meeting) with internal and external stakeholders; Google Docs; Google Docs developed for feedback on each Other Plan Provision; follow-up email requesting more feedback on Other Plan Provisions June 16, 2016. Email requesting feedback on schoolwide waiver, July 12, 2016.	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, community based organizations, institutes of higher education
Standards and Assessment	July 21, 2016	Webinar	
Supporting All Students	August, 18, 2016 Planning – Parent Advisory Committee, collaboration	Conference call with ISDE, in-person collaborative effort, PAC	LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders,

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
	with North Carolina Department of Education	meeting	paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, parents and families
Supporting All Students	July 26, 2016 Stakeholder webinars, homeless and rural	Email and webinar	Civil rights organization, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, parents and families, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting All Students	June 14, 2016 External stakeholder webinar	Webinar	Members of the state legislature, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel
Supporting All Students	October 5, 2016 External stakeholder meeting for Accountability Group	Face-to-face	Members of the state legislature, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel
Supporting All Students	September, 16, 2016 External stakeholder meeting for Identification and Reclassification Group	Face-to-face	Members of the state legislature, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel
Supporting All Students	September 21-22, 2016 External stakeholder meeting to inform them of ESSA changes to IC program	Face-to-face	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel
Supporting All Students	July 18, 2016 External stakeholder webinar	Webinar	The governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's Office, LEAs, including rural

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
			LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, community-based organizations, institutes of higher education
Accountability and School Improvement	Accountability Oversight Committee, in-person feedback	Face-to-face	Members of the state legislature, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders
Accountability and School Improvement	Accountability Oversight Committee, written feedback	Written feedback submitted to committee throughout development process	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, institutes of higher education
Accountability and School Improvement	Accountability Oversight Committee, online survey	Survey on draft accountability framework	Members of the state legislature, LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, parents and families, community-based organizations
Accountability and School Improvement	Accountability Oversight Committee, meeting with governor	Face-to-face	The governor or appropriate officials from the Governor's Office
Consultation and Coordination	September 2, 2016 Idaho Indian Education Committee	Face-to-face	Representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, institutes of higher education
Consultation and Coordination	Higher Education American Indian Teacher Education faculty and staff at University of Idaho and Lewis-Clark State College	Face-to-face	Representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state
Supporting All	June 16, 2016	Electronic mail	Teachers, principals, other

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
Students			school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel; LEAs, including rural LEAs, charter school leaders, ISDE staff
Supporting All Students	July 12, 2016 email on Schoolwide Program State Waivers	Electronic mail	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel; LEAs, including rural LEAs, charter school Leaders, ISDE staff
Supporting All Students	August 4, 2016 am-meeting to develop paraprofessional standards	Face-to-face	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel; parents and families, ISDE staff; LEAs, including rural LEAs
Supporting All Students	August 5, 2016 email on well-rounded and supportive education	Electronic mail	Teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel; LEAs, including rural LEAs, charter school leaders, ISDE staff
Supporting All Students	August 24, 2016 early childhood meeting	Face-to-face	Institutes of higher education, community-based organizations
Supporting Excellent Educators	March 31, 2016 PSC meeting	Face-to-face	LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, civil rights organization, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting	June 16, 2016 teacher	Face-to-face	Members of the state board,

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
Excellent Educators	certification workgroup meeting organized by OSBE		LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting Excellent Educators	May 26, 2016 email to external stakeholder group	Email	LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, parents and families, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting Excellent Educators	July 6, 2016 teacher certification workgroup meeting organized by OSBE	Face-to-face	Members of the state board, LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting Excellent Educators	July 18, 2016 teacher certification workgroup meeting organized by OSBE	Face-to-face	Members of the state board, LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting Excellent Educators	June 23–24, 2016 PSC Meeting	Face-to-face	LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, civil rights organization, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students, institutes of higher education, employers

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
Supporting Excellent Educators	September 1, 2016, email to external stakeholder group	Electronic mail	LEAs, including rural LEAs, representatives of Indian Tribes located in the state, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, parents and families, institutes of higher education, employers
Supporting All Students	August 29, 2016, emailed level I stakeholders with outcomes from questionnaire and a copy of the draft plan	Electronic mail	LEA's including rural districts other school leaders, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, civil rights organization, including those representing students with disabilities, and other historically underserved students, parents and families
Supporting All Students	September 2, 2016, emailed level 1 stakeholders with outcomes from survey monkey and a copy of the draft plan	Electronic mail	LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders, institutes of higher education
Supporting All Students	September 2, 2016, emailed level 1 stakeholders with outcomes from survey and a copy of the draft plan	Electronic mail	LEAs, including rural LEAs, teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized support personnel, charter school leaders. parents and families
Supporting All Students	September 7, 2016 emailed level 2 stakeholder the draft plan for feedback	Electronic mail	Community-based organizations, civil rights organization, including those representing students with disabilities, English learners, and other historically underserved students, institutes of higher education
Supporting all	April 2016: Section 1118(a)	Electronic mail and face-	Fiscal employees, program

ESSA subcommittee	Event	Method of engagement	Stakeholder groups represented
Students	and Section 8521 Maintenance of Effort (MOE)	to-face	coordinators
Supporting all Students	May 2016: Section of the law was addressed: Section 1118(a) and Section 8521 Maintenance of Effort (MOE)	Electronic mail and face-to-face	Fiscal employees, program coordinators
Supporting all Students	July 6 and 7, 2016: Section 1118(a) and Section 8521 Maintenance of Effort (MOE)	Electronic mail and face-to-face	Fiscal employees, program coordinators
Supporting all Students	July 2016 through August 2016: Consulted with corresponding program coordinators (employees) in regards to fiscal changes in funding formula and reservations at the state level. All general fiscal sections were summarized, including charts, in one document.	Electronic mail and face-to-face	Fiscal employees, program coordinators