

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



**U.S. Department of Education**  
**Issued: March 2017**

---



**U.S. Department of the Interior**  
**Bureau of Indian Education**

This

page  
intentionally  
left  
blank.

## Introduction from U.S. Department of Education

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

**Bureau of Indian Education Introduction:** 20 U.S.C.A. § 6311 describes the process that States must adhere to in terms of complying with ESSA State plan requirements. The Bureau of Indian Education is not a State as defined in ESSA; the BIE is a federal agency. Consequently, not all provisions applicable to states similarly apply to the BIE. Specific responsibilities of the BIE as a State Education Agency (SEA) historically, at least since NCLB, have been defined by an agreement between the Departments of the Interior and the Department of Education.<sup>2</sup>

The BIE will use its Agency Plan as a roadmap for school improvement and to support their lowest performing schools. For purposes of this plan, “BIE schools” refers to all BIE funded schools, including Bureau Operated and Tribally Controlled.

**For Further Information:** If you have any questions, please contact the Chief Academic Officer for BIE, Dr. Tamarah Pfeiffer, [Tamarah.Pfeiffer@bie.edu](mailto:Tamarah.Pfeiffer@bie.edu).

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

<sup>2</sup> Agreement Between the U.S. Department of the Interior – Bureau of Indian Education and the U.S. Department of Education Under Executive Order 13592 and Section 8204 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), 12/3/2012; as amended through the Amendment to Agreement Between the U.S. Department of Education (ED and the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) – Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), 7/7/2017 (hereinafter, BIE-ED agreement). The BIE-ED agreement is primarily a mechanism to transfer ESEA funds from the U.S. Department of Education to the Bureau of Indian Education. For purposes of the BIE-ED agreement, BIE assumes the responsibility of a state educational agency (SEA) with respect to BIE funded schools.

## Programs Included in the Consolidated Agency Plan

*Instructions:* Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated Agency Plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated Agency Plan, but is eligible and wishes to receive funds under the program(s), it must submit individual program plans for those programs that meet all statutory and regulatory requirements with its consolidated Agency Plan in a single submission.

Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated Agency Plan.  
**or**

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below that the SEA includes in its consolidated Agency Plan:

- Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children – **Note: BIE does not receive Title I, Part C funds.**
- Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement– **Note: BIE does not receive Title III, Part A funds.**
- Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (McKinney-Vento Act)

## Instructions

*Each SEA must provide descriptions and other information that address each requirement listed below for the programs included in its consolidated Agency Plan. Consistent with ESEA section 8302, the Secretary has determined that the following requirements are absolutely necessary for consideration of a consolidated Agency Plan. An SEA may add descriptions or other information, but may not omit any of the required descriptions or information for each included program.*

## A. Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)

### 1. Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments (*ESEA section 1111(b)(1)*)

**BIE Response** – ESSA Section 8007 directs the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, if so requested, to use a negotiated rulemaking process to develop regulations for implementation of the Secretary of the Interior’s obligation to define the standards, assessments, and an accountability system that will be utilized at BIE-funded schools.

The BIE has completed negotiated rulemaking and published its final rule. The new rule updates 25 CFR part 30 and defines the standards, assessments, and an accountability system consistent with ESEA, for BIE-funded schools on a national, regional, or Tribal basis. They were developed in a manner that considered the unique circumstances of BIE funded schools and will be implemented in the 2020-2021 school year.

**Standards** – BIE adopted a set of College- and Career-Readiness Standards (CCRS) for English language arts and mathematics, Next Generation Science Standards and English Language Development Standards for instructional purposes.

Below are links to BIE’s academic standards:

- BIE College and Career Ready Standards in Math, K-12 (Alternate aligned to CCRS): [http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math\\_Standards1.pdf](http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/Math_Standards1.pdf)
- BIE College and Career Ready Standards in English Language Arts, K-12 (Alternate aligned to CCRS): [http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA\\_Standards1.pdf](http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA_Standards1.pdf)
- Next Generation Science Standards/BIE College and Career Ready Standards (Alternate aligned to CCRS): <https://www.nextgenscience.org/search-standards>
- English Language Proficiency Development Standards: <https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/standards/eld/2020>

**Assessments** – BIE plans has procured, assessments aligned to the CCRS and NGSS for administration beginning in SY 2020-2021.

In the procurement process, BIE is including science assessments aligned to Next Generation Science Standards and alternate Assessments aligned to CCRS in English language arts, mathematics and science.

BIE has procured an English Language Proficiency Assessment (WIDA) for the next two years. In SY 2021-2022, BIE will review and revise the English Language Proficiency Assessment Scope of Work for administration of a new contract in SY 2022-2023.

2. Eighth Grade Math Exception (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C):
- i. Does the State administer an end-of-course mathematics assessment to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA?  
 Yes  
 No

**BIE Response** – Not Applicable.

- ii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(i), does the State wish to exempt an eighth-grade student who takes the high school mathematics course associated with the end-of-course assessment from the mathematics assessment typically administered in eighth grade under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa) of the ESEA and ensure that:
  - a. The student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
  - b. The student’s performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA;
  - c. In high school:
    1. The student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA;
    2. The State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and
    3. The student’s performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) of the ESEA and participation in assessments under section 1111(c)(4)(E) of the ESEA.  
 Yes  
 No

**BIE Response** – The BIE does not intend to consider an end-of-course mathematics assessment in the future.

- iii. If a State responds “yes” to question 2(ii), consistent with 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4), describe, with regard to this exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and to take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school.
3. Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F):
- i. Provide its definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population,” and identify the specific languages that meet that definition.

**BIE Response** – The most common languages spoken other than English are Navajo, Cherokee, Choctaw, Apache, Tewa/Tiwa/Towa/Keres/Hopi/Zuni, and Lakota/Dakota/Nakota. Out of 174 schools, no one native language rises to the level of significance that would require an assessment in a language other than English. The BIE intends to meet requirements of ESSA for Native American students, as well as any other students that may enter the BIE education system. BIE recognizes Tribal entities may wish to develop their own Native Language oral/written proficiency assessment.

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

**BIE Response** – There are no existing assessments in languages other than English. All the BIE’s assessments of ELA, Math, Science, Alternate and English Language Proficiency will be provided in English.

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

**BIE Response** – In BIE funded schools, there are no languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population.

- iv. Describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments, at a minimum, in languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population including by providing
  - a. The State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments, including a description of how it met the requirements of 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(4);
  - b. A description of the process the State used to gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment, and consult with educators; parents and families of English learners; students, as appropriate; and other stakeholders; and
  - c. As applicable, an explanation of the reasons the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort.

**BIE Response** – Not Applicable

- 4. Statewide Accountability System and School Support and Improvement Activities (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d)):
  - i. Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)):
    - a. List each major racial and ethnic group the State includes as a subgroup of students, consistent with ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B).

**BIE Response** – I All Students and the American Indian or Alaska Native subgroup will be reported.

- b. If applicable, describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, children with disabilities, and English learners) used in the Statewide accountability system.

**BIE Response** – Based on a previous Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the U.S. Department of Education for ESEA, BIE has not been required to report Economically Disadvantaged as a subgroup, since all BIE schools are considered Title I schools. The assumption was made that all students within the school were economically disadvantaged. Therefore, the “All Students” and the “Economically Disadvantaged” represent the same students. In addition to “Economically Disadvantaged,” BIE has not been required to report on Race/Ethnicity groups since BIE schools were established by the federal government to provide educational opportunities for American Indian and Alaska Native students. BIE has traditionally only reported on “All Students” and no other Race/Ethnicity categories. The assumption was made that all students within the school were American Indian or Alaska Native.

As a result of Tribal Consultation, BIE recognizes that to serve every student within the Bureau of Indian Education school system, additional subgroups will need to be added. Beginning with the SY 2020-2021, BIE will add two additional subgroups of students. The two subgroups will be American Indian or Alaska Native students and non-American Indian or Alaskan Native students. The non-American Indian or Alaska Native subgroup will enable the BIE to collect data on the modest population of students attending BIE schools who do not identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native. The two new categories, 1. American Indian or Alaska Native and 2. non-American Indian or Alaska Native will be identified and used as subgroups in the accountability system.

The new identified subgroups will help BIE with meaningful differentiation. Combining all Race/Ethnicities as non-American Indian or Alaska Native will generate the minimum n-size for important and substantial comparisons.

- c. Does the State intend to include in the English learner subgroup the results of students previously identified as English learners on the State assessments required under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) for purposes of State accountability (ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(B))? Note that a student’s results may be included in the English learner subgroup for not more than four years after the student ceases to be identified as an English learner.
- Yes  
 No

**BIE Response** – BIE currently collects and reports on English learner data.

- d. If applicable, choose one of the following options for recently arrived English learners in the State:
- Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i); or  
 Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii); or  
 Applying the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii). If this option is selected, describe how the State will choose which exception applies to a



recently arrived English learner.

***BIE Response*** – BIE has selected the option that states new arrivals will not assess for their first year in the required reporting areas.

- ii. ***Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)):***
  - a. Provide the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included to carry out the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes.

***BIE Response*** – BIE has chosen a minimum n-size of 10 students for all indicators. A minimum n-size higher than 10 would make accountability determinations difficult in BIE because there are approximately 16 schools that serve small populations. While there may be less stability for schools with a low n-size count, using a higher number would result in too many schools being excluded from the accountability model.

Based on current enrollment, 16 out of 174 Bureau-funded schools have less than ten or close to less than 10 students. These schools would not meet the minimum n-size of 10.

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

***BIE Response*** – Having a minimum n-size of 10 ensures maximum inclusion of all students and each subgroup while protecting against identification of an individual student’s educational outcomes. BIE consulted the Institute of Education Sciences report “Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information” to identify an appropriate, statistically sound minimum n-size.

- c. Describe how the minimum number of students was determined by the State, including how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.

***BIE Response*** – During Public and Tribal Consultation during April – May 2020, BIE received comments supporting the use of an n-size of 10. A few comments brought forth concerns of exposure to Personally identifiable information (PII) that will be addressed in the next section.

- d. Describe how the State ensures that the minimum number is sufficient to not reveal any personally identifiable information.

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

- e. If the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, provide the State’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting.

**BIE Response** – BIE proposes the minimum n-size for reporting is 10, the same number for accountability purposes.

- iii. **Establishment of Long-Term Goals** (*ESEA section 1111(4)(A)*):
  - a. **Academic Achievement**. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa)*)
    - 1. Describe the long-term goals for improved academic achievement, as measured by proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments, for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

**BIE Response** – ESSA requires ambitious long-term goals, as well as measurements of interim progress, in at least three areas: 1) state assessment results in reading/language arts and math, 2) graduation rates, and 3) progress toward English language proficiency for English learners.

BIE’s proposed long-term goals require 75 percent of all students and each identified subgroup of students to reach proficiency in both English language arts and mathematics by SY 2038-2039.

BIE will begin collecting baseline data in SY 20-21 for the following subgroups, which BIE has not reported on in the past: American Indian and Alaskan Native and non-American Indian and Alaskan Native.

The long-term goals for English language arts and mathematics are based on assessment data from SY 2018-2019 when BIE had a 23-part accountability system. BIE may recalculate these long-term goals determined by new baseline data starting with implementation of the SY 2020-2021 BIE unified assessment system.

BIE’s decision to set ELA and math long-term goals out to the SY 2038-2039 is to provide schools with realistic, attainable, increasing targets leading to the 2039 timeline. Given the current baseline data available (15% of All Students meeting proficiency), BIE believes these are ambitious long-term goals.

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

**BIE Response** –In order for 75% of all students and all identified subgroups of students to reach proficiency on ELA and mathematics, all students and identified subgroups of students will gradually increase the number of students proficient by 2-5% annually. BIE may recalculate interim measurements based on new baseline data starting with the implementation of the SY 2020-2021 BIE unified assessment system. See tables below.

BIE’s decision to set ELA and Math goals out to the SY 2038-2039 is to provide schools with realistic, attainable, increasing interim progress targets leading up to the 2039 timeline.

BIE will begin collecting baseline data in SY 20-21 for the following subgroups, which BIE has not reported on in the past: American Indian and Alaskan Native and non-American Indian and Alaskan Native. For now, BIE will use the All Students baseline data, long term goal and interim goals for the American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup data since the majority of our All Students group is American Indian/Alaska Native. BIE has not collected baseline data for Non-American Indian /Alaska Native students. In other State Plans, the American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup consistently scores lower than other subgroups in ELA and Math. Therefore, BIE projects the Non-American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup to have a higher baseline data point than the American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup. BIE projects a 5 percent proficient difference in the baseline data.

**Table Ia. Academic Achievement: English Language Arts Measures of Interim Progress**

Academic Achievement Interim Goals: English Language Arts Proficiency Rates (Percent Proficient)																					
Subgroups*	ELA Base -line Data 18-19 ***	ELA 19-20	ELA 20-21 new base line data	ELA 21-22	ELA 22-23	ELA 23-24	ELA 24-25	ELA 25-26	ELA 26-27	ELA 27-28	ELA 28-29	ELA 29-30	ELA 30-31	ELA 31-32	ELA 32-33	ELA 33-34	ELA 34-35	ELA 35-36	ELA 36-37	ELA 37-38	ELA 38-39
All Students	15	18	21	24	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	54	57	60	63	66	69	72	75
Students with Disabilities	7	12	18	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	46	49	52	55	58	62	65	69	72	75
English Learners	13	14	16	18	19	22	26	29	33	36	40	43	47	50	54	57	61	64	68	72	75
Economically Disadvantaged **	15	18	21	23	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	45	51	54	57	60	63	66	69	72	75
American Indian/Alaskan	15	18	21	24	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	54	57	60	63	66	69	72	75
Non-American Indian/Alaska Native	20	23	26	29	32	35	38	41	44	47	50	53	56	59	62	65	67	69	71	73	75

**Table Ib. Academic Achievement: Mathematics – Measurements of Interim Progress**

Academic Achievement Interim Goals: Mathematics Proficiency Rates (Percent Proficient)																					
Subgroups*	ELA Base -line Data 18-19 ***	ELA 19-20	ELA 20-21 new base line data	ELA 21-22	ELA 22-23	ELA 23-24	ELA 24-25	ELA 25-26	ELA 26-27	ELA 27-28	ELA 28-29	ELA 29-30	ELA 30-31	ELA 31-32	ELA 32-33	ELA 33-34	ELA 34-35	ELA 35-36	ELA 36-37	ELA 37-38	ELA 38-39
All Students	10	13	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	47	50	54	57	61	64	68	71	<b>75</b>
Students with Disabilities	4	8	11	14	18	21	25	29	32	35	39	42	46	50	53	57	60	64	67	71	<b>75</b>
English Learners	7	10	13	16	19	22	26	29	33	35	40	43	47	50	54	57	61	64	68	71	<b>75</b>
Economically Disadvantaged **	10	13	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	47	50	54	57	61	64	68	71	<b>75</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	10	13	16	19	22	25	28	31	34	37	40	43	47	50	54	57	61	64	68	71	<b>75</b>
Non-American Indian/Alaska Native	15	18	21	24	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	54	57	60	63	66	69	72	75

\*The BIE is currently working with their Student Information System vendor to align data collection with ESSA requirements.

\*\*Economically disadvantage and the All Student group is the same set of students. (Per MOU)

\*\*SY 2018-19 Baseline Data is based on a 23-part assessment and accountability system. BIE may need to recalculate the long-term goals as well as the measures of interim progress with new baseline data starting with the implementation of the SY 2020-2021 BIE unified assessment system.

3. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps.

**BIE Response** – Proficiency gaps between subgroups is minor. Our intention is to cut any proficiency gap between any group to 1% by SY 2028-2029.

- b. **Graduation Rate.** (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb)*)
  1. Describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students, including: (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State, and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

**BIE Response** – The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate will be used as the graduation rate indicator for SY 2020-2021. The cohort rate is a standardized way to measure graduation rates among schools and across the BIE. The rate is computed annually for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. A long-term goal for all students and each identified subgroup is 80% and is ambitious because meeting the goal requires an approximately 20% overall gain.

2. If applicable, describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, including (1) the timeline for meeting the long-term goals, for which the term must be the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State; (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious; and (3) how the long-term goals are more rigorous than the long-term goal set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

**BIE Response** – BIE is not using extended year rates.

3. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.

**BIE Response** – See table below for interim measurements of progress for BIE's 4-Year cohort graduation rate.

BIE will begin collecting baseline data in SY 20-21 for the following subgroups, which BIE has not reported on in the past: American Indian and Alaskan Native, non-American Indian and Alaskan Native. For now, BIE will use the All Students baseline data, long term goal and interim goals for the American

Indian/Alaska Native subgroup data since the majority of our All Students group is American Indian/Alaska Native. BIE has not collected baseline data for Non-American Indian /Alaska Native students. In other State Plans, the American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup consistently reports a lower graduation rate than other subgroups. Therefore, BIE projects the Non-American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup to have a higher baseline data point than the American Indian/Alaska Native subgroup. BIE projects a 5 percent difference in the baseline data.

**Table II: Graduation Rate: 4-Year Cohort – Measurements of Interim Progress**

Graduation Rates – Interim Goals (By Percent)													
Subgroups *	SY 18-19 Base-line	SY 19-20	SY 20-21	SY 21-22	SY 22-23	SY 23-24	SY 24-25	SY 26-27	SY 27-28	SY 28-29	SY 29-30	SY 30-31	SY 31-32
All Students	59	60	61	62	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	<b>80</b>
Students with Disabilities	52	54	56	58	60	62	64	66	68	71	74	77	<b>80</b>
English Learners	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	<b>80</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	*59	60	61	62	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	<b>80</b>
American Indian/Alaskan	59	60	61	62	63	65	67	69	71	73	75	77	<b>80</b>
Non-American Indian/Alaska Native	64	66	68	70	72	74	75	76	76	77	78	79	<b>80</b>

\*The BIE is currently working with their Student Information System vendor to align data collection with ESSA requirements. Once data is obtained for each of the subgroups identified, measurements of interim may be modified.

4. Describe how the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps.

**BIE Response** –The long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year graduation rates are the same for all subgroups and all students. Our intention is to cut any graduation rate gaps between any groups to no more than 3%age points by SY 2028-2029.

- c. **English Language Proficiency.** *(ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))*
  1. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment, including: (1) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

**BIE Response** – BIE examined State Plans from States that had a substantial population of American Indian students and that used the WIDA ACCESS as their English Language Proficiency Assessment. After careful consideration of the different state plans, BIE determined that modeling their ELP

proficiency indicators and progress after Idaho’s State Plan would be a reasonable proxy for the BIE system.

BIE determines a student’s eligibility as an English Learner in a multi-step process, beginning with an initial home language survey, completed at the time of registration. If the home language survey indicates a language other than English is the primary language spoken at home, the student is then assessed using the WIDA ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT). The student’s results from this screener determine eligibility and inform the student’s plan for developing English language skills.

The ACCESS assessment is administered to all identified English Learners, annually, and includes the four domains of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. A student receives an overall composite score and a scale score in each of the four domains.

The reading and writing domains are weighted 35% each in the overall composite, while the speaking and listening are weighted 15% each in the overall composite.

Following the SY2020-21 ACCESS administration, a student will be considered proficient when they receive a composite score equal to or greater than 4.2, with a minimum score of 3.5 in the domains of reading, writing, and listening, and a minimum score of 1 in the speaking domain.

BIE has determined a 5-year timeline for students to acquire English language proficiency .The expected time to English Language Proficiency serves educators in the development of the student’s EL plan in setting realistic and attainable growth targets, with a focus on meeting students where they are and moving students where they need to be, so they can successfully access academic content and be college and career ready.

**Table III: Expected Progress Indicators on the WIDA ACCESS**

<b>Initial ACCESS ELP Level</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>
6 Reaching	Considered English Language Proficient in BIE					
5 Bridging	Considered English Language Proficient in BIE					
4 Emerging	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 4	Level 4			
	Expected Progress	4.0-4.1	4.2+			
3 Developing	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 3	Level 3-4	Level 4		
	Expected Progress	3.0-3.5	3.6-4.1	4.2+		
2 Expanding	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 2	Level 3	Level 3-4	Level 4	
	Expected Progress	2.5-2.9	3.0-3.5	3.6-4.1	4.2+	

1 Entering	Expected Proficiency Level	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 3-4	Level 4
	Expected Progress	1.5-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.5	3.6-4.1	4.2+

v. Describe the long-term goals for English learners for increases in the percentage of such students making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment, including: (1) the State-determined timeline for such students to achieve English language proficiency and (2) how the long-term goals are ambitious.

BIE has determined that a 5-year timeline for students to achieve English language proficiency is appropriate (see Table III above). BIE has set a long-term goal of 82.71% in 2023 for increases in the percentage of students making progress in achieving English language proficiency as measures the WIDA ACCESS. This long-term goal of 82.71% is realistic and attainable while being ambitious given the current baseline data. BIE expects to reexamine the goals and measurements of interim progress upon completion of the data analysis of the SY20-21 ACCESS results.

2. Provide the measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency.

**BIE Response** – See Table IV below for ELP measurements of interim progress.

**Table IV: ELP Progress Long-Term Goal and Measurements of Interim Progress**

2018 Estimated Baseline	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
74.07%	75.80%	77.53%	79.26%	80.98%	82.71%

- iv. Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B))
  - a. Academic Achievement Indicator. Describe the Academic Achievement indicator, including a description of how the indicator (i) is based on the long-term goals; (ii) is measured by proficiency on the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments; (iii) annually measures academic achievement for all students and separately for each subgroup of students; and (iv) at the State’s discretion, for each public high school in the State, includes a measure of student growth, as measured by the annual Statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.

***BIE Response*** – BIE will use student performance on the BIE mathematics and ELA assessments as the Academic Achievement indicator beginning in SY 2020-2021 and annually thereafter, for all students and identified subgroups. BIE will not employ growth model for high schools. See below for the methodology for the calculation of the Academic Achievement indicator.

**English language arts (ELA) and Mathematics Proficiency**

**(Total Combined ELA and Math Points = 50; Maximum Points for ELA = 25; Maximum Points for Math = 25)**

BIE will employ an index approach, where each student’s proficiency level translates into an index score. Average index score represents a summary of all students’ proficiency levels. This average index score will determine points earned in the academic achievement indicator. The index score is not the student’s scale score on the assessment. Each student’s index score will be determined as follows:

<b>Proficiency Level based on Assessment Results</b>	<b>Index Score</b>
Advanced	1000
Proficient	800
Nearing Proficient	500
Basic (or did not test/up to 95%)	100

All student index scores will be averaged to determine a school’s (or subgroup’s) points in the academic achievement indicator.

<b>Average Index Scores*</b>	<b>Points Received (Maximum 25 pts. each – ELA and mathematics)</b>
700 or higher	25
Between 100-700	$(\text{SCHOOL AVERAGE} - 100) / 24$ , rounded up to the next whole number.
100	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

To clarify how the proficiency level impacts the index score, if no one in a school scores proficient or above, then the highest score that a school could receive would be 500. A school that receives full points on the academic achievement indicator may still have students that are not proficient. Consider the following examples. Example A: a school where 2/3 are proficient and 1/3 is nearing proficient = 700; Example B: a school where 1/4 of the students are advanced and 1/4 of the students are proficient and the remaining 1/2 are nearing proficient = 700; Example C: a school where 100% of students are proficient = 800.

- b. Indicator for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools (Other Academic Indicator). Describe the Other Academic indicator, including how it annually measures the performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of



students. If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, the description must include a demonstration that the indicator is a valid and reliable statewide academic indicator that allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance.

**BIE Response** – BIE will use student performance on the BIE Science assessment and assign points based on performance as the Other Academic Indicator beginning in SY 2020-2021 and annually thereafter, for all students and identified subgroups. BIE intends to assess all students in required grades tested for Science.

**Other Academic Indicator - Science Proficiency**

**(Total Points = 20)**

BIE will employ an index approach, where each student’s proficiency level translates into an index score. Average index score represents a summary of all students’ proficiency levels. This average index score will determine points earned in the academic achievement indicator. The index score is not the student’s scale score on the assessment. Each student’s index score will be determined as follows:

<b>Proficiency Level based on Assessment Results</b>	<b>Index Score</b>
Advanced	1000
Proficient	800
Nearing Proficient	500
Basic (or did not test/up to 95%)	100

All student index scores will be averaged to determine a school’s (or subgroup’s) points in the Other Academic Indicator.

<b>Average Index Scores*</b>	<b>Points Received (Maximum 20 pts.)</b>
700 or higher	20
Between 100-700	(SCHOOL AVERAGE - 100) / 30, rounded up to the next whole number.
100	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

To clarify how the proficiency level impacts the index score, if no one in a school scores proficient or above, then the highest score that a school could receive would be 500. A school that receives full points on the academic achievement indicator may still have students that are not proficient. Consider the following examples. Example A: a school where 2/3 are proficient and 1/3 is nearing proficient = 700; Example B: a school where 1/4 of the students are advanced and 1/4 of the students are proficient and the remaining 1/2 are nearing proficient = 700; Example C: a school where 100% of students are proficient = 800.

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

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

**BIE Response** – BIE will utilize a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students. The long-term goal for all students and all subgroups is a four-year adjusted cohort rate of 80% reached by 2031-2032.

The four-year graduation rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who graduate within four years, including the summer following their fourth year of high school, with a regular high school diploma by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for that graduating class.

4-year Graduation Rate =  $\frac{\# \text{ of students who graduate within four years with a regular high school diploma}}{\# \text{ of first-time 9}^{\text{th}} \text{ graders in the fall three years earlier} + \# \text{ of students who transferred in} - \# \text{ of students who transferred out during the past 4 years}}$

**4-Year Cohort Graduation**

**(HS Total Points = 20)**

Schools with 80% or higher graduation rate receive full points. Schools with less than 67% graduation rate receive 0 points.

High School points = (GRAD RATE-67)\*1.5, rounded up to the next higher number.

Average Percentage*	K-8: Points Received (Maximum 0 pts.)	HS: Points Received (Maximum 20 pts.)
Schools with 80% or more of students graduating	N/A	20
Schools with 67% - 79% students	N/A	(GRAD RATE-67)*1.5, rounded up to the next higher number
Schools with less than 67%	N/A	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

- d. Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency (ELP) Indicator. Describe the Progress in Achieving ELP indicator, including the State’s definition of ELP, as measured by the State ELP assessment.

**BIE Response** – BIE administers the ACCESS 2.0 developed by WIDA as our English Language Proficiency assessment. BIE defines English language proficiency as measured the the WIDA ACCESS assessment when a student receives a composite score equal to or greater than 4.2, with a minimum score of 3.5 in the domains of reading, writing, and listening, and a minimum score of 1 in the speaking domain. Students are defined as making progress depending on their time in a US school and current designation via the assessment. The progress in achieving ELP is defined in detail in section iv.c above. See Table III.

**Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator**

**(K-8 = 15 Total Points; HS = 15 Total Points)**

Schools with 75% or more of their students achieving progress receive full points. Schools with 0% progress receive 0 points.

K-8 School points = (PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next higher number.

High School points = (PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next higher number.

Average Percentage	K-8: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)	HS: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)
Schools with 75% students or more making identified progress	15	10
Schools with 0 to 74% students making identified progress	(PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next whole number	(PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next whole number
Schools with 0% students making identified progress	0	0

- e. School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s). Describe each School Quality or Student Success Indicator, including, for each such indicator: (i) how it allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance; (ii) that it is valid, reliable, comparable, and statewide (for the grade span(s) to which it applies); and (iii) of how each such indicator annually measures performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the description must include the grade spans to which it does apply.

**BIE Response** – Beginning in SY 2020-2021, BIE will use Chronic Absenteeism as the only School Quality or Student Success Indicator for all grade spans meaningful differentiation of schools. BIE defines Chronic Absenteeism as being absent (excused and unexcused) from school for 10% or more of school days per student within a school year. Absenteeism represents lost instructional time whether excused or not and has a strong relationship with achievement and graduation. Absenteeism further serves as an indicator in the early warning system that is relevant to all grades and is considered an important metric in accountability, demonstrating greater variance across schools than attendance alone, enhancing meaningful differentiation of schools. Students are at academic risk due to any excessive absences and are considered chronically absent.

The BIE will continue to work with stakeholders to establish the full methodological and operational implications; and training in school-wide processes in submitting daily attendance and absences in the BIE student information system. The BIE will continue on-going training with schools to code appropriate cultural or ceremonial absences not defined under chronic absenteeism.

**School Quality or Success Indicator - Chronic Absenteeism**

**(K-8 = 15 Total Points; HS = 15 Total Points)**

Schools with 20% of students or less identified as chronically absent will receive full points. Schools with 50% of students or more will receive 0 points.

Schools with 20%-50% of students identified as chronically absent:

K-8 School points =  $(50 - \text{CHRONIC}) / 2$ , rounded up to the next whole number

High School points =  $(50 - \text{CHRONIC}) / 2$ , rounded up to the next whole number

Average Percentage*	K-8: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)	HS: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)
Schools with 20% students or less identified as chronically absent	15	15
Schools with 20% - 50% students identified as chronically absent	$(50 - \text{CHRONIC}) / 2$ , rounded up to the next whole number	$(50 - \text{CHRONIC}) / 2$ , rounded up to the next whole number
Schools with 50% students or more identified as chronically absent	0	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

Following this methodology will award schools points on the chronic absenteeism indicator based on their share of chronically absent students. BIE identifies a student as chronically absent if the student has been absent – excused and unexcused – for 10 or more instructional days during the school year. A school’s chronic absenteeism rate is the percentage of students who are chronically absent. The chronic absenteeism rate ranges from 0 percent to 82 percent during School Year 2019-2020. Using BIE’s formula, this would result in 15 accountability points in the first case and 0 accountability points in the second case. At the extremes, schools with 20% of students or less identified as chronically absent will receive 15 points. Schools with more than 50% of students or more will receive 0 points, and schools in between will receive between 0-15 points. This differential awarding of accountability points allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance. The average percent of students chronically absent across all BIE-funded schools during School Year 2019-2020 was 29.8%. There were 58 BIE-funded schools that had less than 20% of students chronically absent. 58 out of 174 BIE schools would receive full points for the Chronic Absenteeism indicator.

- v. Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))
  - a. Describe the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA, including a description of (i) how the system is based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system, (ii) for all students and for each subgroup of students. Note that each

state must comply with the requirements in 1111(c)(5) of the ESEA with respect to accountability for charter schools.

***BIE Response*** – Described below is BIE’s plan to outline the system of annual differentiation of schools.

The purpose of BIE’s accountability system is to identify schools that could benefit from additional supports and interventions. The indicators used for accountability determinations are listed in the table below.

<b>BIE Accountability Indicators Beginning SY 2020-21</b>	<b>Grade Span</b>	
	K-8	H.S.
Accountability Indicators	K-8	H.S.
1. Academic Achievement-proficiency on statewide mathematics and ELA assessments	yes	yes
2. a. Other Academic Indicator: Science (proficiency on statewide Science assessments	yes	N/A
3. English Learner Progress-applied to all schools with 10 or more English Learners	yes	yes
4. a. Four-Year cohort graduation rate	N/A	yes
5. SQSS Chronic Absenteeism	yes	yes

The accountability indicators above, with the exception of the English language proficiency indicator, will be calculated for all students and all identified subgroups. As noted earlier in this plan, the BIE is currently working with their Student Information System vendor to align data collection with ESSA requirements for identified subgroup information.

The accountability indicators will be based on the following information:

- Academic Achievement: Students’ proficiency levels on the ELA and Math Assessment.
- Other Academic Indicator: Students’ proficiency levels on the Science Assessment.
- Progress of English Learners: Comparison of the current year to the previous year for a progress measurement determined by time in the U.S. and initial results on the ELP assessment (see chart IV on page 15). The percent of students who show progress at each school will then be used as the measure to evaluate the progress in achieving English language proficiency indicator.
- Graduation Rate: The four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
- Chronic Absenteeism: The percentage of students absent for 10% or more of the days during the school year.

Schools will be evaluated on five indicators, though small schools may not meet the minimum n-size on each indicator, and so may be evaluated by other means. These indicators will apply uniformly to all schools in the BIE.

**English language arts (ELA) and Mathematics Proficiency**

**(Total Combined ELA and Math Points = 50; Maximum Points for ELA = 25; Maximum Points for Math = 25)**

BIE will employ an index approach, where each student’s proficiency level translates into an index score. Average index score will determine points earned in the academic achievement indicator. The index score is not the student’s scale score on the assessment. Each student’s index score will be determined as follows:

<b>Proficiency Level based on Assessment Results</b>	<b>Index Score</b>
Advanced	1000
Proficient	800
Nearing Proficient	500
Basic (or did not test/up to 95%)	100

All student index scores will be averaged to determine a school’s (or subgroup’s) points in the academic achievement indicator.

<b>Average Index Scores*</b>	<b>Points Received (Maximum 25 pts. each – ELA and mathematics)</b>
700 or higher	25
Between 100-700	$(\text{SCHOOL AVERAGE} - 100) / 24$ , rounded up to the next whole number.
100	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

Consider the following examples. A school that receives full points still has students that are not proficient. Example A: a school where 2/3 are proficient and 1/3 is nearing proficient = 700; Example B: a school where 1/4 of the students are advanced and 1/4 of the students are proficient and the remaining 1/2 are nearing proficient = 700; Example C: a school where 100% of students are proficient = 800.

**Other Academic Indicator - Science Proficiency**

**(Total Points = 20)**

BIE will employ an index approach, where each student’s proficiency level translates into an index score. The index score is not the student’s scale score on the assessment. Each student’s index score will be determined as follows:

<b>Proficiency Level based on Assessment Results</b>	<b>Index Score</b>
Advanced	1000
Proficient	800
Nearing Proficient	500
Basic (or did not test/up to 95%)	100

All student index scores will be averaged to determine a school's (or subgroup's) points in the Other Academic Indicator.

Average Index Scores*	Points Received (Maximum 20 pts.)
700 or higher	20
Between 100-700	(SCHOOL AVERAGE - 100) / 30, rounded up to the next whole number.
100	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

Consider the following examples. If no one in a school scores proficient or above, then the highest score that a school could receive would be 500. Example A: a school where 2/3 are proficient and 1/3 is nearing proficient = 700; Example B: a school where 1/4 of the students are advanced and 1/4 of the students are proficient and the remaining 1/2 are nearing proficient = 700.

### **Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator**

**(K-8 = 15 Total Points; HS = 15 Total Points)**

Schools with 75% or more of their students achieving progress receive full points. Schools with 0% progress receive 0 points.

K-8 School points = (PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next higher number.

High School points = (PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next higher number.

Average Percentage	K-8: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)	HS: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)
Schools with 75% students or more making identified progress	15	10
Schools with 0 to 74% students making identified progress	(PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next whole number	(PERCENTAGE) / 5, rounded up to the next whole number
Schools with 0% students making identified progress	0	0

### **School Quality or Success Indicator - Chronic Absenteeism**

**(K-8 = 15 Total Points; HS = 15 Total Points)**

Schools with 20% of students or less identified as chronically absent will receive full points. Schools with 50% of students or more will receive 0 points.

Schools with 20%-50% of students identified as chronically absent:

K-8 School points = (50 - CHRONIC) / 2, rounded up to the next whole number

High School points = (50 - CHRONIC) / 2, rounded up to the next whole number

Average Percentage*	K-8: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)	HS: Points Received (Maximum 15 pts.)
Schools with 20% students or less identified as chronically absent	15	15
Schools with 20% - 50% students identified as chronically absent	(50-CHRONIC) / 2, rounded up to the next whole number	(50-CHRONIC) / 2, rounded up to the next whole number
Schools with 50% students or more identified as chronically absent	0	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

Following this methodology will award schools points on the chronic absenteeism indicator based on their share of chronically absent students. BIE identifies a student as chronically absent if the student has been absent – excused and unexcused – for 10 or more instructional days during the school year. A school’s chronic absenteeism rate is the percentage of students who are chronically absent. The chronic absenteeism rate ranges from 0 percent to 82 percent during School Year 2019-2020. Using BIE’s formula, this would result in 15 accountability points in the first case and 0 accountability points in the second case. At the extremes, schools with 20% of students or less identified as chronically absent will receive 15 points. Schools with more than 50% of students or more will receive 0 points, and schools in between will receive between 0-15 points. This differential awarding of accountability points allows for meaningful differentiation in school performance. The average percent of students chronically absent across all BIE-funded schools School Year 2019-2020 was 29.8%. There were 58 BIE-funded schools that had less than 20% of students chronically absent. 58 out of 174 BIE schools would receive full points for the Chronic Absenteeism indicator.

#### **4-Year Cohort Graduation**

##### **(HS Total Points = 20)**

Schools with 80% or higher graduation rate receive full points. Schools with less than 67% graduation rate receive 0 points.

High School points = (GRAD RATE-67)\*1.5, rounded up to the next higher number.

Average Percentage*	K-8: Points Received (Maximum 0 pts.)	HS: Points Received (Maximum 20 pts.)
Schools with 80% or more of students graduating	N/A	20
Schools with 67% - 79% students	N/A	(GRAD RATE-67)*1.5, rounded up to the next higher number
Schools with less than 67%	N/A	0

\*Averages apply to schools and subgroups.

In K-12 schools and other instances where a school has elementary and high school grades, BIE will calculate accountability results using both K-8 and HS approaches and see which one produces the more



favorable results. BIE will use the accountability approach that produces the most total points for the school.

**Translating Accountability Points/Weights to Accountability Status:**

<b>Accountability Status</b>	<b>Combined Points/Weights from ELA/Math Proficiency, Science Proficiency, EL Progress, 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate and Chronic Absenteeism</b>
Meets or Exceeds Expectations	70-100
Approaching Expectations	40-69
Needs Improvement	0-39

- b. Describe the weighting of each indicator in the State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in ELP indicators each receive substantial weight individually and, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.

***BIE Response*** – The weighting of each of BIE’s indicators are listed below.

**Table V – Weighting of BIE Indicators**

<b>Federally Required Indicators</b>	<b>SY 2020-2021 (Transition)</b>	
	<b>K-8</b>	<b>H.S.</b>
Accountability Indicators	K-8	H.S.
1. Academic Achievement-proficiency on statewide mathematics and ELA assessments	50 Pts.	50 Pts.
2. a. Other Academic Indicator: Science (proficiency on statewide Science assessments)	20Pts.	N/A
3. English Learner Progress-applied to all schools with 10 or more English Learners	15 Pts.	15 Pts.
4. a. Four-Year cohort graduation rate	N/A	20 Pts
5. SQSS Chronic Absenteeism	15 Pts.	15 Pts.
Total	100	100

- c. If the State uses a different methodology for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a. above for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (e.g., P-2 schools), describe the different methodology, indicating the type(s) of schools to which it applies.

**BIE Response** – When a school does not have at least ten students on at least two of the accountability indicators, a small school review is conducted to protect student-level information. In order for a school to be assigned a school performance level the school must meet the minimum n-size of 10 students on at least two indicators. Schools with scores on just one indicator or no indicators will undergo a small school review.

During a small school review, schools receive their performance data, and their school improvement plan, and other relevant data such as their absenteeism data, English Proficiency data, graduation rate data, fiscal monitoring data, etc. The data is reviewed by BIE staff to ensure that their goals align to the indicators within the accountability model. School schools earn a determination of *Met* or *Not Met* on their school improvement plan, and they are identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, as appropriate, when their improvement plan earns a determination of *Not Met*.

- vi. **Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D))**
  - a. **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe the State’s methodology for identifying not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement.

**BIE Response** – BIE will use three years of data utilizing the accountability indicators described above to determine a ranking for schools in order to identify the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools, for comprehensive support and improvement. Under the waiver received from the U.S. Department of Education, mentioned in the Introduction, any school that is identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement or additional targeted support and improvement in the 2019-2020 school year will maintain that identification status in the 2020-2021 school year and continue to receive supports and interventions consistent with the school’s support and improvement plan in the 2020-2021 school year. The process of annual meaningful differentiation will utilize previously mentioned federally required indicators and include all students and all subgroups. BIE is currently working with their Student Information System vendor regarding a report card format for future determinations.

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

**BIE Response** – The BIE will identify all high schools with a graduation rate below 67 percent for comprehensive support and improvement, beginning with the 2020-2021 school year. Due to the 2019-2020 Assessments and Accountability Waiver from USED, BIE will use 2020-2021 assessment and accountability data to identify schools for 2021-2022. New identification of schools will occur in 2021-2022. BIE funded schools will remain in their previous Comprehensive Support and Improvement status for 2020-2021.

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

**BIE Response** - Title I schools identified for additional targeted support will move to the CSI list if they do not meet the ATSI exit criteria after three consecutive years.

- d. Year of Identification. Provide, for each type of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. Note that these schools must be identified at least once every three years.

**BIE Response**– Every three years, the BIE will identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement. Due to the 2019-2020 Assessments and Accountability Waiver from USED, BIE will use 2020-2021 assessment and accountability data to identify schools for 2021-2022. New identification of schools will occur in 2021-2022. Schools will remain in their previous CSI status for 2020-2021 based on 2018-2019 data.

- e. Targeted Support and Improvement. Describe the State’s methodology for annually identifying any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation, including the definition used by the State to determine consistent underperformance. (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii)*)

**BIE Response** – Beginning in fall of SY 2021-2022 the BIE will use three years of data utilizing the accountability indicators described above to determine a ranking for schools in order to identify schools for targeted support and improvement (TSI) by using the school’s 3-year average for any subgroup performance which would be at or below that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5-percent of Title I, Part A schools). Under the waiver received from the U.S. Department of Education, mentioned in the Introduction, any school that is identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement or additional targeted support and improvement in the 2019-2020 school year will maintain that identification status in the 2020-2021 school year and continue to receive supports and interventions consistent with the school’s support and improvement plan in the 2020-2021 school year. Future annual identification will be based on the most recent 3-year data trend.

If the school is identified as a TSI school, the school can exit TSI status in one of two ways, by, the school no longer meeting the criteria that led to identification of being a TSI school or by the school’s 3-year average growth in subgroup proficiency exceeds target proficiency growth rate projected for the same statewide subgroup.

- f. Additional Targeted Support. Describe the State’s methodology, for identifying schools in which any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), including the year in which the State will first identify such schools and the frequency with which the State will, thereafter, identify such schools. (*ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D)*)

***BIE Response***– Beginning in fall of SY 2021-2022 the BIE will identify schools for additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI) by using the school’s 3-year average subgroup performance which would be at or below that of all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5-percent of Title I, Part A schools). Future annual identification will be based on the most recent 3-year data trend.

If the school is identified as an ATSI school, the school can exit ATSI status by the school achieving a 3-year average performance for each subgroup above all students in the lowest performing schools (bottom 5% of Title IA schools).

Note: Title I schools identified for additional targeted support will move to the CSI list if they do not meet the ATSI exit criteria after three consecutive years.

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

***BIE Response*** – None.

- vii. Annual Measurement of Achievement (*ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii)*): Describe how the State factors the requirement for 95 percent student participation in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.

***BIE Response*** – The participation requirement is 95%. Non-participants in excess of 5% are counted as “Basic” and “not proficient” on the state assessment and will be included in the Achievement indicator. The participation rate is computed for all students with an active enrollment in the school during the test window.

- viii. Continued Support for School and LEA Improvement (*ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)*)
- a. Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe the statewide exit criteria, established by the State, for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, including the number of years (not to exceed four) over which schools are expected to meet such criteria.

***BIE Response***– CSI Schools identified as the lowest-performing 5% may exit if the school no longer meets the lowest 5% entrance criteria and demonstrates an improvement in the overall state assessment score greater than or equal to 3% of the gap between the baseline state assessment score and 100. This 3% improvement must be demonstrated from the highest of the three state assessment scores used in the three-year average to the current state assessment score. CSI High Schools identified as having low-graduation rates may exit by attaining a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate greater than 67%. BIE

will continue to work with schools in 2020-2021 which were identified in SY 2019-2020, prior to school closures caused by COVID-19.

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

***BIE Response***– Beginning 2021-2022, ATSI Schools identified as having at least one subgroup that is performing in the lowest 5% of all schools in at least 50% of the state assessment components may exit the ATSI status if no subgroup is performing in the lowest 5% of all schools in at least 50% of state assessment components.

ATSI Schools identified as among all schools identified for consistently underperforming subgroup, have at least one subgroup that is performing in the lowest 5% of all schools in all state assessment components. ATSI Schools may exit this status by ensuring no subgroup is performing in the lowest 5% of all schools in all state assessment components AND the subgroup’s current score is greater than the previous score for all components in which the subgroup is no longer in the lowest 5% of all the schools in at least 50% of the state assessment components.

**Note:** Title I schools identified for additional targeted support will move to the CSI list if they do not meet the ATSI exit criteria after three consecutive years.

- ii. The State’s methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.

- c. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the ESEA.

***BIE Response*** – The process the BIE will use to determine school designations ensures schools of every degree of quality are represented in the accountability system. The school designation will determine the source(s) and depth of technical assistance provided. The BIE in conjunction with the various units (Division of Performance & Accountability, Associate Deputy Directors, Education Resource Centers), is responsible for providing technical assistance to Comprehensive Support and Improvement; Targeted Support and Improvement; and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement for SIG Schools. The remainder of this document will concentrate on the processes and procedures used to support these identified schools.

The school improvement process utilized by the BIE follows the U.S. Department of Education recommendations that schools in need of improvement:

- conduct a needs assessment
- develop a plan for improvement
- implement the plan, and then

- evaluate the implementation of the plan in order to inform future practice.

These tasks are the key responsibilities of school leadership teams. Technical assistance provided by the BIE and other support groups is intended to complement rather than disrupt the recommended cycle of improvement. BIE will utilize a variety of communication methods to reach out to schools. BIE will also use virtual training and support models during the current events as well as future years. Technical assistance will be dependent upon individual schools. Services typically provided to schools include the following:

- establishment of school leadership team and collaborative teams
- assessment of readiness and building capacity
- development of improvement plans
- monitoring and adjustment of plans
- technical assistance related to curriculum and instruction, student engagement and culture and climate
- data training and support for using assessments
- leadership development
- support with parent and community involvement and
- dissemination of knowledge

There are multiple reasons why schools are unable to fully address the needs of all students; therefore, efforts to help schools improve must be individualized. The actual services that are provided should reflect the documented needs of the school. Once local needs are identified, the BIE's system of support can draw from a host of supporting groups to customize services to reflect the schools' and districts' unique challenges.

For those schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement, Targeted Support and Improvement, and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement, the BIE will provide targeted support that promotes school-wide efforts as follows:

- Establishing a Positive Climate and Cohesive Culture;
- Building capacity and supporting effective School Leadership;
- Aligning instruction with Standards-Based Curriculum and Assessments;
- Building infrastructure for Student Support Services and Family/Community/Tribal Connections;
- Developing and maintaining Educator Professional Growth and Development;
- Building the infrastructure to support Efficient and Effective Management of the school and its federal education programs; and
- Building a culture of Continuous School Improvement.

School falling in the CSI category, both lowest-performing and low-graduation rate will receive more targeted support interventions as follows:

### **Plan of Support**

- Ongoing collaboration and technical assistance for continuous improvement
- LEA/school level reviews and walkthroughs
- 1003(a) School Improvement Funds formula allocation
- Professional learning

- BIE School Improvement Education Program Specialist to support LEAs/schools in their plan of support for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools
- ADD/ERC School Improvement School Diagnostic Team – On-site, on-going support provided by a BIE ADD/ERC School Improvement Education Program Specialist and BIE ad hoc members as needed.

### **Guidelines**

- Develop plan between LEA/school and BIE to set shared expectations and responsibilities
- ADDs/ERCs/EPA and School Improvement Specialists to create an LEA/school plan of support for identified schools
- Identified CSI Schools will conduct a CNA and create a School Improvement Plan (SIP) for 2019-2020
- Attend required BIE professional learning

School falling in the TSI and ATSI category will receive addition targeted support interventions as follows:

### **Plan of Support**

- Ongoing collaboration and technical assistance for continuous improvement
- LEA/school level reviews and walkthroughs by the ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialist as requested
- Annual Title I, Part A 1003(a) School Improvement Funds formula allocation
- Professional learning
- BIE ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialist to support LEAs/schools in their plan of support for identified schools

### **Guidelines**

- Develop plan between LEA/school and BIE to set shared expectations and responsibilities
- Create a LEA/school plan of support for identified schools
- Identified Schools will conduct a CNA and create a School Improvement Plan (SIP) for 2019-2020
- Attend required BIE professional training

- d. Resource Allocation Review. Describe how the State will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

***BIE Response*** – In the BIE school system, schools are designated as Local Educational Agencies (LEA). The BIE as SEA therefore works directly with schools as the LEAs to address requirements affecting LEAs.

### **General Guidelines for on-site support, planning and progress tracking visits by the ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialists:**

Prior to the visit, the LEA/school site staff will establish an agenda for day(s) in collaboration with the ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialist. Each school is in a different place in the Comprehensive

Needs Assessment (CNA), root cause analysis, and planning process. Site visits during the planning year will be very specific to the needs of individual schools.

Keeping in mind the focus on reviewing and analyzing the CAN, looking deeper at the root causes for the primary concerns and determining what evidence-based interventions might be the most successful, all visit will include:

- ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialist and Principal conversation at the beginning of the visit for school status update, to review CNA, root cause analysis, current CSI School Improvement Plan and planning needs
- ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialist meets with Administrative and Leadership Team to review CAN, root cause analysis, current CSI School Improvement Plan and planning needs as well as current data
- Exit Interviews
  - Principal and Assistant Principal(s)
  - Administrative Team
  - Leadership Team
  - School Collaboration Teams: Student Focus, Faculty Focus, School Improvement Focus and Stakeholder Focus

On-Site Visits may include:

- Walkthrough classroom observations (10-15 minutes each) using a pre-developed walkthrough protocol.
  - Observe in all Math and English/Language Arts classrooms
  - Observe in other classrooms as time permits
  - Share the classroom observation data and provide feedback to Principal and/or Administrative and Leadership Teams
- Focus Group Interviews (approximately 30 minutes each)
  - Teachers (4-6) depending on school size
  - Students (4-6) grade 5 and above
- Follow-Up Meeting(s)
  - On-site or online to continue the discussion(s), tracking planning action steps, discuss evidence-based intervention possibilities, etc.

### **ADD/ERC School Improvement Diagnostic Team Review**

The ADDs/ERCs will schedule a Diagnostic Team visit. This visit involves a scheduled, full day school review completed by an ADD/ERC Diagnostic Team of approximately four to six members of their BIE staff. The visit includes a classroom observation and interviews with teachers, students, counselors and administrators. Interview questions will revolve around assisting the Diagnostic Team to make decisions on the types of and amount of technical assistance each Comprehensive and Targeted school needs. During the Diagnostic Review the ADDs/ERCs will follow established protocols to be developed by ADD/ERC BIE staff. Each ADD/ERC Diagnostic Team will appoint a liaison to serve as the Comprehensive or Targeted School Improvement Coordinator to assist in the facilitation of the Diagnostic Review visit and follow-up review technical assistance.

### **BIE School Improvement Diagnostic Review Process**

1. The ADD/ERC will contact the superintendent and/or principal of the Comprehensive/Targeted School to schedule the Diagnostic/Review visit.



2. Principal and/or Superintendent holds a meeting with school staff to explain that a BIE Diagnostic Review Team of team of 4-5 members will spend a day in the school. These Diagnostic Review Team members will be observing classrooms and interviewing students, teachers, staff, and administration. Principal/Superintendent needs to emphasize that the Diagnostic Review Team will be looking at overall processes and structures, not checking for compliance.
3. Also at this Review, school staff members will be given a form to complete concerning the school culture survey (TBD) and leadership effectiveness (TBD). School faculty and staff should feel secure in providing honest answers since the surveys are compiled in a data base.
4. The Diagnostic Review Team will spend a full day at the school using a pre-developed BIE school improvement observation form and a pre-developed interview questionnaire. These two forms will assist in guiding the Review Team's discussions and facilitate their observations. Assessing the school leadership is a critical component of the diagnostic review. The Diagnostic Review Team will provide an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the administration, along with recommendations for improvement.
5. At the conclusion of the day, the Diagnostic Review Team will debrief with both the school and school administration. The debrief meeting will be a time to share the major concerns of the day. Concerns about the leadership will be voiced at this time to the superintendent/principal so that he/she can begin to focus on the leadership of the school and determine a plan of action.
6. A time will be scheduled with the school administration to return to the school and share the results of the culture survey and the diagnostic visit with the administration and faculty. The report is meant to provide an overview of the team's observations and information gathered. It should be seen as a discussion tool to help guide the planning for the school improvement process.
7. Upon the return visit, the diagnostic report and culture survey will be shared with the entire staff. It is at this point, that the process becomes individualized based on the needs of the school.

The DPA staff will assist the schools in ensuring the schools are making the best use of and are in compliance with their educational monies supporting the implementation of the school's continuous school improvement plan, including any Comprehensive Support and Targeted schools improvement activities.

Every three years, the BIE will conduct a comprehensive review to analyze and identify what is working, what is not, and what changes need to be made to support school improvement. Aspects analyzed:

- Improvement on all accountability indicators
  - The Comprehensive School Improvement Plans
  - The funding supports in our fiscal federal financial system in order to equitably allocate those funds with flexibility to the extent available in distribution methods
- e. Technical Assistance. Describe the technical assistance the State will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.

***BIE Response*** – The BIE will provide technical assistance to schools throughout every step of the continuous improvement cycle, beginning with the development of a comprehensive needs assessment. The BIE will provide technical assistance to school leaders engaging school leaders with their communities and families in conducting needs assessment, analyzing data, and developing a continuous improvement plan. The BIE will provide a template that will assist schools with aligning funding with programs and selecting evidence based practices and determining implementation for possible

interventions. The BIE will provide guidance to schools in writing their plans, setting goals, (for ELA, Math, EL Progress, chronic absenteeism and subgroups) and progress monitoring. Additionally, the BIE will provide schools with technical assistance and professional development opportunities regarding improving student outcomes. Finally, the BIE will assist with progress monitoring to ensure schools are on track with meeting academic goals.

### **On-Site Support, Planning and Progress Visits**

The **BIE System of Technical Assistance Support** is designed as follows:

- Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) will be supported by the ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialists
- Support continuous school improvement in all BIE schools
- Assist identified lowest performing schools as well as other BIE schools as requested
- Focus on leadership at the school level
- Build LEA/school capacity to support lowest performing schools to guide continuous school improvement
- Support the development of a network of schools within the BIE to guide continuous improvement
- CSI schools will be tracked, supported, and provided technical assistance for the next three years by the ADD/ERC School Improvement Specialist to ensure continued improvement
- CSI schools must Exit this CSI status within four years. If not, the CSI School will be placed in a more rigorous intervention process.

- f. Additional Optional Action. If applicable, describe the action the State will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that are consistently identified by the State for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting exit criteria established by the State or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans.

**BIE Response** – Not Applicable

5. Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B)*): Describe how low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, and the measures the SEA agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such description.

**BIE Response** – BIE evaluates Bureau-Operated School teachers. Collects teacher quality data at 50 of 183 schools. BIE is developing processes and procedures as part of the Strategic Direction.

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

***BIE Response*** – The BIE’s Education Resource Center (ERCs) comprised of School Improvement, Title Programs, Special Education - Education Specialists will support all BIE schools by providing on-going professional development training and resources to school staff regarding practices that reduce the use of aversive behavior interventions that compromise student health and safety and reduce the overuse of discipline methods that remove students from the classroom. Examples of training include topics on as Trauma Informed Instruction, social-emotional development, Response to Intervention, Positive Behavior Interventions, Transition Services, Early Childhood, Individual Education Plan best practices, and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs). Staff can also receive clarification to the responsibilities of meeting legal requirements for Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), Section 504 and more. All staff have access to online tools such as LRP Resources to gain a clear understanding of special education requirements and services and how they work. School staff can access Special Ed Connection, Title I Admin, and DirectSTEP eCourses.

BIE is working with their Student Information System vendor to enhance the functionality of all data collections, which would include discipline data, such as suspensions, expulsions, bullying and harassment. BIE will conduct data analysis on discipline information to identify trends and patterns to assist with providing strategic support if certain elements or locations show greater need and also to confirm that BIE’s support to schools in lowering incidences of removing students from the classroom.

7. School Transitions (*ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(D)*): Describe how the State will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school), including how the State will work with such LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out.

***BIE Response*** –The BIE will work directly with schools in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school) to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out. BIE’s plan is under development.

BIE recognizes that there are four critical transitional times within the span of a student’s education that must be supported through a variety of programs, models, and evidence-based best practices that include the purposeful engagement of parents and families in a framework that is both trauma-informed and culturally responsive.

The BIE has developed and in the process of implementing a Strategic Direction plan for BIE’s pre-K-post-secondary educational system. The Strategic Direction outlines goals in Early Childhood, K-12 instructional programs and post-secondary programs. An example of a Strategic Direction activity in the implementation of a BIE Guidance/Behavioral Counselors’ Conference that looks at a variety of topics and data of schools around transitional services, graduation rates, development of new programs in schools, Human Capital. Counselors play a role in Special Education services and IEP meetings.

At all grade spans, BIE supports programs designed to support students with disabilities in all transition activities. For example, job shadowing, internships, time management, career advisement, vocational and college school tours, are some programs that can be utilized to support the transition of students with disabilities.

Each LEA should be responsive to the needs of their students and work within the parameters of their fiscal funding.

The BIE works in partnership with many state and local entities and with LEAs to ensure effective transitions across all grades, with particular focus on the following:

### **Early Childhood and Kindergarten**

- Collaboration between elementary schools, local preschool programs, special education, preschools, and Head Start programs.
- A kindergarten transition tool regarding best practices on early childhood transition, such as summer jumpstart program for incoming kindergarten students.
- Special assistance for children in foster care and homeless children, including immediate enrollment, transportation, and community referrals for children in foster care and homeless children.
- Evidence-based programs (e.g., Parents as Teachers, Families as Teachers, Parent Teacher Home Visiting program).
- Collaboration with school counselors and psychologists.
- Family and Community Engagement. At all grade levels, BIE encourages parental involvement through after-school projects such as family literacy nights, math nights, etc. potentially utilizing 21<sup>st</sup> Century grants.

### **Elementary to Middle School**

- School-family communication, which must include information about the school's curriculum, assessment, and test score data for their child, the school, the district, and the state in a form that is clear and understandable.
- Meaningful opportunities for families to engage in their child's learning.
- Use data to identify students who may be struggling academically or at risk of dropping out. Educators can use this information to make sure students get the support they need to be successful.
- Collaboration with school counselors and psychologists.

### **Middle School to High School**

Many BIE schools are K-8 and, given the rural nature of the communities, many ninth grade students attend public schools.

- Evidence-based practices that support high school transitions, such as summer bridge programs, Shadowing, and peer mentorship.
- Parent Teacher Home Visits and other outreach to parents and families.
- Effective counseling practices, including communicating high school expectations, rules, state and local requirements for graduation, college enrollment, and career training opportunities with students and families.
- Youth mental health programs and practices, such as Native Wellness Youth Camps.
- Opportunities to develop innovative educational experiences, such as project-based learning, place-based learning, and STEM.
- Career Fairs.
- In SY 2019-20, BIE implemented a pilot program in two high schools for financial literacy, which will be mandatory under the Arizona State Course requirements.

The BIE works with LEAs to support dropout prevention by:

- Encouraging schools to offer credit recovery options.
- Better align comprehensive school improvement plan and school needs assessment.
- Share enrollment data and NASIS graduation cohort Student Data Health Check.

- Providing professional development and technical assistance to alternative school programs across the state in creating innovative programming.
- Encouraging alternative and innovative educational opportunities, such as alternative programs, career and technical education pathways, dual enrollment, and more.

### **High School to College, Career, and Community**

- Career fairs at Bureau Operated Post-Secondary Schools.
- Career and technical education programming that gives students an opportunity to earn industry-recognized credentials and move into further training after high school.
- Advanced Placement (AP) courses and International Baccalaureate (IB) Programs.
- Dual enrollment opportunities in academic and career and technical education courses, which give students an opportunity to earn college credits.
- Counseling services that support career and college exploration.
- Information regarding financial aid and college admissions process.
- Specific post-secondary planning for students with IEPs.
- Career coaches trained in various career related assessments to help guide and navigate students in planning for future goals.
- BIE encourages high schools located near colleges and universities to enter into Memorandums of Understanding with local colleges and universities to provide dual enrollment/credit. BIE also encourages BIE high schools local industry for job shadowing.
- In SY 2019-20, BIE implemented a pilot program in two high schools for financial literacy which will be mandatory under the Arizona State Course requirements.
- In SY 2019-20, BIE working with Assistant Secretary Sweeny, will implement on the longest bus routes, wi-fi access for students.

Remaining sections are not applicable for the Standards, Assessments and Accountability Plan.