

ESEA FLEXIBILITY PART B MONITORING REPORT

MONITORING VISIT INFORMATION	
State Educational Agency (SEA)	Arizona Department of Education (ADE)
Request Approved	July 19, 2012
Request Amended	November 25, 2013
ESEA Flex Monitoring Activity	Part B Desk Monitoring
Monitoring Review Date(s)	December 16-18, 2013
Exit Conference	January 27, 2014
Interviews Conducted	Karla Phillips, Jennifer Johnson, Elliott Hibbs, Leila Williams, Kathy Hrabluk, Karen Butterfield, Marv Lamer, Mark Masterson, Amit Soman, Ed Jung, Pat Childress, Irene Hunting, Sarah Galetti, Angela Denning, Kelly Koenig, Todd Peterson, Peter Laing, Dan Brown, Robert Gray, Carrie Giovannone, Rebecca Bolnick, and Laura Toenjes
U.S. Department of Education (ED) Monitors	Christina Imholt and Millicent Bentley-Memon

OVERVIEW OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY MONITORING

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is committed to supporting State educational agencies (SEAs) as they implement ambitious reform agendas through their approved ESEA flexibility requests. Consistent with this commitment, ED has designed a monitoring process to assess an SEA's implementation of the principles of ESEA flexibility and the State-level systems and processes needed to support that implementation.

Part B Monitoring

In Part B monitoring, SEA implementation of ESEA flexibility was reviewed across several key areas: State-level Systems and Processes, Principle 1, Principle 2, and Principle 3, as outlined in the *ESEA Flexibility Part B Monitoring Protocol*. In each broad area, ED identified key elements that are required under ESEA flexibility and are likely to lead to increased achievement for students. Through examination of documentation submitted by the SEA and interviews with SEA staff, ED assessed the effectiveness of implementation of ESEA flexibility by identifying the extent to which the SEA:

1. Is ensuring that implementation is occurring consistent with the SEA's approved request and the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility.
2. Is continuing to review and make adjustments to support implementation.
3. Is establishing systems and process to sustain implementation and improvements.

The report contains the following sections:

- *Highlights of the SEA's Implementation.* This section identifies key accomplishments in the SEA's implementation of ESEA flexibility.
- *Status of Implementation of ESEA Flexibility.* This section indicates whether or not the SEA has met expectations for each element of ESEA flexibility.
- *Elements Requiring Next Steps.* When appropriate, this section identifies any elements where the SEA is not meeting expectations and includes Next Steps that the SEA must take to meet expectations.

- *Recommendations to Strengthen Implementation.* This section provides recommendations to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation.
- *Additional Comments.* When appropriate, this section includes any additional information related to the SEA’s implementation of ESEA flexibility not included elsewhere.

HIGHLIGHTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY

The SEA’s work includes the following key accomplishments relating to the implementation of ESEA flexibility and/or efforts to engage in a process of continuous review and analysis, particularly for those elements receiving a comprehensive review:

- ADE has established processes for holding the SEA accountable for implementing the principles of ESEA flexibility by establishing as part of ADE’s Strategic Plan, SMART goals and objectives. ADE generates monthly reports on progress towards these goals and objectives and ADE’s leadership convenes on a quarterly basis to monitor progress.
- Through the Governor’s College and Career Ready Program, ADE convened high school teachers and community college faculty to discuss and collaborate on what it means to be college ready to ensure that students are actually college ready and that both groups have the same understanding. Teachers and faculty compared curricula at the high school and college levels and discussed expectations for college readiness.
- To support focus schools in targeting interventions to address schools’ needs, ADE’s Office of Exceptional Student Services (ESS) reviewed focus schools, which were identified based on the performance of the bottom quartile of students, for high concentrations of students with disabilities within that bottom quartile. ESS created a grant program specifically for these schools to be able to target interventions toward supporting students with disabilities.

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ESEA FLEXIBILITY

SEA Systems & Processes

Element	Status
Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)	Not Meeting Expectations
Technical Assistance (2.G)	Meeting Expectations
Data Collection & Use (§9304(a)(6))	Meeting Expectations
Family & Community Engagement and Outreach (Implementation Letter)	Meeting Expectations

Principle 1

Element	Status
Transition to and Implement College- and Career-ready Standards (1.B)	Meeting Expectations
Adopt English Language Proficiency Standards (Assurance 2)	Meeting Expectations ¹

¹ Please note that in this report, ED is not taking any position on Arizona’s implementation on other aspects of Arizona’s Title III programs, or on whether the State is in compliance with Federal civil rights and programmatic requirements or its resolution agreement with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education

Element	Status
Develop and Administer High-Quality Assessments (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer Alternate Assessments (Assurance 3)	Meeting Expectations
Develop and Administer English Language Proficiency Assessments (Assurance 4)	Meeting Expectations ²
Annually Reports College-going and College-credit Accumulation Rates (Assurance 5)	Meeting Expectations

Principle 2

Element	Status
Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (2.A)	Not Meeting Expectations
Reward Schools (2.C)	Not Meeting Expectations
Priority Schools (2.D)	Not Meeting Expectations
Focus Schools (2.E)	Not Meeting Expectations
Other Title I Schools (2.F)	Meeting Expectations
State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)	Not Meeting Expectations

Principle 3

Element	Status
Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)	Arizona's Principle 3 guidelines are under review
Principal Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)	Arizona's Principle 3 guidelines are under review

ELEMENTS REQUIRING NEXT STEPS

Element	Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)
Summary and Status of Implementation	While ADE provided evidence that it has a process in place for monitoring implementation of Principle 1 and Principle 3, the SEA has not demonstrated that the monitoring of focus schools was carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request. According to ADE's approved ESEA flexibility request, "LEAs implementing targeted interventions will receive implementation checks one to two times a year from the School Improvement and Intervention (SII) team using the Revised Tier III PMI [(Progress Monitoring Instrument)]. These instruments monitor

Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.)

² Please note that in this report, ED is not taking any position on Arizona's implementation on other aspects of Arizona's Title III programs, or on whether the State is in compliance with Federal civil rights and programmatic requirements or its resolution agreement with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). (Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, and requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.)

Element	Monitoring (EDGAR 80.40 and 2.G)
	<p>the progress of the LEA to implement the selected interventions and the school's progress on increasing all student performance and closing identified achievement gaps." Although ADE provided documentation demonstrating that it had a process to monitor focus schools during the 2012–2013 school year and ADE indicated during the monitoring interview that the SII team conducted onsite monitoring and desktop monitoring (implementation checks) for all focus schools during the 2012–2013 school year, the State was not able to provide sufficient evidence demonstrating that it had in fact carried out a monitoring process for all focus schools that ensured the implementation of selected interventions matched the reason for identification during the 2012–2013 school year.</p>
Next Steps	<p>Through the ESEA flexibility extension process, ADE must provide evidence demonstrating that during the 2012–2013 school year the SEA carried out its monitoring of focus schools to ensure the implementation of selected interventions that match the reason for focus school identification (i.e., a schedule of monitoring). If ADE is unable to provide such evidence, it must provide a schedule for monitoring all focus schools during the 2013–2014 school year.</p>

Element	Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (2.A)
<p style="text-align: center;">Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In its approved ESEA flexibility request, ADE indicated that all schools would receive a letter grade under the SEA’s system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support. During ADE’s ESEA Flexibility Part A Monitoring Review, which occurred on September 5, 2012, ADE indicated that 29 Title I schools would not receive letter grades in the 2012–2013 school year due to insufficient data (<i>e.g.</i>, having fewer than 30 student observations over a five-year period or insufficient data to calculate for the school a student growth percentile, which comprises half of a school’s letter grade). As a result, ADE’s ESEA Flexibility Part A Monitoring included a Next Step indicating that “ADE’s Title I and School Improvement Division is reviewing the list of 29 schools that did not receive letter grades, given their unique characteristics, to determine what process can be designed to determine an appropriate accountability and, if necessary, support and intervention process.” During Part B monitoring, ADE indicated that in 2013–2014, 64 schools did not receive letter grades. ADE provided a plan for carrying out this next step and documentation demonstrating that it has begun convening workgroups to develop an accountability system for these extremely small schools, as well as online schools. However, ADE has not yet developed an appropriate accountability process for these schools and is not ensuring that all schools receive a letter grade under the SEA’s system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support as it committed to do in its approved ESEA flexibility request. ○ In its approved ESEA flexibility request, ADE indicated that as part of the State’s A-F letter grade system, a school could receive 3 additional points toward its composite score if it reclassified 30% or more of its English Learners as fully English proficient based on the Arizona English Language Learning Assessment (AZELLA). During the Part B monitoring interview, ADE indicated that it had modified the percentage of English Learners that needed to be reclassified in order for a school to earn the three additional points toward its composite score in light of the new AZELLA assessment and so that it would align with the State’s Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). <p>Additionally, as indicated in ED’s November 25, 2013 letter, ADE has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the final version of the new letter grading system with a graduation rate weight of at least 20 percent. This element is being addressed through ADE’s work to address that condition.</p>

Element	Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support (2.A)
Next Steps	<p>To ensure that ADE implements a State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support for all LEAs in the State and for all Title I schools in these LEAs, ADE must, through the ESEA flexibility extension process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Amend its request to include its plan and timeline for how it will ensure that its extremely small schools that do not currently receive letter grades, given their unique characteristics, are held accountable and, if necessary, receive appropriate supports and interventions. ○ Amend its request to reflect the change in the percentage of English Learners that needed to be reclassified in order for a school to earn the three additional points toward the composite score of its A-F letter grade. <p>Additionally, ADE must continue its work to address the outstanding condition on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED's November 25, 2013 letter.</p>

Element	Reward Schools (2.C)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. Arizona's approved ESEA flexibility request indicates that it will recognize the State's reward schools by providing "Meaningful Public Recognition," "Leadership Opportunities," and "Financial Rewards." ADE provided evidence of recognizing these schools at State conferences, providing pins to all staff members at those schools, and sending letters of acknowledgement. However, ADE did not provide evidence of providing financial rewards by creating a competitive grant program.</p>
Next Steps	<p>Through the ESEA flexibility extension process, ADE must amend its request for this element to reflect the activities the SEA will engage in relating to reward schools.</p>

Element	Priority Schools (2.D)
<p style="text-align: center;">Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>According to the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, the SEA must ensure that each LEA with one or more priority schools implements, for three years, meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles. ADE indicated in Part A monitoring that the 2012–2013 school year would be the first year of implementation for all of its non-SIG priority schools. However, based on the documentation submitted by ADE and monitoring interviews during the Part B process it is not apparent that all non-SIG priority schools implemented all of the turnaround principles in 2012–2013 or are fully implementing all of the turnaround principles in 2013–2014. Specifically, the following areas of concern were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While ADE requires all LEAs and priority schools to identify strategies aligned to the turnaround principles in their LEA Continuous Improvement Plans (CIPs) and School CIPs, as indicated in its approved request, ADE’s review of these plans does not ensure that the strategies selected by LEAs and schools fully address all of the turnaround principles. According to ADE’s “Checklist for LEA/School CIP Intervention Strategy Verification,” ADE reviews these plans “to verify that at least one strategy from each of the 7 Turnaround Interventions for Priority Schools have been addressed in the LEA/School’s CIP.” However, in order to fully meet an individual turnaround principle and therefore all of the turnaround principles, a priority school may need to implement more than one strategy. For example, according to the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> one of turnaround principles requires that schools are “redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration.” According to ADE’s review form, to meet this particular turnaround principle, a school could include a strategy to “conduct an instructional time audit to determine best approach to providing more time for core subjects for all students.” This would not fully ensure that the school day, week, or year has in fact been redesigned to include additional time for student learning, as well as additional time for teacher collaboration. ○ Although ADE was able to indicate whether a principal had been retained for all but one of its priority schools, ADE did not provide evidence of a process for LEAs who are retaining principals in priority schools to demonstrate to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort. Therefore, ADE is not ensuring that the turnaround principle related to school leadership was fully implemented.

Element	Priority Schools (2.D)
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While ADE monitored all non-SIG priority schools in 2012–2013 at least twice, based on the evidence ADE provided to ED about that monitoring, which shows ADE’s assessment of implementation in these schools, a large number of schools are still in the “Program Installation” stage of implementation for their turnaround principles, which is defined as “Prepare for use of the practice or program” and “Establish the resources needed to use and implement the practice or program with fidelity and good outcomes for students,” or an earlier stage. Therefore, it is not clear that all non-SIG priority schools had moved beyond a planning or pre-implementation stage and were implementing all of the turnaround principles in 2012–2013. <p>Based on this information, it is not clear that all schools implemented all of the turnaround principles in what is considered the first year of implementation according to ADE’s approved ESEA flexibility request. To count as the first year of the three years of full implementation, priority schools must implement all of the turnaround principles in the first year.</p> <p>With regards to ADE’s SIG priority schools, through the on-site monitoring visit conducted by the ED’s Office of School Turnaround on May 13-17, 2013, and indicated in the subsequent monitoring report issued on October 24, 2013, ED determined that ADE was not fully complying with all School Improvement Grants (SIG) requirements.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not clear that the total number of priority schools identified in Arizona equals at least 5 percent of the Title I schools in the State, as required by the definition of priority schools in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. While ADE identified 65 priority schools in August 2012, ADE indicated that it has subsequently learned that thirteen of these schools have closed, but it is not clear that these schools closed consistent with the closure model under the SIG program.</p>

Element	Priority Schools (2.D)
<p data-bbox="175 877 321 911">Next Steps</p>	<p data-bbox="386 220 1463 674">As part of its request for extension of ESEA flexibility, ADE must provide evidence demonstrating how it is ensuring that interventions aligned with all of the turnaround principles are being implemented in all priority schools in the first of three years of required implementation. Specifically, ADE must provide to ED a demonstration that all priority schools implemented interventions aligned with all of the turnaround principles beginning in 2012–2013. Additionally, for schools that are considering either the 2012–2013 or the 2013–2014 school year as the first year of three years of required implementation, ADE must provide evidence of how ADE ensured that LEAs with non-SIG priority schools reviewed the performance of the current principal and have either replaced the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or is demonstrating to ADE that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort no later than the start of the 2013–2014 school year.</p> <p data-bbox="386 720 1463 1031">If ADE is not able to provide such evidence, ADE may not consider the 2012–2013 or 2013–2014 school year as the first year of three years of required implementation for those schools for which it does not have such evidence. ADE must then, as part of its request for extension, submit a high quality plan for ensuring that all priority schools are implementing interventions aligned with all turnaround principles in the first year of implementation and an amendment to its approved ESEA flexibility request with an updated timeline for implementation of interventions aligned with all of the turnaround principles that ensures that the first year of implementation for all priority schools occurs no later than the 2014–2015 school year.</p> <p data-bbox="386 1077 1463 1283">Furthermore, to ensure that the SEA implements meaningful interventions in its SIG-awarded Tier I and/or Tier II schools consistent with the SIG final requirements, and therefore, may continue to count such schools as priority schools, consistent with the principles and timelines in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, ADE must work with the ED’s Office of School Turnaround to resolve any remaining findings relating to the monitoring and/or implementation of the SIG models.</p> <p data-bbox="386 1329 1463 1562">Additionally, to ensure that the SEA identifies 5 percent of Title I schools as priority schools and implements interventions in these schools no later than the 2014–2015 school year, ADE needs to provide an updated list of priority schools as part of the ESEA flexibility extension process. For any schools that are included on ADE’s priority list that are closed, ADE must ensure that these schools have closed consistent with the school closure model under the SIG program and have supporting documentation on file.</p>

Element	Focus Schools (2.E)
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>Under Principle 2, the SEA is required to work to close achievement gaps by publicly identifying Title I schools with the greatest achievement gaps, or in which subgroups are furthest behind, as “focus schools” and ensuring that each LEA implements interventions in each of these schools based on reviews of the specific academic needs of the school and its students. ADE identified focus schools based on the performance of the bottom 25% of students. While focus schools are required to establish goals, strategies and action steps for the performance of the bottom 25% of students in math and English as part of their School CIPs, based on a review of sample focus school plans, it is not evident how interventions included in those plans specifically address the performance of the bottom 25% of students. Additionally, it is not evident how ADE ensures in its review process that the interventions address the performance of the bottom 25% of students. Therefore, the SEA has not provided evidence that it is ensuring LEAs are implementing interventions that work to close the achievement gaps as outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not clear that the total number of focus schools in Arizona equals at least 10 percent of the Title I schools in the State, as indicated in the definition of focus schools in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. While ADE identified 126 focus schools in September 2012, ADE indicated that it has subsequently learned that seven of these schools have closed.</p>
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>As part of its request for extension of ESEA flexibility, ADE must submit to ED a plan describing how it will ensure that LEAs with focus schools are working to close achievement gaps by implementing interventions in each of these schools that specifically address the performance of the bottom 25% of students that led to the school’s identification as a focus school.</p> <p>To ensure that the SEA identifies 10 percent of Title I schools as focus schools and implements interventions in these schools, ADE needs to provide an updated list of focus schools as part of the ESEA flexibility extension process.</p>

Element	State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA; 2.B and Assurance 14)
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with its approved ESEA flexibility request and the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i> or §1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Although ADE provided a link to its 2012–2013 State report card which includes all data under §1111 of the ESEA, ADE did not provide samples of local report cards to show that it includes all required elements. ADE is in the process of redesigning its 2013–2014 State and local report cards and released the first phase of information in February 2014. However, ADE has not provided evidence that it is reporting performance against its new AMOs or reporting all required information consistent with §1111 of the ESEA and ED’s February 8, 2013 report card guidance.</p>

Element	State and Local Report Cards (§1111 of the ESEA, 2.B and Assurance 14)
Next Steps	As part of its request for extension of ESEA flexibility, ADE must submit evidence that its report cards for the 2013–2014 school year include all information required under ESEA §1111 and are consistent with ED’s February 8, 2013 report card guidance or provide a plan and a timeline for doing so.

Element	Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)
Summary and Status of Implementation	<p>The SEA has not demonstrated that this element is carried out consistent with the principles and timelines outlined in the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>. According to the document titled <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, “an SEA must commit to develop, adopt, pilot, and implement. . . teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that. . . use multiple valid measures in determining performance level, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice.” The model evaluation system that ADE has developed does not require growth for all students in teacher evaluation and support systems. Specifically, according to the rating tables that ADE developed for the Student Academic Progress portion of its model system, for several groups of teachers, such as teachers of non-tested grades and subjects in grades 3-12 and new teachers in grades 2-12, the only growth measure required are “Targeted Student Learning Objectives” (Targeted SLOs). According to ADE’s guidance, Targeted SLOs are “A student learning objective written specifically for the lowest prepared students that aims to close the achievement gap in their learning using targeted instructional strategies with the objective of bringing these students up to grade-level.” As a result, ADE’s model evaluation system does not require student growth for all students as required under the principles of <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>.</p> <p>Additionally, as indicated in ED’s November 25, 2013 letter, ADE has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the submission of final guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that meet the requirements of ESEA flexibility, including the use of student growth, as defined in <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, as a significant factor in determining a teacher’s or principal’s summative evaluation rating. This element is being addressed through ADE’s work to address that condition and resolve its high-risk status.</p>
Next Steps	<p>As part of its request for extension of ESEA flexibility, ADE must submit a plan for ensuring that its State Model teacher evaluation and support system and any LEA developed teacher evaluation and support systems that are implemented in 2014–2015 include for all teachers student growth for all students.</p> <p>Additionally, ADE must continue its work to resolve its high-risk status and address the outstanding condition on its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED’s November 25, 2013 letter.</p>

Element	Principal Evaluation and Support Systems (3.B)
<p>Summary and Status of Implementation</p>	<p>As indicated in ED's November 25, 2013 letter, ADE has not addressed the condition placed on the approval of its ESEA flexibility request requiring the submission of final guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that meet the requirements of ESEA flexibility, including the use of student growth, as defined in <i>ESEA Flexibility</i>, as a significant factor in determining a teacher's or principal's summative evaluation rating. This element is being addressed through ADE's work to address that condition and resolve its high-risk status.</p>
<p>Next Steps</p>	<p>ADE must continue its work to resolve its high-risk status and address the outstanding condition on its ESEA flexibility request consistent with ED's November 25, 2013 letter.</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS TO STRENGTHEN IMPLEMENTATION

The following recommendations are provided to support the SEA in continuing to meet the principles and timelines of ESEA flexibility and strengthening implementation through continuous improvement and the establishment of systems and processes to sustain implementation and improvement:

- As ADE continues to develop its Instructional Toolbox to provide teachers with resources to support implementation of Arizona's college- and career-ready standards, ADE should ensure that resources comprehensively address the needs of teachers across grades and content areas and are presented in a manner that is useful to teachers and effective for supporting instruction. The Toolbox examples presented were limited in scope and did not fully address all grades and content areas.
- ADE should continue to expand its work with Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS) and ESS on college- and career-ready standards training, to ensure all teachers have access to curricula and resources that support English Learners and students with disabilities in accessing the college- and career-ready standards. The trainings on math standards and on close reading for English Learners are two examples of the types of trainings that ADE could continue to support and expand.
- ADE should consider providing additional technical assistance to LEAs and schools on developing high-quality plans and selecting appropriate interventions and/or strengthening the SEA's review process to provide feedback on the appropriateness and quality of the interventions that LEAs and schools are including in their plans to ensure that interventions identified in School CIPs for priority, focus, and pre-intervention schools and ultimately implemented are meaningful and likely to improve student achievement.