4.1 Accountability System.

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

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

NOTE: Areas where DDOE is still seeking stakeholder feedback and stakeholder feedback received so far are indicated by blue highlights.

Indicator	Measure	Description
Academic Achievement	Proficiency in ELA Proficiency in Math Proficiency in Science Proficiency in Social Studies DDOE is currently seeking from its stakeholder engagement efforts feedback regarding the measures to include within the Academic Achievement indicator. Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, there is interest in including the following indicators in Delaware's accountability system:	The Academic Achievement metric area measures student performance in relation to grade-level expectations. This area currently includes student performance data on statewide assessments in four content areas: ELA, math, science, and social studies. Achievement is reported for all students as well as separately for each subgroup of students. An overall rating is provided for this indicator, allowing for the meaningful differentiation all public schools statewide.

	• Proficiency in ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies • Literacy by 3rd grade • Kindergarten readiness • Access to a well-rounded education (fine arts, media, technology, options in programs) • Early learning indicators • Only including what is required by ESSA	
Academic Progress	Growth On-Track to Graduate DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding the measures to include within the Academic Progress indicator. Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, there is interest in including the following indicators in Delaware's accountability system: • Growth at the student level [student growth] • PSAT to SAT growth at the high school level • IEP growth goals • Student performance on locally-developed assessments • On-track to graduation at the high school level (earning enough credits to graduate on time)	The Growth area metrics measure how well schools are doing at improving student learning over time. The On-Track-to-Graduation area metrics aggregate student progress to and through high school graduation. In elementary and middle schools, attendance data are used to calculate On-Track-to-Graduation metric. In high schools, the data for the calculation of the On-Track in 9th Grade metric is gathered from course credit information. An overall rating is provided for this indicator, allowing for the meaningful differentiation all public schools statewide.

| Graduation Rate | 4-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate
5-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate
6-year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate

DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder engagement regarding whether to include the extended graduation rates. Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, there is interest in including the following indicators in Delaware's accountability system:
    • Keep the 5 and 6 extended year graduation rates
    • Recognize students who graduate on-time based on their IEP | Graduation rates are calculated based on the number of student who earned a regular high school diploma divided by the total number of students in the cohort. An extended graduation rate of 5 years is included to recognize that some students need additional time to graduate. All graduation rates are reported for all students as well as separately for each subgroup of students. An overall rating is provided for this indicator, allowing for the meaningful differentiation all public schools statewide. |
| Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency | DDOE is currently seeking from its stakeholder engagement efforts feedback regarding how to measure progress in achieving English Language Proficiency. Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, the following ideas have been submitted with regard to developing the measuring progress toward English Language Proficiency indicator:

    • Baseline academic performance
    • Urban versus rural background | The DDOE is currently stakeholder feedback regarding how to measure progress in achieving English Language Proficiency. |

	• Academic indicators/screenings in home language • Prior year educational history • Age • Proficiency in home language • Literacy in home language • Develop differentiated targets if appropriate	
School Quality or Student Success	Attendance (Elementary and Middle Schools only) DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding the measures to include within the School Quality or Student Success Indicator. Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, there is interest in including the following indicators in Delaware's accountability system: • Chronic absenteeism	This is calculated by starting with the total number of days of attendance for all students and dividing that number by the total number of school days in a given year. An overall rating is provided for this indicator, allowing for the meaningful differentiation all public schools statewide.
School Quality or Student Success	College and Career Readiness The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding the measures to include within the School Quality or Student Success Indicator. Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, there is interest in including the following indicators in Delaware's accountability system:	Elementary and Middle Schools only: Growth to Proficiency is the percent of students who are on track to be on grade level in a given content area within three years. This indicates that students are growing fast enough to meet and maintain academic success. For the Growth to Proficiency metric, the content areas used are ELA and math. An overall rating is provided for this indicator, allowing for the meaningful differentiation all public schools statewide.

	• More college and career readiness options • More school quality measures • Access to a well-rounded education (fine arts, media, technology, options in programs) • Teacher retention • Student and teacher portfolios • Discipline data • Teacher quality • Full-time employment of a certified librarian in each school • Teacher, student and parent surveys • Non-academic indicators like socioemotional learning and surveys • Counselor-to-student ratio	High Schools only: College and Career Preparation is the percent of students who have demonstrated preparation for education and career training after high school through Smarter, AP, IB, SAT, Career and Technical Education (CTE) pathways, and dual enrollment. Students that demonstrate early success in these areas increase their likelihood of entry and success in education and career training after high school. An overall rating is provided for this indicator, allowing for the meaningful differentiation all public schools statewide.

As part of ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:

- *What other school quality indicators should Delaware consider?*
- *What additional non-academic indicators should be considered?*
- *Should Delaware consider a different way to measure student growth? Why?*
- *Should Delaware consider adding options for students to demonstrate college and career readiness, such as ASVAB, Certificate of Bilingualism, and additional career options? What other options should be considered?*
- *What should Delaware take into consideration with regard to adding early literacy indicators?*
- *Should Delaware consider replacing attendance with chronic absenteeism? Why?*
- *English Learners enter our schools with varying levels of education with and/or without records, at varying ages through age 21, and with varying English language proficiency levels. What should we take into consideration when setting growth targets for English learners?*

B. **Subgroups.**

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

   > Subgroups included in the Delaware accountability system include the following: All students, American Indian, African American, White, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Asian, Hispanic, Multiracial, Students With Disabilities, English Learner, and Low Socioeconomic Status. Although not required in the accountability determination, consistent with 200.16(a)(2), the DDOE will be also including the following subgroups in its reporting performance: Homeless, Foster Care and Military Dependent.

   ii. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedures for:
   a. Former English learners consistent with §200.16(b)(1).

   > The DDOE intends to use the flexibilities under ESSA for all students who are former English learners. The determination of the number of years the DDOE will include former ELs for accountability is under consideration and open for public comment. The reporting of former ELs will be included for four years as required by law.

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

   > Delaware intends to continue to use the allowable one-year exemption previously provided by U.S. ED Title III. Recently-arrived English learners who have not been in U.S. schools for 12 months will be given a one-year individual exemption from the reading and English language arts assessments. The State intends to include the test scores of English learner students who have been in the U.S. for more than 12 months in the accountability determination. The Department is reviewing its previous ESEA Flexibility Waiver application regarding recently arrived ELs and will conduct a data analysis and develop a model for each of the allowable exceptions for internal consideration.
   >
   > Based on stakeholder feedback received to date, there is interest in including the following considerations with regard to exceptions:
   >
   > - Evidence collected by local education agencies
   > - Access scores upon entry
   > - Number of years in educational system
   > - Local decision
   > - How long a student has been there
   > - Age grade vs. skill grade

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

   > Accountability systems often use a minimum n-size for determining whether to include a measure in a school's accountability rating. The rationale is that when the number of students for which a measure is calculated is too small, the measure is likely to be a less reliable measure of school

performance. If the number of students for which a measure is calculated meets or exceeds the minimum n-size, the measure is included in the rating. If the minimum n-size is not met, the measure is excluded.

The DDOE is currently seeking from its stakeholder engagement efforts feedback regarding the minimum number of students to include in each subgroup. Based on feedback received to date, recommendations include the following:

- Keep at current n of 30 for accountability but n-size of 15 for reporting purposes
- Consider 15-20, but provide what the impact would be for each
- Consider a number that includes all students

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

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

ESSA Section 200.17(a)(1) prohibits a State from using disaggregated data for reporting purposes or AYP determinations if the number of students in the subgroup is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information. DDOE currently employs a minimum n of 30 for accountability to provide both statistical reliability across accountability metric calculations and privacy protection for those subgroups too small to report without disclosing personally identifiable information. DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding decreasing the minimum N from 30.

Based on feedback received to date, recommendations include the following:

- Keep at current n of 30 for accountability and 15 for reporting
- Consider 15-20, but provide what the impact would be for each
- Consider a number that includes all students

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

DDOE's current accountability system does not average data across years or subgroups. Its multiple measures aggregate for all subgroups under Section 200.16(a)(2) without the use of a super-group. DDOE proposes to continue this strategy under the new law and regulation. To ensure the statistical reliability and soundness of the accountability data, DDOE currently employs an n count of 30. DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding decreasing the minimum n count from 30.

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

DDOE employs a two-tiered approach to disclosure avoidance. When reporting aggregate counts for complementary subgroups where the total for all complementary groups is also reported, Delaware will suppress aggregates that fall below the minimum N count. If there is only one such group, Delaware proposes to either use complementary suppression or blurring techniques such as subgroup combination. When reporting percentages, blurring techniques such as top-and-bottom coding will be used as well as rounding and ranges to protect student privacy. The U.S. Department of Education's Privacy Technical Assistance Center (PTAC) states that many statisticians consider a cell size of 3 to be the absolute minimum needed to prevent disclosure (note that this does not speak to the statistical reliability of the aggregate obtained). Currently, Delaware's minimum n count is 30 for accountability. The DDOE continues to seek stakeholder feedback regarding reducing minimum n count.

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

The table below shows the number of students that would be excluded from the accountability system based on variable changes in n-size, from n=30 which is currently used, to n=10. For example, with an n-size of 30, 366 African American students are excluded from accountability statewide, with an n-size of 20 138 African American students are excluded, with an n-size of 15 60 African American students are excluded, and with an n-size of 10 only 14 are excluded. This trend can be seen across all subgroups.

Demographic	Total N	N30	N20	N15	N10
African American	38765	366	138	60	14
American Indian	512	512	512	512	424
Hispanic/Latino	19243	760	352	158	70
Asian	4629	1556	1023	750	401
Hawaiian	151	151	151	151	140
White	59626	437	224	140	91
Multi-Racial	3507	2079	1132	679	316
ELL	8329	1291	877	491	248
LowSES	42867	366	171	77	26
SWD	19157	377	74	41	41

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

Delaware is not considering using an n size that exceeds 30.

D. **Meaningful Differentiation.** Describe the State's system for meaningfully differentiating all public schools in the State, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESSA and §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

> DDOE will implement a single, statewide accountability system that will be effective in ensuring that all local educational agencies including public charter schools, public elementary schools, and public secondary schools are continuing to show improvement as defined in section 1111(c)(4)(c) of the ESSA. The DDOE continues to seek feedback from our stakeholder groups regarding how best to meaningfully differentiate all public schools in Delaware.
>
> This system may be used to identify multiple tiers of support and provide LEAs with targeted technical assistance. This supports the premise behind the state's vision that every student graduate college and career ready.
>
> Delaware charter schools are held to higher standards of accountability and transparency than traditional public schools. The rigorous standards charter schools are held to are established at the point of application, continue through annual reporting of charter school performance, and are enforced through both the formal review and five-year renewal processes. Charter school performance is reported for each charter school and collectively for all charter schools annually. This public reporting is referred to as the Charter School Performance Framework ("CSPF"). The CSPF includes an annual analysis of academic, organizational, and financial performance of schools. The Academic Performance Framework section of the CSPF is the statewide accountability system used for all public schools. The Organizational and Financial Performance Frameworks are utilized only for charter schools and measure organizational soundness and financial viability of charter schools.
>
> The charter school approval, renewal, and formal approval processes are governed by state charter law.
>
> DDOE continues to seek stakeholder feedback regarding meaningful differentiation of all public schools.

Describe:

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

> Under the current multiple measures accountability system, schools and districts receive ratings based on performance in each area (e.g., Academic Achievement, Growth, On-Track-to-Graduation, and College and Career Preparation). Individual student data is aggregated at the school and district levels to generate a numeric score for each metric and metric area. Each of the metrics contributes a weighted value toward the numeric score, which is then converted into a star value for each of the four metric areas.
>
> The system must also identify the lowest performing schools and schools that have low performing subgroups for comprehensive support and improvement and/or targeted support and improvement.

The new accountability system under ESSA is expected to be implemented during the 2017-18 school year.

The DDOE continues to seek stakeholder feedback regarding how best to calculate distinct levels of school performance.

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

The Delaware Department of Education is reevaluating its existing weighting system, which was developed from the recommendations of the Accountability Framework Working Group. Please Note: These examples are provided in order to elicit comments and questions from our stakeholders as we transition to ESSA. At this time, DDOE has not made any determination on the weighting of each indicator of the accountability system, and no decisions have been made regarding the inclusion of indicators within the accountability system.

The current metrics are aggregated on a 500-point scale reflecting different values for elementary/middle and high schools. There is also a district-level aggregation for LEAs with more than one school. Each metric area (e.g., Academic Achievement), currently receives a star rating from one to five stars based on the aggregated performance on metrics in that particular area. The current metric weights and associated points are as follows:

Elementary/Middle School

Metric Area/Metrics	Weight	Points
Academic Achievement	*30%*	*150*
Proficiency ELA	10%	50
Proficiency Math	10%	50
Proficiency Science	5%	25
Proficiency Social Studies	5%	25
Growth	*40%*	*200*
Growth in ELA	20%	100
Growth in Math	20%	100
On-Track-to-Graduation	*10%*	*50*
Average Daily Attendance	10%	50
College and Career Preparation	*20%*	*100*

Metric Area/Metrics	Weight	Points
Growth to Proficiency in ELA	10%	50
Growth to Proficiency in Math	10%	50
Total	**100%**	**500**

High School

Metric Area/Metrics	Weight	Points
Academic Achievement	*25.0%*	*125.0*
Proficiency ELA	7.5%	37.5
Proficiency Math	7.5%	37.5
Proficiency Science	5.0%	25.0
Proficiency Social Studies	5.0%	25.0
Growth	*45.0%*	*225.0*
Growth in ELA	22.5%	112.5
Growth in Math	22.5%	112.5
On-Track-to-Graduation	*20.0%*	*100.0*
On-Track in 9th Grade	5.0%	25.0
4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	10.0%	50.0
5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	3.0%	15.0
6-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	2.0%	10.0
College and Career Preparation	*10.0%*	*50.0*
College and Career Preparation	10.0%	50.0
Total	**100.0%**	**500.0**

District

Metric Area/Metrics	Weight	Points
Academic Achievement	*27.5%*	*137.5*
Proficiency ELA	8.75%	43.75

Proficiency Math	8.75%	43.75
Proficiency Science	5.0%	25.0
Proficiency Social Studies	5.0%	25.0
Growth	*42.5%*	*212.5*
Growth in ELA	21.25%	106.25
Growth in Math	21.25%	106.25
On-Track-to-Graduation	*15.0%*	*75.0*
Average Daily Attendance	5.0%	25.0
On-Track in 9th Grade	2.5%	12.5
4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	5.0%	25.0
5-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	1.5%	7.5
6-Year Cohort Graduation Rate	1.0%	5.0
College and Career Preparation	*15.0%*	*75.0*
Growth to Proficiency in ELA	5.0%	25.0
Growth to Proficiency in Math	5.0%	25.0
College and Career Preparation	5.0%	25.0
Total	**100.0%**	**500.0**

The DDOE continues to seek feedback from our stakeholder groups regarding how best to determine the weighting of each indicator that will ultimately be included in the statewide accountability system.

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

As summative ratings are required under the draft regulations, DDOE continues to seek feedback from our stakeholder groups regarding how to best represent and calculate summative ratings for all LEAs.

The DDOE continues to seek stakeholder feedback regarding the following question:
- *If regulations change, should Delaware calculate a summative rating?*

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

> As required by federal law, Delaware will factor the 95 percent student participation into its system of annual meaningful differentiation of all public schools. As such, the DDOE is seeking stakeholder feedback regarding the methodology in which the participation rate will be applied.
>
> The following recommendations have been submitted for consideration:
> - Do not impose penalties
> - Require documentation/evidence of due diligence from LEAs
>
> *Please note that 95 percent student participation in statewide assessments is a federal requirement.*
>
> As stated in DDOE's June 30, 2015 ESEA Flexibility Waiver, beginning with school year 2015–2016 (accountability year 2016–2017), ELA and math proficiency for all schools will be adjusted when calculating the numerical score for the Academic Achievement area. *This adjustment is only for the purposes of accountability calculations and determinations and not for reporting on the school reports.* The adjustment is based on the following calculation:
> (Participation Rate in Content Area / 0.95) * Proficiency Rate in Content area
> For instance, if School A has a participation rate of 100% and proficiency rate of 50% in ELA, the school's adjusted rate would be 1 / 0.95 = 1.053 * 50% = 52.6%.
>
> The DDOE continues to seek stakeholder feedback regarding the following question:
> - *How should we factor in the 95 percent student participation requirement in our accountability system?*

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

> Delaware does not average data across school years.

G. **Including All Public Schools in a State's Accountability System.** If the States uses a different methodology than the one described in D above, describe how the State includes all public schools in the State in its accountability system including:

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

   > For those schools whose grade configuration does not require the administration of a statewide academic assessment (e.g. K-2 schools), DDOE's current accountability system attributes a portion of each applicable 3rd grader's academic performance on a prorated

basis to the schools in which they attended grades K-2. That performance is then aggregated to attribute an accountability score to those schools with non-assessed grades. The school that provided kindergarten services would be accountable for 10% of the score; the school that provided first grade services gets 20% of the score; the school that provided second grade services gets 30% of the score; and the school that provided third grade services gets 40% of the score.

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

For those schools with grade configurations that span both elementary and secondary grades, (e.g. P-12 schools), DDOE's current accountability system treats these schools as secondary schools to generate an accountability rating.

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

DDOE continues to seek stakeholder feedback as it relates to generating accountability scores for schools whose all-student populations are below the DDOE minimum accountability threshold. Based on stakeholder feedback, a recommendation to attribute district-level accountability results to such schools is being considered.

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

Schools that are designed to serve specialized populations and contain state assessment-eligible grades are currently treated equally to non-specialized Delaware public schools.

Charter schools that are identified as serving "at-risk" students are governed under state charter school law.

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

Newly opened schools with at least one state assessment-eligible grade currently receive an accountability determination per Delaware's accountability business rules. If the newly opened school has a grade configuration that does not require a statewide assessment, current business rules stipulate they do not receive an accountability score until such time as their grade configuration expands to state assessment-eligible grades or their students matriculate into state assessment-eligible grades, whichever comes first.

4.2 Identification of Schools

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

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

> **Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) School Identification:** ESSA specifies that state education agencies (SEAs) identify schools for "comprehensive support and improvement" beginning with school year 2017-2018 and at least once every 3 years. Schools that meet the following criteria are required to be identified:
>
> · *Lowest Performing 5% of Title I Schools (CSI 1):* The lowest-performing 5% of all Title I schools in the state (based on performance on accountability framework over no more than 3 years).
>
> · *Low Graduation Rate High Schools (CSI 2):* All public schools (Title I or non-Title I) that graduate less than 67% of their students. States can set a higher graduation rate requirement.
>
> · *Schools with Chronically Low-Performing Subgroups (CSI 3):* Any Title I school with at least one chronically low-performing subgroup of students, defined as a subgroup that is performing as poorly as all students in any of the lowest performing 5 percent of Title I schools (see *TSI 1* below) <u>and</u> which has not sufficiently improved (as defined by the State) after implementation of a targeted support and improvement plan over no more than three years.
>
> The DDOE is considering using its existing accountability framework, which was developed from the recommendations of the Accountability Framework Working Group, to identify schools for comprehensive support. Please Note: These examples are provided in order to elicit comments and questions from our stakeholders as we transition to ESSA. At this time, DDOE has not made any determination on the weighting of each indicator of the accountability system, and no decisions have been made regarding the inclusion of indicators within the accountability system.
>
> The DDOE will identify Comprehensive Support (CSI) school by the beginning of the SY 2017-2018 per ESSA requirements. The Local Education Agency (LEA) will assist with schools with conducting a needs assessment, analyze the data, and develop improvement plans. The DDOE will provide templates for LEA's to select from, if an LEA elects to utilize a local template, however, it must meet DDOE requirements aligned to ESSA requirements.
>
> ### Currently in Delaware:
>
> **Priority schools** are those schools that:
> · Are the lowest-performing 5 percent of all Title I schools based on the average proficiency rate in ELA and mathematics of the most recent year and the preceding year, OR
> · Have a graduation rate below 60% for two of the last three years (includes Title I eligible high schools that are not participating in Title I funding).

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

Exit criteria for Comprehensive Support (CSI) schools:

- The State must establish uniform statewide exit criteria for schools implementing a CSI plan. Such exit criteria must, at a minimum, require that within a State-determined number of years (not to exceed four years), the school: 1) improves student outcomes; and 2) no longer meets the criteria for identification as a CSI school (suggesting that exit criteria needs to be aligned to the state's accountability framework).

- If CSI schools fail to meet exit criteria in the specified period of time, the state must require the LEA to conduct a new needs assessment and amend its improvement plan to address the reasons that the school did not exit. This amendment must include a state-determined intervention that is more rigorous than the intervention(s) previously implemented.

Currently in Delaware:
Priority schools:

- Priority schools are required to stay in Priority status for three full years, plus the planning year.

- Exit targets are identified based on the level of proficiency of students on the state assessment (for both ELA and math). Targets call for a priority school to close half of the gap between current overall proficiency (based on student performance on Smarter Balance assessment in Spring 2015) and 100% proficiency in three years.

If exit criteria is not met after 3 years, the MOU is renegotiated with the Secretary.

1. (Exit Criteria) – How long should schools remain in each status?
a. Should exit criteria be directly tied to the measures that caused the school to go into improvement status? Or should the school have to meet all targets across all DSSF measures?
b. Schools identified for CSI have up to four years to exit.
    i. What happens if a school does not exit after four years?
    ii. Should we allow the full four years for a school to exit?
c. How long does a school stay in comprehensive improvement before additional conditions/requirements are placed on the school? What are those conditions/requirements?

B. **Targeted Support and Improvement Schools**. Describe:
  i. The State's methodology for identifying schools with "consistently underperforming" subgroups of students, including the definition and time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance, under §200.19(b)(1) and (c).

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) School Identification: ESSA calls for schools to be identified as in need of "targeted support and improvement" if they have at least one subgroup of students underperforming. ESSA calls for two types of targeted support and improvement schools:

- *Low-performing Subgroup at Level of Lowest 5% of Schools (TSI 1)*: Schools with at least one low-performing subgroup of students, defined as a subgroup of students that is performing as poorly as all students in any of the lowest performing five percent of Title I schools (CSI schools).
- *Consistently Underperforming Subgroups (TSI 2)*: Schools (Title I or non-Title I) that have at least one "consistently underperforming" subgroup as identified through a state-established methodology (to be determined) based on the State's accountability system.

Currently in Delaware:

The current group of 14 **Focus schools** is based on a list of 10% of Title I schools with the:

- Largest combined ELA and math achievement gap between "Student Gap Group" students and all others within the school (students in the "Gap Group" include students in subgroups that have historically demonstrated achievement gaps including ethnicity/race (African American, Hispanic, Native American), students with disabilities, low income and English Language Learners); and
- Lowest combined ELA and Math percent proficient over a three-year period for each of the following subgroups: low income, African American, Hispanic, English Language Learner, and students with disabilities.

The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding the identification of Targeted Support and Improvement Schools. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:

1. (Methodology) – How should the State identify schools for TSI?

a.   How should the State define "consistently underperforming subgroups" in order to identify schools for targeted support and improvement status?
b.   What should we consider a "gap"?
c.   Will the comprehensive and targeted support and improvement status be limited to Title I schools or will Delaware consider these statuses for all schools?
d.   Should the State consider including the mandatory 95% participation rate as an indicator for targeted improvement?

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

The Department of Education is currently seeking stakeholder feedback to determine if and how to identify additional targeted schools.

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

Exit criteria for Targeted Support (TSI) schools:
·   For *TSI 1* schools (low-performing subgroups), the state must establish uniform exit criteria that, at a minimum, ensures the school: 1) improves student outcomes for its lowest-performing subgroups; and 2) no longer meets the criteria for identification as a *TSI 1* school. If a school does not satisfy the exit criteria, the state must identify the school as a CSI school (states to identify CSI schools at least once every 3 years).

·   ESSA calls for LEAs to establish uniform exit criteria for schools identified as *TSI 2* schools (consistently under-performing subgroups) and to determine the number of years a school has to demonstrate improved student outcomes for each subgroup for which the school had been identified. LEAs must require schools that do not improve student outcomes within the specified time period to amend their plans to include additional actions. The LEA will be required to increase monitoring.

Currently in Delaware:
Focus schools:
   • Focus schools are also required to stay in Focus status for three full years, plus a planning year. However, a school may be eligible to exit status after the end of year 2 if it meets exit targets early and shows substantial progress in other leading indicators of their school plans.

   • A Focus school must meet the targets for each subgroup for two consecutive years before exiting status. Each Focus school has its own set of targets for subgroups that were identified, which calls for the school to be on a trajectory towards reducing by 50% the number of students who are not proficient.

   • Schools that do not meet exit criteria within 3 years are identified as Focus Plus schools and develop new plans.

> *The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding the identification of Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:*
> 1. (Exit Criteria) – How long should schools remain in each status?
>   a. What exit criteria should the State use to determine whether these schools have met their goals?
>   b. If a school exits early, should there be a sustainability year, to include monitoring and support?

4.3 <u>State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools</u>

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

> ESSA requires each SEA to describe how it will allocate funds and the supports it is providing to LEAs with schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement.
>
> The Delaware Department of Education is exploring the possibility of completing applications and plans via eGrants (a web based consolidated federal funds application system).
>
> Funding for the CSI could be calculated as follows:
> 1. Specific amount allocated to each CSI school
> 2. Formula for remaining funds could be based upon enrollment or poverty rates.
>
> If funds are used towards evidence-based interventions, an evaluation of selected interventions will be conducted and findings reported to the LEA.
>
> In order to receive additional funding, it must be determined that the identified school is making progress on the indicators determined by the statewide accountability system and the evidence-based interventions are being implemented with fidelity.
>
> *The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding the allocation of resources for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions*
>
> · Will improvement grants be competitive or issued via formula?
> · If by formula, how? (student population? Low-income student population? Other?)
>
> The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding its process for making grants to LEAs to serve schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans.

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

ESSA requires each SEA to describe its processes for approving, monitoring, and periodically reviewing LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans for identified schools. The DDOE will offer a variety of supports to schools and LEAs that could include: on-site technical assistance, off-site networking sessions, embedded professional development, virtual learning experiences, guidance documents, and templates to support improvement planning and monitoring.

The DDOE will work with LEAs and regional assistance centers to develop a resource hub with regionally-implemented evidenced-based strategies. In addition, DDOE will assist LEAs in exploring and identifying appropriate resources in national clearinghouses such as:

- What Works Clearinghouse
- Results First
- National Clearinghouse
- Regional Education Laboratories
- Best Evidence Encyclopedia

The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding the types of support the state might offer for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:

- *What criteria will the state use to approve LEA plans – ensuring the use of "evidence-based interventions"?*
- *What are the needs analysis criteria for schools in improvement and what criteria will the state use to determine whether plans will effectively meet those needs?*
- *Should the DDOE create a list of state-approved, evidence-based interventions for schools in comprehensive or targeted support and improvement status – and if so, how?*

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) of the Act and §200.21(f).

As per ESSA, if a school does not meet the exit criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement, DDOE will require the LEA to conduct a new school-level needs assessment and, based on its results, amend its comprehensive support and improvement plan to

1. Address the reasons the school did not meet the exit criteria, including whether the school implemented the interventions with fidelity and sufficient intensity, and the results of the new needs assessment;
2. Update how the LEA will continue to address previously identified resource inequities and identify any new resource inequities consistent with the requirements to review those inequities in its original plan.
3. Include the implementation of additional interventions in the school that *are identified by DDOE* and that are more rigorous and based on strong or moderate levels of evidence.

- **Note:** Determining what is a "more rigorous intervention" will depend in part on what interventions the school already implemented that did not lead to improved outcomes. The determination of a "more rigorous intervention" might need to be done on a school by school basis. Interventions will be aligned to the schools' needs assessments and the indicator areas for which the schools were identified.

The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding 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.

The DDOE could consider "more rigorous intervention" for schools identified as CSI and TSI that have not made sufficient progress to exit after three (3) years. "More rigorous interventions" will depend upon the interventions previously selected by the school that have not demonstrative improved outcomes. To ensure implementation of "more rigorous intervention" are focused on root causes for insufficient progress, the DDOE will conduct a needs assessment of the LEA and school(s) to focus on the current state of implementation of their plan. Findings will be shared with the LEA, schools, community, and stakeholders. Revised plans will be developed with assistance of the DDOE.

The DDOE could pursue, as allowed for in ESSA, improvement action in any LEA with a significant number of school identified for Comprehensive Support that are not meeting exit criteria or a significant number of schools identified for targeted support. Such actions could include placing conditions on LEA uses of funds and/or requiring LEAs to provide specific school supports aligned with school needs/areas of low student performance.

DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding potential action steps. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following question:
What action steps should Delaware consider for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State's exit criteria within the required number of years?

D. **Periodic Resource Allocation Review.** Describe the State's process, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the Act and §200.23(a), for periodically reviewing and addressing resource allocation to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and

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

ESSA requires states to review resource allocation between LEAs and between schools for those LEAs with a significant number of schools identified as TSI or CSI. A review of resource allocation must include a review of LEA and school-level resources, among and within schools, including:

- Disproportionate rates of ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers identified by the State and LEA consistent with sections 1111(g)(1)(B) and 1112(b)(2) of the Act
- Per-pupil expenditures of Federal, State, and local funds required to be reported annually consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(x) of the Act; and

Also including, at the school's discretion, a review of LEA and school level budgeting and resource allocation with respect to resources described above and the availability and access to any other resource provided by the LEA or school, such as—
(A) Advanced coursework;
(B) Preschool programs; and
(C) Instructional materials and technology.

The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding its process for periodically reviewing and addressing resource allocation. Based on feedback received to date, the following suggestions have been offered by stakeholders for consideration:
- Provide equitable and flexible state funding
- Offer resources on best practices regarding school improvement
- Focus on teacher preparation, recruitment and retention; for example, provide paid internships for pre-service teachers who chose to work in low-performing schools
- More flexibility to innovate at the school-level
- Use a needs-assessment to identify root cause of student performance
- Improve school climate and behavioral supports such as behavioral health services and trauma supports at the school level

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

Strategy	Timeline	Funding Sources
DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding other strategies to improve low-performing schools, including non-Title I schools. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:		

• *What strategies should Delaware consider to improve low-performing schools?* • *What timeline should be considered?* • *How should these strategies be funded?*		

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

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its system of performance management for implementation of State and LEA plans regarding accountability, support, and improvement for schools, consistent with §299.14 (c) and §299.17. The description of an SEA's system of performance management must include information on the SEA's review and approval of LEA plans, collection and use of data, monitoring, continuous improvement, and technical assistance. If a table is provided below, the SEA's description must include strategies and timelines.

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

> The Delaware Department of Education will, with the input of its stakeholders, utilize a streamlined, consolidated, and continuous improvement planning process, driven by Local Education Agency (LEA) needs and supported by performance, as measured by the statewide accountability system, to support LEA planning processes that meet statutory and regulatory requirements.
>
> Through the DDOE performance management process, proposes to:
>
> - Identify metrics that are aligned with the Delaware School Success Framework that best represent LEA performance;
> - Enhance a suite of technical assistance options for LEAs regarding identifying LEA school and student needs through analyzing data in a comprehensive needs assessment, determining root causes, as well as aligning priorities, supports and funding;
> - Develop a consolidated and aligned LEA plan and application process that address and supports LEA and State priorities;
> - Identify and categorize LEA needs based on financial and performance indicators; and
> - Implement a tiered system of supports to address LEA categorization, which will also include responses for targeted assistance from the LEA and identified areas from the LEA financial and performance indicators.
>
> LEA plans will provide DDOE an opportunity to provide ongoing performance management, technical assistance, differentiated service and support through a model of tiered supports.

B. **Review and Approval of LEA Plans.** Describe the SEA's process for supporting the development, reviewing, and approving the activities in LEA plans in accordance with statutory and regulatory

requirements, including a description of how the SEA will determine if LEA activities align with the specific needs of the LEA and the State's strategies described in its consolidated State plan for implementation of Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

> The DDOE will utilize a streamlined, consolidated, and continuous improvement planning process, driven by Local Education Agency (LEA) needs and supported by performance, as measured by the statewide accountability system, to support LEA planning processes that meet statutory and regulatory requirements.
>
> To support the development, review and approval of the LEA plan, the DDOE proposes to:
>
> - Provide state accountability metrics, by which LEAs can assess performance;
> - Provide LEAs with a needs assessment template and technical assistance in analyzing LEA data to determine gaps and identify root causes;
> - Provide a suite of options for targeted technical assistance, such as on-site trainings, group trainings, easily accessible resource documents, and webinars; and
> - Consolidate plan review efforts within the Department to reduce duplicative information provided by the LEA, for example setting review and approval expectation for Department reviewers, and providing internal training to calibrate and unify DDOE guidance to LEAs.
>
> Specific and more targeted technical assistance may be provided based on a methodology to be informed by stakeholder feedback.

i. **LEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans.** Describe the SEA's process to approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans that include evidence-based interventions consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B) of the Act and §200.21(e).

> **Proposed in ESSA:**
>
> **CSI Schools**: LEAs (local education agencies, such as a school district) are expected to develop and implement, with stakeholder engagement, improvement plans for CSI- identified schools. Plans must be based, in part, on a school-level needs assessment, and must include evidence-based interventions and strategies for addressing any resource inequities. The school, LEA, and state approve the plan. The state monitors and periodically reviews LEA implementation of plans. The state determines the number of years (not to exceed four) a plan can be unsuccessful before taking action.
>
> *Identification Timeline:* ESSA calls for CSI schools to be identified at least once every three years beginning with the 2017-18 school year. (*CSI 3* schools will not be identified in SY17-18 as such schools first need to be identified as TSI and only become CSI if they have not met TSI exit targets.)
>
> **TSI Schools**: TSI schools develop their own plans, with stakeholder input, to address the reasons for identification and improve student outcomes for identified subgroup(s). The LEA approves and monitors schools' TSI plans.

Identification Timeline: Beginning in 2017-18, the state is required to inform LEAs of any school that meets targeted support and improvement criteria. ESSA calls for *TSI 2* schools to be identified annually, beginning with the 2018-19 school year. *TSI 1* schools will be identified in the same timeframe as the lowest 5% CSI schools (starting in 2017-18).

Monitoring LEA Implementation of Plans

ESSA requires the state to monitor and periodically *review each LEA's implementation of the CSI plans*. DDOE currently monitors identified schools at school level so a shift from current monitoring to the district level is required. Districts may also need assistance in more fully developing their data capacity so they can monitor identified schools.

The DDOE could support the LEAs in monitoring the implementation of the CSI plans based on their relative programmatic areas. On-site monitoring will offer a collaborative model to reduce the need for multiple monitoring sessions from multiple programs in isolation.

The monitoring process could include both programmatic and fiscal components and will include the provision of targeted technical assistance and support.

The DDOE is exploring and evaluating current tools and processes that could assist with monitoring CSI and TSI schools.

The DDOE could provide support, technical assistance and monitoring in areas including and not limited to:

· Review of Comprehensive Needs Assessment

· Conduct differentiated on-site support visits based on needs

· Assist LEAs with the evidence-based decision making process

· Support use of high-quality data

· Support the initial development of LEA & School Comprehensive Strategic Plans with encouragement to select bold, innovative evidenced-based interventions

· Support implementing & monitoring LEA & School Comprehensive Strategic Plans

· Monitor strategies and action steps for completion and success

· Support implementation of bold evidence-based LEA and school systems and structures to create powerful change

· Support and guide selection and implementation of innovative, locally selected evidence-based interventions leading to dramatic increases in student achievement

· Review data submissions and discuss needed midcourse adjustments

· Review resource allocation by the LEA to comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools **Possible DDOE support for LEA development of CSI plans to consider:** • The DDOE would offer an (optional) needs assessment tool and training on tool to support LEA efforts. Current state provided school improvement tools/resources could be modified to meet ESSA needs. • For LEAs that want to use a different needs assessment tool, DDOE could specify the requirements for the assessment as identified in ESSA. • DDOE could provide professional development regarding how evidence-based interventions are defined, possible resource locations, and criteria to evaluate if an intervention is evidence-based. The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding its process to approve, monitor, and periodically review LEA comprehensive support and improvement plans that include evidence-based interventions.	

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

Strategy	Timeline
In addition to analysis of publicly reported district-level assessment data, DDOE has in recent years collected self-reported data on district benchmark assessments and progress updates on state initiatives 3 times per year, in accordance with most districts' assessment schedules. This data is analyzed along with expenditure and staffing information to outline the traceability between student performance, progress to strategies, and resource allocations. *DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder feedback regarding the most effective process to collect and use information and data to evaluate progress toward improving student outcomes. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:* • *What kinds of data should be considered when evaluating LEA progress toward improving student outcomes?*	

• *How should those data be collected (e.g., collected by DDOE, self-reported by the LEAs, or a combination of both?)*	

D. **Monitoring**. Describe the SEA's plan to monitor SEA and LEA implementation of included programs using the data in section 4.4.C to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements related to Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

Strategy	Timeline

The DDOE is currently evaluating staffing capacity and knowledge, as well as internal processes to effectively monitor LEA implementation, using data as described above. Once the internal environment scan has been complete, appropriate resources will be allocated to ensure the execution of effective monitoring. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflection on the following questions:
 	
- How often should the SEA monitor LEAs throughout the course of ESSA?
- Should LEA monitoring frequencies be determined by categorization?
    o How often should a low performing LEA be monitored by the SEA?
    o How often should an average performing LEA be monitored by the SEA?
    o How often should a high performing LEA be monitored by the SEA?
- Should there be differentiation for monitoring between charters, districts and vocational-technical districts? What technical assistance processes are paired with monitoring?	

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

Strategy	Timeline
DDOE's tiered support through the former "routines" process is designed to provide districts with specific	

supports based on their local needs. Additionally, a cross-Department team is dedicated to supporting the implementation of strategies in the highest needs schools.
 	
DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding the most effective process to improve both SEA and LEA strategies that are not leading to improved student outcomes. As part of the ongoing stakeholder engagement, the DDOE has asked for feedback and reflections on the following questions:
   - *What approach should be considered when determining how DDOE provides support to LEAs to improve student outcomes?*
   - *What timelines should be considered?*	

F. **Differentiated Technical Assistance**. Describe the SEA's plan to provide differentiated technical assistance to LEAs and schools to support effective implementation of SEA, LEA, and other sub-grantee strategies for implementation of Accountability, Support, and Improvement of Schools.

Strategy	Timeline

The DDOE will implement a tiered system of supports to provide LEAs with differentiated technical assistance to support effective implementation of LEA strategies. The DDOE plans to offer availability of all supports to any requesting LEA, however the degree of DDOE guided support will be based on the LEA categorization.
 	
The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding the development of tiers for technical support and the process of implementation. The DDOE is currently:
 	
   • Enhancing a suite of technical assistance options for LEAs regarding identifying LEA school and student needs through analyzing data in a comprehensive needs assessment, determining root causes, as well as aligning priorities, supports and funding;
   • Identifying and categorize LEA needs based on financial and performance indicators; and
   • Creating and implement a tiered system of supports to address LEA categorization, which will also include responses for targeted assistance from the LEA and identified areas from the LEA financial and performance indicators.	

i. **Technical Assistance to Specific LEAs.** Describe the technical assistance it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement, including technical assistance related to selection of evidence-based interventions for comprehensive and targeted support and improvement schools, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii) of the Act and §200.23(b)

The DDOE will identify and categorize LEA needs based on financial and performance indicators, and provide tiered technical assistance supports to LEAs while completing a comprehensive needs assessment that assesses:

- Engaged and Informed Families, Schools, Districts, Communities and Other Agencies
- Safe and Healthy Environments Conducive to Learning
- Equitable Access to Excellent Educators
- Rigorous Standards, Instruction, and Assessments
- High Quality Early Learning Opportunities

Areas identified with significant need will be addressed; including identified causes, desired outcomes, action steps to be taken, allocated resources, timelines and data to assess progress, within the LEA priorities section which are included in the consolidated application process.

The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding how priorities are identified and how to address LEA needs when resource allocation barriers exist.

ii. Describe any additional improvement actions the State may take consistent with §200.23(c), including additional supports for interventions in LEAs, or in any authorized public chartering agency consistent with State charter school law, with a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that are not meeting exit criteria or a significant number of schools identified for targeted support or improvement.

As outlined in ESSA, the DDOE could take action to initiate additional improvement in any LEA, or in any authorized public chartering agency consistent with State charter school law, with a significant number of schools that are consistently identified for comprehensive support and improvement under § 200.19(a) and are not meeting exit criteria established under § 200.21(f) or a significant number of schools identified for targeted support and improvement under § 200.19(b).

The DDOE is currently seeking stakeholder input regarding any additional improvement actions that Delaware may take for any LEA not meeting exit criteria and/or any LEA with a significant number of schools identified for either comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.