

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: North Dakota



U.S. Department of Education
April 5, 2017

SECTION A: TITLE I, PART A: IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LEAS

A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

Note: State Plan template item A.1 is submitted as part of the separate assessment peer review process consistent with ESEA section 1111(b) and 34 CFR § 200.2(d), and thus has no applicable peer review criteria in this document.

A.2: Eighth Grade Math Exception (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C) and 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

Note: State Plan template items A.2.i and A.2.ii require binary yes/no responses from SEAs, and thus have no applicable peer review criteria.

A.2.iii: Strategies (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C); 34 CFR § 200.5(b)(4))

- If applicable,¹ does the SEA describe, regarding the 8th grade math exception, its strategies to provide all students in the State the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics coursework in middle school (e.g., appropriate data and evidence that the strategies are likely to provide all students in the State that opportunity)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A, the SEA does not offer end of course assessments/exception for 8 th graders
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

¹ In order for an SEA to exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8th grade under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(aa), it must ensure that: a. the student instead takes the end-of-course mathematics assessment the State administers to high school students under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); b. the student's performance on the high school assessment is used in the year in which the student takes the assessment for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E); and c. in high school: (1) the student takes a State-administered end-of-course assessment or nationally recognized high school academic assessment as defined in 34 CFR § 200.3(d) in mathematics that is more advanced than the assessment the State administers for 8th graders under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb); (2) the State provides for appropriate accommodations consistent with 34 CFR § 200.6(b) and (f); and (3) the student's performance on the more advanced mathematics assessment is used for purposes of measuring academic achievement under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i) and participation in assessments under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E).

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement

A.3: Native Language Assessments (ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(F) and 34 CFR § 200.6(f)(2)(ii) and (f)(4))

A.3.i: Definition

- Does the SEA provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”?
- Does the SEA identify the specific languages that meet that definition?
- Does the SEA’s definition include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans?
- In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, does the SEA describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Set at 30% of the EL population, the SEA’s definition of “significant extent” does not include its most populous language other than English (which is Spanish at 28%). The SEA does provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent” in the participating student population p. 35-36. The SEA finds that no language meets the 30% benchmark, but Spanish is at 28%. The SEA’s definition does not include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population. The SEA did not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans. The SEA does not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs. Also, ELPAC supports this definition.
<i>Strengths</i>	Some peer reviewers found support for Native American languages. The SEA recognized its second most prevalent language other than English as Somali (15% of EL population).

	<p>The SEA does offer Spanish translations even though the population does not meet the 30% benchmark. The SEA describes consulting and receiving feedback on this component.</p> <p>SBAC has stacked Spanish translations; ELPAC approved use of Spanish language translation; will utilize any additional translations that SBAC may develop.</p> <p>Definition is clear.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Per the current definition, none of the SEA’s non-English languages meet the SEA’s current threshold of “present to a significant extent.” No information was provided to indicate that the SEA analyzed individual LEA-level student populations for significant presence of non-English languages. The definition references the threshold percent for “languages spoken” by the EL population, however element 3.B.iv indicates that home language literacy skill will be an additional factor into whether translated assessments will be provided to non-Spanish speaking ELs who meet the presence threshold. Some Peers felt that that rationale is not clear. The definition is limited because it would allow a maximum of three native language assessments. Also, the definition is limited because if it drives developing assessments in the significant languages and the number of ELs is very low (e.g. 3, then 1 student in each language would constitute significant) and the native language assessment would be prohibitively expensive.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA’s definition of significant language does not include at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population.</p> <p>Some peer reviewers felt that a state must define its most populous language as significant, and North Dakota’s definition does not meet regulations; however, some peer reviewers felt that the state needs to minimally identify the most populous language other than English in order to meet this requirement.</p> <p>In determining which languages are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, the SEA does not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by LEA populations of English learners, including English learners who are migratory, English learners who were not born in the United States, and English learners who are Native Americans. North Dakota should indicate how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more of the State’s LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels.</p>

A.3.ii: Existing Assessments in Languages other than English

- Does the SEA identify any existing assessments that it makes available in languages other than English, and specify for which grades and content areas those assessments are available?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that the Smarter Balanced mathematics assessment that the SEA uses is offered in a “stacked” Spanish-English format for grades 3-8 and 10. Some peers felt that the term “stacked translations” may be confusing to readers unfamiliar with EL accommodations. ND indicates it will provide stacked translation based on students’ literacy, not their spoken language.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A, but plan to develop once significant language arises.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some peers felt that North Dakota’s claims that stacked translation is better than a native language test warrants specific evidence to support the statement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

- Does the SEA indicate the languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan, for which yearly student academic assessments are not available and are needed?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A. Despite indicating that no language meets its definition of ‘present to a significant extent,’ the SEA did indicate that the mathematics content assessment is offered in Spanish, the SEA’s most populous non-English language.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A but plan to develop as need arises.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA indicates that the literacy rate will constitute a factor in determining whether future non-English assessments are offered; however the SEA definition of ‘languages present to a significant extent’ references only <i>spoken</i> non-English languages.
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

<i>requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
 - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
 - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
 - 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (*e.g.*, legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	When the SEA revisits its definition of ‘present to a significant extent’ to include, at minimum, its most populous non-English language, the SEA will need to ensure that any language fitting its definition is addressed by this element.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA presently provides a Spanish-language mathematics assessment (stacked translation). The SEA convened ELPAC committee to help develop guidelines and considerations.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The process by, and the extent to which, input was solicited from various stakeholders on this element of the ESSA plan is unclear; for example, the ELPAC consisted of some stakeholders, but it appears there was not an opportunity for non-ELPAC members to contribute.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in (at a minimum), languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template.</p> <p>In order to meet this requirement, the SEA must provide a list of names/positions of ELPAC members.</p> <p>The SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population does not include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments.</p>
--	---

A.4: Statewide Accountability Systems & School Support and Improvement (ESEA section 1111(c) and (d))

A.4.i: Subgroups (ESEA section 1111(b)(3), 1111(c)(2))

A.4.i.a: Major Racial and Ethnic Subgroups of Students (ESEA section 1111(c)(2)(B))

- Does the SEA list each major racial and ethnic group that the SEA includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA lists economically disadvantaged, students with disabilities, and English learners. In place of “students from each major racial and ethnic group” the SEA lists only “race/ethnicity” not a list of the specific racial/ethnic groups it will include.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA will report on foster students and students whose parents are in the military (not included in accountability system).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Not clear (here) how subgroups are included in the accountability system.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should list the race/ethnicity subgroups specifically. The current list does not include them.

A.4.i.b: Additional Subgroups at SEA Discretion

- If applicable, does the SEA describe any additional subgroups of students other than the statutorily required subgroups (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) included in its statewide accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that it will make note of foster children and military children, but will not include them in its accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.i.c: Previously Identified English Learners

Note: State Plan template item A.4.i.c requires a binary yes/no response from SEAs, and thus has no applicable peer review criteria.

A.4.i.d: If Applicable, Exception for Recently Arrived English Learners

Note: This peer review criterion applies only if a State selects the third option in item A.4.i.d in the consolidated State plan template for recently arrived English learners under which the State applies the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(i) or the exception under ESEA section 1111(b)(3)(A)(ii) to a recently arrived English learner.

- Does the SEA describe how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner (*e.g.*, a statewide procedure that considers English language proficiency level in determining which, if any, exception applies)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that it has selected the third option, however based on the description provided it appears to refer to Option 1 (1111(b)(3)(A)(i)), which is that North Dakota will allow the exemption of one administration of the reading and language arts portion of the NDSA/NDAA during the first twelve months of the English learner's

	attendance in school in the United States.
<i>Strengths</i>	Specific definitions indicated (although not consistent with checked box).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	An appropriate description related to universally-applied LEA decision procedures for the selected element is not provided.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA must either select option #1, (1111(b)(3)(A)(i)), or identify a plan that specifies the business rules for different testing options based on some initial criteria.

A.4.ii: Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A))

A.4.ii.a: Minimum N-Size for Accountability (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

- Does the SEA provide the minimum number of students that the State determines is necessary to meet the requirements of any provisions under Title I, Part A of the ESEA that require disaggregation of information by each subgroup of students for accountability purposes, including annual meaningful differentiation and identification of schools?
- Is the minimum number of students the same State-determined number for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State (*i.e.*, economically disadvantaged students, students from each major racial and ethnic group, children with disabilities, and English learners) for accountability purposes?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicated that its n size of ‘greater than 9’ is applied as a minimum for a school’s or subgroup’s inclusion in the state accountability system and for LEAs unable to meet that n size, multiple years of data would be aggregated for accountability and reporting purposes. The n size is the same for all students and each subgroup of students. Recommendation: The SEA should be consistent when referring to minimum N size either as >9 or N= 10 because these can lead to different results when aggregating over multiple years.
<i>Strengths</i>	Long-standing state policy; enhances inclusion.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some peers felt that the SEA should specify specific multi-year aggregation rules in order to maintain uniformity in inferences based on school aggregate results (<i>i.e.</i> always use 2 or always use three years of aggregation).

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.b: Statistical Soundness of Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(i))

➤ Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s long-established n size of 10 appears to capture the most schools and subgroups in this sparsely populated SEA without compromising student privacy.
<i>Strengths</i>	Low minimum N is good for inclusion.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While a low minimum N is good for inclusion, other issues arise from its use, such as lack of stability and creating very wide confidence bands due to using a 99% confidence interval.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i>	If aggregated by different number of years, some schools will be accountable for a single year, while others will be accountable for multiple years. This creates a sampling problem in that in some schools, the N is not independent and standard errors will be artificially small. Some peers pointed out that this has worked for the state historically

² Consistent with ESEA section 1111(i), information collected or disseminated under ESEA section 1111 shall be collected and disseminated in a manner that protects the privacy of individuals consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g, commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974”). When selecting a minimum n-size for reporting, States should consult the Institute of Education Sciences report [“Best Practices for Determining Subgroup Size in Accountability Systems While Protecting Personally Identifiable Student Information”](#) to identify appropriate statistical disclosure limitation strategies for protecting student privacy.

<i>SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	and that ND is a rural state with many small schools.
--	---

A.4.ii.c: How the SEA Determined Minimum N-Size (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it determined the minimum number of students?
- Does the description include how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	ESSA Planning committee is maintaining its n size of previous years. The SEA Accountability and Reporting subcommittee includes representation of various stakeholder groups, and in turn the subcommittee sought input from constituents on minimum n size.
<i>Strengths</i>	Larger and smaller schools and districts were taken into consideration as well as the lack of reliability in aggregating too many years to meet larger n sizes (if so determined). Also, ND is a unique state with its small school districts and it gave consideration to how all could be accountable. The SEA maintains its long standing state policy – already approved; schools or subgroups with less than 10 would then combine data over two or three years.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The description of collaboration with stakeholders, etc., is not very specific. The SEA only indicated the Standards, Assessment, Accountability and Reporting committee gathered input from constituents. Also, the process seemed very much discussion-based without use of data to help inform decision.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	

requirement

A.4.ii.d: Minimum N-Size and Ensuring Student Privacy (ESEA section 1111(c)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students?³

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA addressed FERPA requirements, the sufficiency of sample sizes and the maximum years it deemed appropriate to combine data in order for a school or subgroup to achieve the minimum n.
<i>Strengths</i>	SEA was very thoughtful in this regard. ND also uses 4-level system to guard against compromising student privacy: minimal value rule, single-populated level rule, total population below proficient rule and distinguished students rule.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	ND indicates here that a decision has not been made regarding how sample sizes greater than 10 would impact rural districts in ND; the SEA anticipates maintaining this sample size minimum of N<10 restriction – this is confusing.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.ii.e: If Applicable, Minimum N-Size for Reporting

- If the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes, does the SEA provide the minimum number of students for purposes of reporting?
- Is the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting consistent with the requirements in ESEA section 1111(i), including with respect to privacy and statistical reliability?

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii: Establishment of Long-Term Goals (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A))

A.4.iii.a: Academic Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(aa))

A.4.iii.a.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?
- Does the SEA identify and describe long-term goals for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides baseline and long-term goals for All Students and each subgroup of students, specifying the major racial/ethnic subgroups, in reading/language arts and mathematics. The timeline for the reduction of non-proficient students by 33%, for all students and each subgroup of students, is six years.</p> <p>Each category’s interim achievement rate is determined by adding the annualized rate to the category’s previous year’s base rate. This method provides a calculation when improvement means reducing the percentage of non-</p>

	<p>proficient students and results in an increase of proficient students.</p> <p>The SEA’s description includes baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students, and also includes the timeline for meeting the long-term goals.</p> <p>The timeline is the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The long-term goals are ambitious.</p> <p>BL is 2015-16 with a six-year plan for state achievement in Rdg/LA and math using an annualized rate.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA looked at each subgroup and applied a 33% improvement rate to all. The SEA utilized the same timeline across all subgroups; has baseline data, and uses same multi-year length of time for all students. The ND ESSA Planning committee approved all long term goals. The goals for lower-performing subgroups appear to be appropriately ambitious.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some peer reviewers felt that at the end of six years, EL proficiency rates were still below 40%.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.a.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	In the appendix the SEA provides each annual goal leading to the ultimate six-year long-term goal. These interim goals are listed for the All Students group and each subgroup and are differentiated based on the progress needed to achieve each group’s individual long-term reduction-in-non-proficient goal.
<i>Strengths</i>	Interim achievement rate is determined by adding the annualized rate to the category’s previous years’ base rate; calculation definitions included with table in Appendix N.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA needs to add language about what would occur at various years if progress is not made.

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii.a.3: Improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for academic achievement take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps, such that the State’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>In the appendix the SEA provides each annual goal leading to the ultimate six-year long-term goal. These interim goals are listed for the All Students group and each subgroup and are differentiated based on the progress needed to achieve each group’s individual long-term reduction-in-non-proficient goal.</p> <p>Yes, the overall goal of reducing the percentage of non-proficient students by 33% does take into account greater improvement needed for subgroups who are currently performing at lower levels (more non-proficient students).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	6-year plan gives time to see data changes with targeted work. Also, goals are based on percent not proficient which requires larger gains for subgroups further behind.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Could have stated target in terms of the positive (increase in proficient students).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA is encouraged to include the monitoring process in the narrative.

A.4.iii.b: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

A.4.iii.b.1: Long-term goals for four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides for 4 options for schools or LEAs to meet the graduation rate goal: 1. Meet the 90% four-year ACGR; or 2. Achieve 10% reduction in non-grads (against the 90% goal) over previous year’s; or if not, then 3. For 5 extended-year cohort target: achieve 12.5% reduction in non-grads over previous year, against 90% goal; or if not, then 4. For 6 year extended cohort target: achieve 21% reduction in non-grads over previous year, against the 90% goal. The SEA states that GED graduates will “account for up to 8% of the 21% graduation goal”. Meeting any one of these 4 goals or targets would be considered meeting the school’s or LEA’s graduation rate goal. The 90% four-year ACGR is surpassed by what appears to be the majority subgroup (resulting in an All Students baseline near-to-goal).</p> <p>The long-term goals are ambitious, except for the White subgroup, because it already has achieved 90.5%.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA has continued its present model for graduation rate. This model has been valuable to the state. The goals are ambitious for some subgroups. The 4-year rate uses a 10% growth rate over the 6 year timeframe.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA appears to be including GEDs in each of its graduation rate cohorts. (See January 2017 Graduation Rate Guidance A-14). The White subgroup currently surpasses the 90% goal; the goal is not ambitious for the All Students group.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>At 90.5% the long-term goals are not ambitious for “white students”.</p> <p>The SEA is including GEDs in graduation rate calculations (up to 8% of the overall graduation rate) and this needs greater clarification.</p>

A.4.iii.b.2: If applicable, long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- If applicable (*i.e.*, if the SEA chooses, at its discretion, to establish long-term goals for one or more extended-year rates), does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Does the SEA’s description include the timeline for meeting the long-term goals?
- Is the timeline the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students?
- Are the long-term goals ambitious?
- Are the long-term goals more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA has established two extended-year graduation cohorts: five-year and six-year. The extended-6 year long-term graduation goal rate is 93%, to be met within 6 years. The SEA’s description included baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students. The SEA’s description included the timeline for meeting the long-term goals. The timeline is the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students. The long-term goals are ambitious for most subgroups. The long-term goals are slightly more rigorous than the long-term goals set for the four-year adjusted -cohort graduation rate (except no information about the 5 year rate is provided – see below).
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s use of multiple extended-year graduation rates may incentivize schools and LEAs to continue to support non-graduates beyond the initial four years of high school.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA’s 5 and 6 extended-year graduation goals are not presented independently and appear not to differ from one another. The SEA could have state the goal in positive terms (increase in grad rate).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA has not been explicit about meeting the criteria. As an example, a higher graduation rate for the six-year category should exist, and targets differ among subgroups. Year 5 subgroups need clarification.</p> <p>At 90.5% the long-term goals are not ambitious for “white students”.</p>

A.4.iii.b.3: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	These are provided in Appendix N. Meets requirements for providing interim progress measures for 4-year adjusted cohort rate and the 6-year extended rate.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA has a stable model and wants to continue using this practice.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is unclear from the plan how this is monitored/adjusted during the 6 th year; specifically what actions the state is considering in year 6, if the goals have not been accomplished.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The table in Appendix N needs to include interim progress measurements for five-year extended-year graduation rates.

A.4.iii.b.4: Improvement necessary to close statewide graduation rate gaps

- Do the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate take into account the improvement necessary for subgroups of students who are behind in reaching those goals to make significant progress in closing statewide graduation rate gaps, such that the State’s long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	To meet the four-year ACGR goal of 90%, the non-white subgroups in this SEA must make growth of anywhere from 12.3% to 30.3%. The All Students group must improve its current ACGR by 3.7%. The White subgroup’s current ACGR of 90.5% meets the long-term goal. To meet the extended six-year ACGR of 93%, the subgroups in this SEA must make growth of anywhere from 1.1% to 27.7%. The All Students group must improve its current ACGR by 3.9%.

	It appears that the benchmarks are set and a reviewer was unable to find any text that spoke to how groups that are significantly behind other groups would close the gap.
<i>Strengths</i>	Goals for the majority of subgroups are ambitious. The methodology is easy to follow.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some peers felt that insufficient text that indicated how groups that are significantly behind other groups would close the gap. See below
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The peer reviewers cannot accurately assess these criteria without clear subgroup rigor and ambitiousness. Only the four-year rates are reviewable, and the extended years are not, given the lack of goals for the five-year extended-year graduation rates.

A.4.iii.c: English Language Proficiency (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii))

A.4.iii.c.1: Long-term goals

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency, as measured by the statewide English language proficiency assessment?
- Does the SEA’s description include baseline data?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State-determined timeline for English learners to achieve English language proficiency?
- Is the long-term goal ambitious?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA uses only the EL’s initial proficiency level in its growth to target proficiency model. The SEA will begin to collect SLIFE data and, subsequent to analyses, may include such characteristics in a future growth model proposal. ELs have 2 to 6 years to reach full ELP, based on their initial CPL. The SEA goal is 72% proficient ELs in 6 years – a 33% increase over their current, baseline proficiency rate of 58%; the SEA goal is also 72% of ELs “meeting interim progress goals” within 6 years. (1.C.ii) The baseline proficiency level will be based on the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 composite proficiency level (CPL), however the ultimate attainment goal is based on conjunctive model of CPL and individual domain scores. (5.0 CPL and 3.5 in each domain). The SEA specifies that Student interim progress goals are based on an EL’s annual CPL “remaining at or above their established trajectory growth line.” To meet interim progress goals, in Year 1 Schools must ensure that at least 60% of its ELs remain on target to ELP, based on their initial CPL. In subsequent years, this interim goal increases by 2.33%, ultimately reaching 72% of schools’ ELs meeting interim goals in 2023-2024. Attainment of the goal equates to

	exit from the EL subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides baseline data. The annual goals for ELP growth take individual language domains as well as CPL into consideration. The annual 2.33% increases in the state long-term goal rates are ambitious. The long-term goal of 72% of ELs meeting proficiency within 6 years of initial ELP assessment is equally ambitious.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The description in 1.C.i indicates that growth trajectories will be calculated from the baseline, initial CPL to the “5.0 target proficiency level.” However, in 1.C.ii and 6.2.D.i the attainment of proficiency is described as more than attaining the 5.0 target – adding 3.5 individual domain proficiency levels to the definition of “attaining proficiency” – clarification is needed. LEAs do not appear to be addressed in this element of the plan. Also, this goal is somewhat confusing with a state overall proficiency rate (72%) over 6 years, though the schools goal relates to 72% of students meeting interim measures. It is not clear how exactly the growth model will work (how are growth trajectories created?) and so it is difficult to evaluate whether the target is ambitious and reasonable.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should review language associated with tables and charts throughout this section, as terminology appears not to be uniform. Progress, proficiency, and exit are used interchangeably – this is confusing. Specifically, it is unclear if the long-term goal of EL students exiting with language proficiency is the same as 72% of EL students meeting the interim measures goal. Refer to table on page 321.</p> <p>The SEA merged long-term growth and attainment goals in the narrative; these goals need to be teased out and discussed separately.</p> <p>The SEA needs to explain how it monitors progress of the students in proficiency level 5.0 to 6.0 based on the domain-specific exit criteria.</p>

A.4.iii.c.2: Measurements of interim progress

- Does the SEA provide measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>To meet the interim progress goal, an EL must show an increase in his/her ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 composite proficiency level score and “remain at or above their established trajectory growth line.”</p> <p>The SEA provided measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency. Appendix N stated The State ESSA Committee has adopted a goal of increasing the number of proficient students by 24 percent within six years.</p>

	Measures of interim progress are calculated by dividing the overall increase by 6.
<i>Strengths</i>	The rate of increase seems reasonable.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some peers felt that additional detail regarding the growth model would help understand the reasonableness of the expectations. Some peers felt that there is a misalignment between overall state goal of increasing EL students who exit from the program and interim goals of 72% of EL students meeting their own interim measures (and that this alignment is also due to inconsistent vocabulary use).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not provide interim measurements of progress for ELs whose initial CPL falls within the 5.0 – 6.0 range, but, due to not meeting the 3.5 individual domain requirement, have 2 years to reach English language proficiency.

A.4.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

Note: A single indicator may consist of multiple components or measures. Peers must review each such component or measure for compliance with all of the required elements.

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

- Does the SEA describe the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all LEAs across the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator, including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2) a description of the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement; 3) if the State uses one, a description of the performance index; 4) if, at the high school level, the indicator includes a measure of student growth, a description of the growth measure (e.g., a growth model); and 5) if the State averages data, a description of how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?
- Is the indicator measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments?
- Does the indicator measure the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA has set the Academic Achievement indicator weight at 30% of the Elementary/Middle School accountability system, and 25% of the High School accountability system. The SEA has set long-term achievement goals at a 33% reduction in non-proficient students within 6 years. This goal applies to all accountable grade levels, is disaggregated by subgroup and is differentiated between ELA and mathematics. (1.A.i and Appendix N) A school or LEA assessing <95% of students (or students in subgroup) would be placed on reduced program status and required to develop an improvement plan, involving community outreach. The SEA describes its procedures to average data across years: if it cannot be determined with >99% confidence that the entity's achievement rate is lower than the state's goal – the entity will be considered as having met the goal. Otherwise, additional tests are applied by combining achievement data over two, and up to three, years. NB: A new statewide assessment will be administered in 2017-18
<i>Strengths</i>	Academic achievement is straight-forward and meets the requirements. The SEA include baseline data and the indicator is likely valid. The SEA has past practices of quality to use in this plan.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv.b: Other Academic Indicator for Elementary and Secondary Schools that are Not High Schools

Note: If the SEA uses a different Other Academic indicator for each grade span, peer reviewers must separately review each indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one Other Academic indicator for elementary schools and a different Other Academic indicator for middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator.

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?

- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides for a growth indicator at the elementary level (progress in academic achievement) that is measured by an index growth model for all public elementary and middle schools in its LEAs. The SEA indicates that all components of its accountability system are disaggregated by student subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Schools with high achievement need to continue consistent improvement and lower achieving schools have a steeper trajectory to reach target; based upon a quartiles. The growth index is based on one or more years' worth of growth achieved.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Some peers could not tell if the survey would be reported by subgroup. Some peers felt a year's worth of growth is not sufficiently defined.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA needs to define "a year's worth of growth".

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

- Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA's long-term goals?
- Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?
- If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?

- If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides a four-year ACGR and a five- and six-year extended ACGR to be applied to all LEA high schools and it carries a weight in the accountability system of 13%. The graduation rate calculations include GED recipients in all 3 cohorts. The ACGR goals and progress goals are disaggregated by subgroup. The indicator is based on any of the three ACGR rates; meeting any one constitutes meeting the graduation rate goal. Data from schools with n sizes below 10 will be combined with up to 2 additional years in order to meet the n size and determine accountability.</p> <p>Meets all 8 elements listed above and small schools can combine data over multiple years (up to three).</p> <p>The SEA uses the 4-year as well as extended graduation rates. High Schools also earn credit for GED completion.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA employs a variety of measures to ensure that the most high schools possible will be included in its accountability and reporting system. The multiple extended ACGRs support schools’ efforts to graduate students who have passed the four-year mark.</p> <p>The SEA is continuing to use a measure used before.</p> <p>State determined to include GED as part of graduation rate for dropouts who earn GED prior to 22nd year; will account for 8% of the 21% goal.</p> <p>The SEA uses the adjusted 4-year rate.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The GED appears to be included as 8% of the 21% weight assigned to the ACGRs in the accountability system.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>It is not clear how much weight each element of the graduation rate receives in the 4, 5, and 6 year rates. The three rates for the indicator besides the GED are not explicitly spelled out.</p> <p>The SEA does not include information about students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards and awarded a state-defined alternate diploma (refer to page 43).</p>

A.4.iv.d: Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator

- Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?
- Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The progress in ELP indicator carries a weight of 10% in each level of the accountability system. This indicator measures the progress achievement of all students, K-12 in each LEA. It is aligned with the SEA’s 6-year timeline and it specifies the exit criteria as a 5.0 CPL with each domain no less than a 3.5 Proficiency Level.</p> <p>Using composite proficiency level and use of ACCESS 2.0 as assessment is valid.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>K-12 will be assessed.</p> <p>The SEA has provided a specific differentiated timeline for exiting (based on initial performance).</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Some peer reviewers felt that relative to the other academic indicators, the SEA has afforded little weight to the Progress in ELP indicator.</p> <p>The SEA has not provided a specific model to monitor progress.</p> <p>The SEA may want to change from K-12 to 1-12, as kindergartners do not have a baseline from which to assess growth.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA must define growth anticipated/expected during each year in order to know whether progress benchmarks are met.</p> <p>Reviewers were unable to find information showing that the indicator is valid and reliable because the SEA did not provide a specific model to monitor progress.</p>

	<p>Learners in the two-year band (5-6) will not show progress, as it is a two-year band and therefore is not being assessed on an annual basis. The SEA needs to develop a measure of interim progress within the Level 5 performance level on the ACCESS.</p> <p>The definition for ‘exiting’ is conjunctive, and the SEA needs to indicate how monitoring progress ensures students are exited.</p>
--	---

A.4.iv.e: School Quality or Student Success Indicator(s)

Note: Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA’s description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))

- Does the SEA describe each School Quality or Student Success indicator used in its statewide accountability system for all public schools in the State?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- Does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Is the indicator valid, reliable, comparable, used statewide in all schools (for the grade span to which it applies), and calculated in a consistent way?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA’s School Quality indicator appears to be Student Engagement (measured by the AdvancED Student Engagement Survey – see Appendix R), which carries a 30% weight at the Elementary/Middle School levels and 22% weight at the High School level. The indicator will measure three domains: Cognitive, Emotional and Behavioral, and grade spans will be measured against benchmarks (by grade span) established across the AdvancED network. It appears to allow for meaningful differentiation between grade levels, grade spans, schools and LEAs.</p> <p>There is one indicator of School Quality to be used across Elem/MS-Student Engagement and engagement is compared across three domains: emotional, cognitive and behavioral.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>As the SEA is using an AdvancED product, the engagement survey may provide valuable comparable data from a national standpoint as well.</p> <p>Student engagement is a research-based measure that improves achievement.</p>

	Will use eProve platform from AdvancED for survey results; results will be compared against appropriate grade levels for better comparison; same system/survey to be used across all schools and grades.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Additional information about validity and reliability is needed.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not describe the School Quality or Student Success indicator in any level of detail. The SEA names the tool to determine school quality but does not describe the indicator. If the state could point to a technical manual provided by the vendor that would suffice. Because the indicator is not described, the Panel is unable to determine whether this student engagement measure is valid, reliable, or comparable. Information is not provided on whether the results can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.

A.4.v: Annual Meaningful Differentiation (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(C))

A.4.v.a: State's System of Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- Does the SEA describe its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State?
- Is the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation based on all indicators in the State's accountability system?
- Does the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation include the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State's accountability system?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA described its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State. The State's system of annual meaningful differentiation will be based on all indicators in the State's accountability system. On pp. 53-55, the SEA did not state that each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State's accountability system will be shown. There is an annual process for differentiating and the SEA will be developing dashboard for multiple indicators.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan is based on all measures.

	<p>Multi-year accountability determinations for all schools/districts/state every three years using three-step process; Use of different process for small schools and subgroups –when there are too few students; however, all students must be included and achievement data is only referenced once; the SEA also has process for incremental achievement goals and will use a weighted method combining adjoining achievement goals</p> <p>The SEA describes the methodology in detail, which works through a multi-step process.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Differentiation is limited on Comprehensive, Targeted and General support.</p> <p>Subgroup performance appears to only impact schools for Targeted Support.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

- Does the SEA describe the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation, including how the weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (e.g., for the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator)?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually?
- Do the Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides weightings for each indicator, differentiated by grade span, and will proportionally redistribute any indicator’s weight should it not be able to be calculated due to low N-size. The Academic Achievement and Growth indicators at the elementary and middle school levels individually receive substantial weight. The Progress in ELP indicator does not individually receive substantial weight. In the aggregate, the Achievement, Growth, Graduation Rate and Progress in ELP carry much greater weight than the Climate/Engagement indicator in the SEA’s accountability system.</p>

	<p>The Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators each receive substantial weight individually.</p> <p>Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators do receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate.</p> <p>The SEA has weighted each indicator, with major percentage assigned to the academic indicators of Achievement and Growth, Grad Rate, EL Progress for all grades; 70% weight for Elem and MS and 78% for HS. The remaining indicator of Student Engagement is 30% at Elem and MS, and 22% at HS; if there are a minimum number of students for any of the indicators, then data is combined over 1-3 years to maintain privacy of students.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The weighting is aligned to the requirements.</p> <p>The weighting system attempts to weight schools in different circumstances differently. Academic indicators receive substantially more weight.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Some peer reviewers felt that the 10% weight of Progress in ELP, individually, is not substantial relative to School Climate in the SEA’s accountability system.</p> <p>This plan appears to create different weights for status and growth depending on whether a school has high status and/or high growth. This appears to be a post-hoc adjustment and may create confusion since a school or stakeholder will not know the weighting of the indicators until after results are completed. Moreover, a school may have difficulty planning for improvement, since the weights of the school’s performance receive can change from one year to the next.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA needs to clarify, specifically, whether Students with disabilities will be included for two years after exit for reporting only (Refer to page 46).</p> <p>Some peers believe that ELP growth was insubstantial in relation to the climate indicator. No rationale was provided that indicates how this would be substantial.</p>

A.4.v.c: If Applicable, Different Methodology for Annual Meaningful Differentiation

- If the SEA uses a different methodology or methodologies for annual meaningful differentiation than the one described in 4.v.a of the State’s plan for schools for which an accountability determination cannot be made (*e.g.*, P-2 schools), does it describe the different methodology or methodologies, including how the methodology or methodologies will be used to identify schools for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Does the SEA’s description of a different methodology indicate the type(s) of schools to which it applies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that for schools whose grade spans do not participate in assessments, reports of student achievement will be returned to those schools once their students move into their first assessed grade level at a receiving school. The lower-grade span schools will then be linked to the district-level accountability system. This will apply to 10 schools statewide. For schools with the number of students below the n-size, findings will not be assigned or reported publicly, though the SEA will conduct performance audits on these schools’ accountability indicators and engage with staff regarding the school’s implementation efforts and performance levels. Schools with special populations: in a public school, the accountability is assigned to that school; in a contracted facility, accountability is assigned to the student’s LEA of residence; in a state facility, accountability is assigned to the state. Newly opened schools are provided accountability determinations based on the student’s historical achievement data from the previous three years of records.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear how exactly the linkages work or how P-2 schools would receive designations based on the receiving school results (it may be that the P-2 schools simply get the designation of the receiving school).
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	In P-2 schools, students are not assessed on academic content in the accountability year. The SEA has not presented an alternative methodology that allows for a summative rating for schools not assessing academic content. The state needs to clarify how ELP progress will be included in these schools’ summative ratings.

A.4.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

A.4.vi.a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Lowest Performing

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement including, if applicable, how it averages data (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>At the beginning of the school year 2018-2019, the SEA will establish the first list (in a 3-year cycle) of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement. The SEA will select the lowest performing 5% (approximately 15) schools for comprehensive support, which includes 3-year school improvement grant funding of \$300,000-\$400,000 per school. These grants will assist the identified schools in implementing evidence-based strategies to improve performance.</p> <p>The SEA describes its methodology to identify not less than the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds in the State for comprehensive support and improvement.</p> <p>The SEA does include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (i.e., does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance).</p> <p>Process begins with 2018-19 school year and occurs every three years thereafter. The lowest 5% performing Title schools in state will be identified using a uniform averaging method.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA is continuing to use a model that has been successfully used by the state.</p> <p>Will use an AdvancED program to assist with the development of improvement plans that includes a diagnostic review to identify root causes. Selection is to occur in spring 2018 in order for schools to prepare for comprehensive support in 2018-19.</p> <p>The SEA explicitly uses a method to select the lowest 5% of schools for Comprehensive, and the subsequent 5% for Target support. All other schools are placed in a general support category.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.4.vi.b: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Low Graduation Rates

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement, including: 1) a description of whether the SEA uses one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates in addition to the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of all public high schools in the State failing to graduate one-third or more of their students for comprehensive support and improvement?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Any public high school that graduates less than 67% of its students will also be identified for Comprehensive Support. See comments included in the previous section (A.4.vi.a) related to Comprehensive Support.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is utilizing a graduation methodology they are comfortable with and have used. The plan seems to be straight forward with respect to the 67% Grad Rate requirement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not specify its methodology in this identification, including whether it averages data or uses extended-year cohorts in determining whether a school is identified for Comprehensive Support.

A.4.vi.c: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support Not Exiting Such Status

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (*i.e.*, based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA does not appear to have specified additional support for schools not having exited this subgroup performance-based category of Comprehensive Support schools.</p> <p>Schools are selected for \$50,000 grant based on low performing or underperforming EL students or minority students, or students with disabilities or students in poverty. Schools that have one or more subgroups with achievement levels below the highest performing Comprehensive Schools, based on all accountability factors within the SEA’s accountability system (5%). Targeted schools identified in 2019-20 not 2018-19. Determination occurs annually.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Beyond original identification criteria, additional targeted support is not described.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe its methodology to identify schools that have received additional support but have not satisfied state exit criteria (in addition to the state exiting criteria not being clear). There is no way to identify those schools and, therefore, the Panel cannot assess adherence to the timeline.</p>

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification?
- Does the SEA’s timeline result in identification of these schools at least once every three years?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA will identify schools for improvement at least once every 3 years, beginning with school year 2018-19.</p> <p>The SEA does include the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification.</p> <p>Schools who are identified will receive support grants of \$350,000 for each of those three years.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Support is maintained over the three-year period.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi.e: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—“Consistently Underperforming” Subgroups

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students, including its definition of “consistently underperforming”?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of any school with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students?
- Is the methodology based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation?
- Does the SEA identify these schools annually?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA will select 10% of its schools each year (approximately 36 schools) for targeted support. Consistently underperforming schools are defined as those either having a high proportion of struggling student groups (5% of the schools) or significant performance gaps between student groups (5% of the schools) – which will be designated as receiving additional targeted support. Subgroups analyzed for these purposes are Economically Disadvantaged, EL, Minority and SWD, and the calculations are based on all indicators in the SEA’s accountability system. The SEA will begin determining which schools fall under this designation in Spring 2019 in order for improvement efforts to begin in the 2019-2020 school year. Targeted designations are made annually.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA proposes to identify two types of student groups for Targeted Assistance: under-performing and low-

	<p>performing student groups and provide each school with the opportunity to apply for and receive a \$50,000 grant to use toward school improvement efforts.</p> <p>Also includes selection of schools with subgroup gaps in performance, which is above the requirement.</p> <p>The process identifies two types of students groups for identification.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear that all schools with a subgroup below comprehensive threshold are included.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>More specificity on the SEA’s methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students is needed. And, the definition of “consistently underperforming” is nonexistent.</p> <p>The SEA indicates that one potential means of designation for Targeted support is the proportion of students in a subgroup not meeting a criterion, as long as the other means for selecting Targeted support schools is based on <u>all</u> indicators, this is acceptable.</p>

A.4.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- Does the SEA’s methodology result in identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA indicates that it will identify for Additional Targeted Support those subgroups with significant achievement gaps based on a comparison of each subgroup’s combined mathematics and reading proficiency rate. These schools will comprise half of the schools identified for Targeted Support and will first be notified of their status in Spring, 2019 for improvement plans to be implemented beginning in the 2019-2020 school year. Determinations of status will be made annually and it appears from the narrative (but is not specified) that the pool of schools included for consideration is all public schools in the SEA. The data averaging procedure used by the SEA is not addressed specifically in this indicator, but is described in 4.C.iv as the SEA’s uniform procedure</p>

	for averaging data. The SEA will provide additional targeted support for subgroup gaps in performance.
<i>Strengths</i>	Frequency and year are defined.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The criteria used for determining which schools have “significant improvement” gaps between subgroups are vague (page 70 - b). Not clear whether all schools with subgroup performance below comprehensive are included as the SEA seems to indicate that Targeted Support is limited to 10% of schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA needs to identify the specific criteria for identification. Including an additional 10% of schools does not ensure that all schools performing below the Comprehensive Support benchmark will be included in Targeted Support. The SEA must apply their methodologies to all schools performing below the Comprehensive support benchmark.

A.4.vi.g: If Applicable, Additional Statewide Categories of Schools

➤ If the State chooses, at its discretion, to include additional statewide categories of schools, does the SEA describe those categories?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	All schools not identified for comprehensive/targeted support (called ‘general’) are required to determine needs and develop an improvement plan targeting subgroup performance through the AdvancED improvement system. Universal support is also available through NDDPI.
<i>Strengths</i>	All schools are involved in school improvement. All schools that are not comprehensive or Targeted become General support schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i>	

<i>SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.4.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?
- If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (e.g., 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA will identify any school or LEA whose ELA or mathematics assessment participation rate is below 95% in the composite or within any designated subgroup. Failure to meet this indicator would be so noted on public reports and the school or LEA’s program status would be reduced and it would be required to develop an improvement plan that includes community outreach efforts presenting the merits of test participation, among other activities.</p> <p>The SEA does describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe how it differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (e.g., 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation).</p> <p>The SEA includes both academic assessments in the composite or by subgroup. The district will be identified due to insufficient participation by reducing the district’s program status and requiring an improvement plan.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Includes outreach efforts to students/parents/community to heighten awareness of the importance of participation in statewide assessments.</p> <p>The SEA indicates that not meeting 95% participation has negative consequences.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Not specific as to what the consequences are for not meeting the 95% participation requirement.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>

<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>The SEA does not specifically describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students, and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students, in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system.</p> <p>Clarity is needed around the meaning of “reduction in program” status.</p>
---	--

A.4.viii: Continued Support for School and Local Educational Agency Improvement (ESEA Section 1111(d)(3)(A))

A.4.viii.a: Exit Criteria for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement, which may include how the exit criteria are aligned with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Is the number of years no more than four years?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes its exit criteria from Comprehensive Support and Improvement status as a school achieving 3 years of scores above the bottom 5% of Title I schools and, a 3-consecutive year graduation rate of 67% or above OR success in meeting its established interim goals for academic achievement and graduation rate for 3 consecutive years.</p> <p>The SEA exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement is: A school could exit Comprehensive support status upon achieving: <input type="checkbox"/> Scores that are above the bottom 5% of Title I schools for three consecutive years, and <input type="checkbox"/> A graduation rate that is 67% or higher for three consecutive years or <input type="checkbox"/> Success in meeting their established interim goals for three consecutive years for both academic achievement and graduation rates.</p> <p>Criteria are described for exiting comprehensive support – every three years and school must maintain current performance. A school could exit Comprehensive support status upon achieving: <input type="checkbox"/> Scores that are above the bottom 5% of Title I schools for three consecutive years, and <input type="checkbox"/> A graduation rate that is 67% or higher for three consecutive years or <input type="checkbox"/> Success in meeting their established interim goals for three consecutive years for both academic achievement and graduation rates.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Procedures are consistent with entrance criteria.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	A comparison of rigor of the different means of exiting would be useful.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA needs to clarify the three exit criteria as being conjunctive or disjunctive, thereby clarifying its response to A.4.vi.c., for these criteria to be adequately assessed. Specifically, which pair of requirements is required for Elem/MS and High Schools.

A.4.viii.b: Exit Criteria for Schools Receiving Additional Targeted Support (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(II))

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (*e.g.*, do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA proposes that a school could exit from Targeted Support status by no longer meeting the Targeted Support eligibility criteria or meeting for 2 consecutive years its interim goals established for the subgroup for which the school was initially identified for Targeted Support. Title I schools that do not meet the criteria for 3 consecutive years will transition into the Comprehensive Support category beginning the subsequent school year. The SEA described its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support as: 1) A school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for Targeted support and improvement, and 2) A school is successful in meeting its established interim goals in the identified subgroup for two consecutive years.
<i>Strengths</i>	Exit criteria are consistent with entrance criteria.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement

A.4.viii.c: More Rigorous Interventions (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i)(I))

- Does the SEA describe the more rigorous State-determined action required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the SEA’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years, which may include interventions that address school-level operations, such as changes in school staffing and budgeting or the school day and year?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA proposes to require the LEA to conduct a new school-level needs assessment of any school that does not exit the Comprehensive Support status.</p> <p>As per ESSA, if a school does not meet the exit criteria for Comprehensive support, NDDPI will require the LEA to conduct a new school-level needs assessment and, based on its results, amend its comprehensive support and improvement plan.</p> <p>New needs assessment conducted and new comprehensive support plan developed.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not identify the terms by which schools must exit the Comprehensive Support status before the more rigorous interventions are put in place.</p> <p>The description is a bit vague.</p> <p>This process of a new needs assessment and plan may not make an impact.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the processes identified would lead to an improved intervention or support since it is based on the school’s own needs assessment.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i>	<p>More specificity of rigorous state-determined action is needed. ND does not indicate what needs to occur within the timeline for remaining in status.</p>

<i>SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
--	--

A.4.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

- Does the SEA describe how it will periodically review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA indicates that it will assign SEA staff to monitor each identified school’s progress over a three year period for comprehensive schools and annually for targeted schools. The oversight process will include fiscal reviews, onsite reviews, desk audits and a required annual review process within which any resource inequities should be identified. These annual reviews include an examination of all federal state and local funding sources. To eliminate the likelihood of financial inequities, schools identified for support will have opportunities to apply for grants to aid them in their improvement efforts (\$300,000-\$400,000 per comprehensive school over the 3 year period and \$50,000 per targeted school as annually identified).</p> <p>The SEA will conduct periodic reviews of resource allocations to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each district serving a significant number or percentage of schools selected for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement.</p> <p>The SEA will conduct onsite, desk audits and fiscal reviews to ensure adequate resource allocation.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Both schools, and LEAs serving those schools, will have resource allocation reviews performed by the SEA as a requirement for school improvement funding. Additional grant resources will be provided to reduce inequities while providing funding to institute improvement measures in the identified schools.</p> <p>Will include both Targeted and Comprehensive support schools.</p> <p>The SEA describes a process of review and who will conduct the reviews.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA indicates that there is a competitive process for funds – and it is not clear how this aligns for the funds allocated for support schools.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	

clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement

A.4.viii.e: Technical Assistance (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(iii))

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?
- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>In 4.3.B, the SEA describes in detail the resources and support it will provide to both Comprehensive Schools and schools identified for Targeted Support. For Comprehensive Schools, this includes grant funding, SEA-delivered trainings, assignment of an SEA support liaison, coaching and consultation services through a contracted partner. For Targeted Assistance schools this includes grant funding of \$50,000/identified year, regional trainings led by the SEA, assignment of an SEA support liaison, training on MTSS through REAs. Additional assistance for all identified entities include website resources, monthly reports on research, the provision of AdvancED’s eProve to streamline schools’ needs assessment, programming and plan reporting to the SEA, partnership with the School Improvement Network and the dissemination of research on interventions for underperforming subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA provides on-going technical assistance to the field. The SEA encourages liaisons, administrators, and other staff through webinars, memos, and newsletters to contact the NDDPI directly with any specific issues. A good deal of the SEA’s time is focused on answering calls from the field to provide technical assistance in specific situations inclusive of identification of students experiencing homelessness. The SEA also provides memos on specific issues to provide more clarification to the field. This occurs on a regular basis. It is uncertain if webinars, memos or newsletter would improve student outcomes.</p> <p>Grant support for both Comprehensive and Targeted schools. There is also support to implement MTSS, coaching, and evidence based programs. NDDPI will assign support from NDDPI.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA delineates an impressive number of promising practices that it will engage in when developing support plans for its identified schools.</p> <p>This section is quite specific and supported by research based strategies; there is differentiated support for</p>

	Comprehensive schools. The SEA describes several evidence-based and technology-based strategies, including vendor-based support.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	More information is needed as to the content addressed in these various communications. While the TA is appropriately identified in general, it is not clear how this will be directly aligned to schools' needs and their ability to select and implement interventions appropriately.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.f: If Applicable, Additional Optional Action

- If applicable, does the SEA describe the action that it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools that it consistently identifies for comprehensive support and improvement and are not meeting the State's exit criteria or in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A Did not see this specifically called out.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.5: Disproportionate Rates of Access to Educators (ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B))

- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?
- Does the SEA describe the measures (*e.g.*, data used to calculate the disproportionate rates) that it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?⁴

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provided definitions and descriptions of inexperienced and out-of-field teachers as well as its definition of high and low poverty schools. The SEA performed an analysis of its schools to measure and compared the educator quality at high vs. low poverty and minority schools. The SEA found minimal difference in the percentage of unqualified teachers at higher poverty or minority schools as compared to lower poverty or minority schools at any level. The SEA also found limited difference between inexperienced teachers at high minority vs. low minority schools at any level. The SEA found an equity gap, however, between the percentage of inexperienced teachers at both levels of schools experiencing high poverty, as compared to low poverty schools of those same grade spans (elementary and secondary).</p> <p>In Appendix L, there is a table of how this will be calculated, but from the description on pages 88-89 it has not yet been calculated.</p> <p>Equity Plan identified 4 areas of improvement: Slightly higher levels of new teachers teaching in high poverty schools than in low poverty schools; teachers and school leader recruitment and retention; teacher shortage; and</p>

⁴ Consistent with ESEA section 1111(g)(1)(B), this description should not be construed as requiring a State to develop or implement a teacher, principal or other school leader evaluation system.

	equitable access to high quality professional development. Key elements/terms are defined so that data can be collected and calculated (ineffective teaching, out of field teacher, inexperienced teacher, low-income student and minority student. Data will be collected annually and BL to be set in 2017-18.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA provided sound data analysis of its equity study and a pervasive root cause analysis. Solution strategies, resource allocations and timelines to reach targets are all included in the plan.</p> <p>The SEA added 3 optional key terms: unqualified teacher, excellent education and determination of educator effectiveness.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA produced information regarding its public reporting on progress toward reducing the equity gaps, however the reporting all appears to take place in 2015. The Tier II strategies are listed as “TBD”.</p> <p>The methodology creates a teacher FTE, but no actual teachers are identified. Also it is not clear how different teachers in different schools can be evaluated on such a variance of indicators (20 to 60). The fact that there are X number of elements rated as low, does not necessarily that any single teacher would be considered ineffective.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	A measure of ‘ineffectiveness’ that identifies ineffective teachers, and not evaluation elements, is needed.

A.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s ESSA Committee determined not to set aside Title IV dollars for addressing bullying, discipline or aversive interventions or parent/family engagement.

<i>Strengths</i>	The state develops five priorities as a framework for supporting LEAs.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The description lacks connections to actual context and circumstances in ND in terms of actual strengths, weaknesses, and what has been previously utilized.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Specific actions to address the following disciplinary issues are not found in the ND plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incidences of bullying and harassment • The overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom • The use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety

A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 1111(g)(1)(D))

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>In its plan to dedicate 1% of its Title IV, Part A funds, the SEA describes various categories in which it supports students: professional learning and quality educators, single system of continuous improvement over 5 year cycle, and addressing fiscal/teacher/access and participation equity. In addition, the SEA supports its LEAs in their provision of rigorous, varied educational opportunities – including those specific to high school such as, career tech and advanced coursework options as well as transitional services provided for students moving to middle and high school grades. In addition, the SEA has recently secured funding for ages 4-5 early learning programs and developed an Office of Early Learning within its organizational structure.</p> <p>The SEA addresses school transitions very broadly (pp 91-95).</p> <p>State Superintendent has set five priority areas that guide the agency’s work in assisting students in achieving the state’s vision of being choice ready: Great Teachers/Leaders, Continuous Improvement, Equity, Local Educational Opportunities, Early Childhood Education.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has described a rich network of supports to ensure quality educational programming K-12.</p> <p>The SEA provides considerable description of a plan to support all students.</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA should add specific language about school transitions and drop-out provision.</p> <p>This specific topic of school transitions appears to be missing.</p> <p>As noted above, the plan seems somewhat generic, and it is difficult to evaluate.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA does not describe how the LEAs are providing assistance for effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out. Additionally, elementary grades are not addressed.</p>

SECTION E: TITLE III, PART A, SUBPART 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND ENHANCEMENT

E.1: Entrance and Exit Procedures (ESEA section 3113(b)(2))

- Does the SEA describe how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide?
- Does the SEA’s description include an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides a universal HLS and offers the choice of one of two WIDA screeners. Exit criteria is based on achieving a 5.0 CPL and 3.5 in each domain on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0.</p> <p>The SEA describes how it will establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with LEAs representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized statewide entrance and exit procedures for English learners, including a description of how, if applicable, a State will ensure that local input included in the exit procedures, such as teacher input or a portfolio, will be applied statewide.</p> <p>The SEA includes an assurance that all students who may be English learners are assessed for such status within 30 days of enrollment in a school in the State.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA plan makes every attempt to ensure that all ELs are assessed on an end-of-year ELP assessment. The SEA has a protocol in place to screen students who were not placed in a language program upon initial enrollment.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The process for “waiving” screening of students with strong academic achievement is not clear. The SEA provides for three exit options: via ACCESS 2.0 score; MODEL score; and teacher input for students with disabilities. However, protocols for universal application related to MODEL and teacher input options are unclear. The SEA does not indicate how it will monitor whether teacher recommendation for entrance is implemented.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA is supposed to screen all students who could potentially be ELs; the exception of screening of students with strong academic achievement is not appropriate. The criteria for the three ways offered for exit -- ACCESS 2.0 score, MODEL score (not a summative assessment), and team input for students with disabilities (EL Team and IEP Team) – are not appropriately delineated. Particularly, teacher input expectations need to be explained. If MODEL scores are approved as an exit criterion, the state will need to describe how these scores will be incorporated into the progress in the ELP indicator.

E.2: SEA Support for English Learner Progress (ESEA section 3113(b)(6))

- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency established under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(ii), including measurements of interim progress towards meeting such goal, based on the State’s English language proficiency assessment under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(G)?
- Does the SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards?

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides state funds to ELs at CPLs 1-3 to provide basic language instruction programming and Title III grants (individual LEA or consortia) to supplement those grants. The SEA supports ELs by sharing information and resources, individualized guidance, conferences and trainings. The SEA described how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goal for English language proficiency.

	<p>The SEA described how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards.</p> <p>Growth and uniform progress will be used to assess EL proficiency using assessment ACCESS 2.0; interim progress targets have been determined.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Students' trajectories will be constructed from the starting point proficiency level to the 5.0 target proficiency level over a period of years according to the table below.</p> <p>Proficiency Level Years to Attain PL (exit):</p> <p>1.0-1.9 6 years 2.0-2.9 5 years 3.0-3.9 4 years 4.0-4.9 3 years 5.0-6.0 2 years</p> <p>The SEA provides weighted formula for state funds for schools with students at levels 1-3; self-monitoring tool to be used starting July 2017.</p> <p>The state's support includes additional funds through a weighted funding formula. The SEA has long term goals that it will monitor to see whether schools are making adequate progress.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>This monitoring and support, due to the inclusion of additional schools is in progress; still somewhat in development.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe specific monitoring related to whether students meet their specific growth goals and what type of interventions might be needed.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

E.3: Monitoring and Technical Assistance (ESEA section 3113(b)(8))

- Does the SEA describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency?
- Does the SEA describe the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective, such as by providing technical assistance and support on how to modify such strategies?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA monitors LEAs for compliance with both Title III and Office for Civil Rights-required language services. This includes review of LEA program plans, program models, entrance and exit procedures, professional learning plans, parent participation, educator credentialing and on-site/desktop monitoring, which takes place every 3-5 years.</p> <p>The SEA described how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency.</p> <p>The SEA described the steps it will take to further assist eligible entities if the strategies funded under Title III, Part A are not effective.</p> <p>Monitoring procedures are described, as are the steps to provide weighted support to schools. The SEA anticipates additional schools, so this may need to be revised.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The monitoring process will include all LEAs with ELs, not only those receiving Title III funds. Reviews are performed on how the school/LEA is meeting school, LEA and state targets for ELs.</p> <p>Monitoring is described and includes multiple measures and a 3 to 5 year cycle for site visits.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA did not address the steps to be taken to assist schools who are not successful and need support to modify interventions or strategies to see student improvement.</p> <p>The specific indicators could be delineated more concretely and identified as to whether they are part of annual monitoring through the management system or through site visits.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Describe the assistance that will be provided to districts under Title III when strategies are not effective.</p>