
ESEA Flexibility

Peer Panel Notes



State Request: Georgia

Date: December 8, 2011

Note: These peer comments reflect the views of the seven peers that comprised the panel that reviewed the SEA's initial submission as well as any additional materials provided by the SEA prior to and during the December 5–9, 2011 on-site peer review. Taking these comments into consideration, the U.S. Department of Education provided feedback to the SEA about aspects of the SEA's ESEA flexibility request that needed additional development or clarification. These peer notes do not reflect the peers' views on any materials, clarifications, or modifications received from the SEA following the peer review. Moreover, although the peer notes inform the Secretary's consideration of each SEA's request, the Secretary makes the final decision whether to grant an SEA's request for ESEA flexibility. For both of these reasons, these peer notes may not align with the determination made by the Secretary.

REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REQUESTS

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) will use a review process that will include both external peer reviewers and staff reviewers to evaluate State educational agency (SEA) requests for this flexibility. This review process will help ensure that each request for this flexibility approved by the Department is consistent with the principles, which are designed to support State efforts to improve student academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction, and is both educationally and technically sound. Reviewers will evaluate whether and how each request for this flexibility will support a comprehensive and coherent set of improvements in the areas of standards and assessments, accountability, and teacher and principal effectiveness that will lead to improved student outcomes. Each SEA will have an opportunity, if necessary, to clarify its plans for peer and staff reviewers and to answer any questions reviewers may have during the on-site review. The peer reviewers will then provide comments to the Department. Taking those comments into consideration, the Secretary will make a decision regarding each SEA's request for this flexibility. If an SEA's request for this flexibility is not granted, reviewers and the Department will provide feedback to the SEA about the components of the SEA's request that need additional development in order for the request to be approved.

This document provides guidance for peer review panels as they evaluate each request during the on-site peer review portion of the review process. The document includes the specific information that a request must include and questions to guide reviewers as they evaluate each request. **Questions that have numbers or letters represent required elements.** The italicized questions reflect inquiries that reviewers will use to fully consider all aspects of an SEA's plan for meeting each principle, but do not represent required elements.

In addition to this guidance, reviewers will also use the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*, including the definitions and timelines, when reviewing each SEA's request. As used in the request form and this guidance, the following terms have the definitions set forth in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*: (1) college- and career-ready standards, (2) focus school, (3) high-quality assessment, (4) priority school, (5) reward school, (6) standards that are common to a significant number of States, (7) State network of institutions of higher education, (8) student growth, and (9) turnaround principles.

Review Guidance

Consultation

1. Did the SEA meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from teachers and their representatives?

- *Is the engagement likely to lead to successful implementation of the SEA's request due to the input and commitment of teachers and their representatives at the outset of the planning and implementation process?*
- *Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on input from teachers and their representatives?*

CONSULTATION QUESTION 1	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 3 Yes, 4 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	Consultation was extensive, but focused on Principle 2. There is evidence that they used feedback about Principle 2 to shape aspects of their approach to Principle 2.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is no evidence of consultation about Principles 1 and 3.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Provide more information about consultation and the use of resulting information on Principles 1 and 3.

2. Did the SEA meaningfully engage and solicit input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes?

- *Is the engagement likely to lead to successful implementation of the SEA's request due to the input and commitment of relevant stakeholders at the outset of the planning and implementation process?*
- *Did the SEA indicate that it modified any aspect of its request based on stakeholder input?*
- *Does the input represent feedback from a diverse mix of stakeholders representing various perspectives and interests, including stakeholders from high-need communities?*

CONSULTATION QUESTION 2	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 3 Yes, 4 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	Consultation was extensive, but focused on Principle 2. There is evidence that they used feedback about Principle 2 to shape aspects of their approach to Principle 2.
<i>Strengths</i>	There is evidence of targeted outreach to advocacy organizations .
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is no evidence of consultation about Principles 1 and 3.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Provide more information about consultation and the use of resulting information on Principles 1 and 3.

Overview

Note to Peers: Staff will review Questions 1 and 3

- Does the SEA’s overview sufficiently explain the SEA’s comprehensive approach to implementing the waivers and principles and describe the Sea’s strategy for ensuring that this approach is coherent?

OVERVIEW QUESTION 2	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The rationale for Principle 2 was described, but not for Principles 1 and 3.
<i>Strengths</i>	The rationale for creating the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) is clearly explained.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is insufficient description of the state’s efforts on Principles 1 and 3 and how the three are connected.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Consider including a Logic Model for Principles 1 and 3 similar to that provided on P. 15 and a narrative explaining how the three are to be connected.

Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students

Note to Peers: Staff will review 1.A Adopt College-And Career-Ready Standards, Options A and B.

1.B Transition to college- and career-ready standards

1.B Is the SEA’s plan to transition to and implement college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the 2013–2014 school year realistic, of high quality, and likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards?

A high-quality plan will likely include activities related to the following questions or an explanation if one or more of the activities is not included. For the activities below that the SEA selects, will the results be used to inform the intended outcome?

- *Does the SEA intend to analyze the extent of alignment between the State’s current content standards and the college- and career-ready standards to determine similarities and differences between those two sets of standards? If so, will the results be used to inform the transition to college- and career-ready standards?*
- *Does the SEA intend to analyze the linguistic demands of the college- and career-ready standards to inform the development of ELP standards corresponding to the college- and career-ready standards and to ensure that English Learners will be able to access the college- and career-ready standards? If so, will the results be used to inform revision of the ELP standards and support English Learners in accessing the college- and career-ready standards?*
- *Does the SEA intend to analyze the learning and accommodation factors necessary to ensure that students with disabilities will have the opportunity to achieve to the college- and career-ready standards? If so, will the results be used to support students with disabilities in accessing the college- and career-ready standards on the same schedule as all students?*
- *Does the SEA intend to conduct outreach on and dissemination of standards? If so, does the SEA’s plan reach the appropriate stakeholders, including educators, administrators, families, and IHEs? Is it likely that the plan will result in all stakeholders increasing their awareness of the State’s college- and career-ready standards?*
- *Does the SEA intend to provide professional development and other supports to prepare teachers to teach all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, to the new standards? If so, will the planned professional development and supports prepare teachers to teach to the new standards, use instructional materials aligned with those standards, and use data on multiple measures of student performance (e.g., data from formative, benchmark, and summative assessments) to inform instruction?*
- *Does the SEA intend to provide professional development and supports to prepare principals to provide strong, supportive instructional leadership based on the new standards? If so, will this plan prepare principals to do so?*

- *Does the SEA propose to develop and disseminate high-quality instructional materials aligned with the new standards? If so, are the instructional materials designed (or will they be designed) to support the teaching and learning of all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students?*
- *Does the SEA plan to expand access to college-level courses or their prerequisites, dual enrollment courses, or accelerated learning opportunities? If so, will this plan lead to more students having access to courses that prepare them for college and a career?*
- *Does the SEA intend to work with the State’s IHEs and other teacher and principal preparation programs, to better prepare*
 - *incoming teachers to teach all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, to the new college- and career-ready standards; and*
 - *incoming principals to provide strong, supportive instructional leadership on teaching to the new standards?*

If so, will the implementation of the plan likely improve the preparation of incoming teachers and principals?
- *Does the SEA plan to evaluate its current assessments and increase the rigor of those assessments and their alignment with college- and career-ready standards, in order to better prepare students and teachers for the new assessments through one or more of the following strategies:*
 - *Raising the State’s academic achievement standards on its current assessments to ensure that the adjusted achievement standards reflect a level of postsecondary readiness, or are being increased over time to that level of rigor (e.g., the SEA might compare current achievement standards to a measure of postsecondary readiness by back-mapping from college entrance requirements or remediation rates, analyzing the relationship between proficient scores on the State assessments and the ACT or SAT scores accepted by most of the State’s 4-year public IHEs, or conducting NAEP mapping studies)?*
 - *Augmenting or revising current State assessments by adding questions, removing questions, or varying formats in order to better align those assessments with college- and career-ready standards?*
 - *Implementing another strategy to increase the rigor of current assessments, such as using the “advanced” performance level on State assessments instead of the “proficient” performance level as the goal for individual student performance?*

Is this activity likely to result in an increase in the rigor of the assessments and their alignment with college- and career-ready standards?
- *Does the SEA propose other activities in its transition plan? If so, is it likely that these activities will support the transition to and implementation of college- and career-ready standards?*

1.B PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 6 Yes, 1 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE has a strong foundation for the transition to college and career expectations for all students.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>GaDOE has laid a strong foundation for the transition through its phasing out of the old graduation requirements, implementation of end-of-course examinations at the high school level, and partnering with the American Diploma Project and Georgia postsecondary institutions to ensure high school assessments have college ready indicators. Outreach and dissemination to build awareness of the new standards have been extensive.</p> <p>Instructional plans for addressing the transition to the new standards is evident, including for teachers of students with disabilities or English learners.</p> <p>The proposal acknowledges the different levels of professional development required for ELA and mathematics. Development and dissemination of instructional materials for each grade and subject is likely to result in greater educator capacity to teach to the common core standards.</p> <p>GaDOE's reorganization, which established a "college readiness unit", is evidence of coherence around the goal of college and career readiness for all students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Limited attention to professional development and support for principals to lead the transition work; however, some panel members appreciated that GaDOE is using lessons learned to change its approach to principal support.</p> <p>Limited information is provided about IHE's role in supporting the transition to the new standards.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	

1.C Develop and Administer Annual, Statewide, Aligned, High-Quality Assessments that Measure Student Growth

1.C Did the SEA develop, or does it have a plan to develop, annual, statewide, high-quality assessments, and corresponding academic achievement standards, that measure student growth and are aligned with the State’s college- and career-ready standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school, that will be piloted no later than the 2013–2014 school year and planned for administration in all LEAs no later than the 2014–2015 school year, as demonstrated through one of the three options below? Does the plan include setting academic achievement standards?

Note to Peers: Staff will review Options A and C.

If the SEA selected Option B:

If the SEA is neither participating in a State consortium under the RTTA competition nor has developed and administered high-quality assessments, did the SEA provide a realistic, high-quality plan describing activities that are likely to lead to the development of such assessments, their piloting no later than the 2013–2014 school year, and their annual administration in all LEAs beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year? Does the plan include setting academic achievement standards?

1.C, OPTION B PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i>	
NA	
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 1.C, Option A or Option C</i>	

Principle 1 Overall Review

Is the SEA’s plan for transitioning to and implementing college-and career-ready standards, and developing and administering annual, statewide, aligned high-quality assessments that measure student growth, comprehensive, coherent, and likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

PRINCIPLE 1 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 6 Yes, 1 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>GaDOE has a strong foundation for the transition to college and career expectations for all students. GaDOE has built this foundation through the adoption of strong content standards, extensive dissemination, a broad range of partnerships and a thorough plan for providing the professional development needed to ensure access to college and career ready standards for all students.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>GaDOE has laid a strong foundation for the transition through its phasing out of the old graduation requirements, implementation of end-of-course examinations at the high school level, and partnering with the American Diploma Project and Georgia postsecondary institutions to ensure high school assessments have college ready indicators.</p> <p>Outreach and dissemination to build awareness of the new standards have been extensive.</p> <p>Instructional plans for addressing the transition to the new standards is evident, including for teachers of students with disabilities or English learners.</p> <p>The proposal acknowledges the different levels of professional development required for ELA and mathematics. Development and dissemination of instructional materials for each grade and subject is likely to result in greater educator capacity to teach to the common core standards.</p> <p>GaDOE’s reorganization that established a “college readiness unit” is evidence of coherence around the goal of college and career readiness for all students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Limited attention to professional development and support for principals to lead the transition work; however, some panel members appreciated that GaDOE is using lessons learned to change its approach to principal support.</p> <p>Limited information is provided about IHE’s role in supporting the transition to the new standards.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>Describe more specifically how educator knowledge and application of the new Georgia Performance Standards (GPS) are assessed through Teacher Keys Evaluation System (TKES) and Leader Keys Evaluation System (LKES).</p>

Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

2.A Develop and Implement a State-Based System of Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support

2.A.i Did the SEA propose a differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system, and a high-quality plan to implement this system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, that is likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students?

2.A.i PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The proposed accountability system includes a number of meaningful measures of college and career readiness and will greatly expand the amount of information available to the public and educators. The panel is confident of the State's capacity to fully implement, by 2013-2014, and be able to calculate College and Career ready Performance Index (CCRPI) ratings for the 2011-2012 and 12-13 school years. However, given that significant components of the system are not yet defined, the panel cannot yet make a judgment about its likely impacts.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>GaDOE has articulated a range of indicators relevant to career and college readiness and are building their system from the perspective of college and career readiness.</p> <p>Focusing on the lowest 25% of students in terms of performance ensures attention to the students who most need the intervention and support.</p> <p>There appears to be a coherent plan for providing professional development for all teachers to address diverse student needs including English learners and students with disabilities.</p> <p>Despite the fact that the supports and interventions components of the proposed accountability system will not be fully implemented by 2012-2013 as required by the waiver requirements, the Panel feels that the proposed phase-in is practical. Given that the State is still completing critical elements of the CCRPI calculation, there is value in piloting that index for two years before using it as the primary designation for supports and interventions as proposed.</p>

2.A.i PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>The proposal does not plan to fully implement until 2013-2014, which is one year later than required under the waiver.</p> <p>The primary weakness with the proposed accountability system is that there are major components that have yet to be determined including the weighting of achievement, progress and gap closure in overall CCRPI values; the weighting of each indicator within achievement, progress and gap closure; the performance targets for expected and exemplary benchmarks; and the growth model.</p> <p>Subgroup graduation rates are not incorporated into overall CCRPI determinations.</p> <p>No subgroups are considered in the achievement category, which GaDOE indicated, in the call of 12/8, is likely to account for 70% of the overall CCRPI.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Complete the design of the accountability system and provide a rationale that addresses key decisions.

- a. Does the SEA’s accountability system provide differentiated recognition, accountability, and support for all LEAs in the State and for all Title I schools in those LEAs based on (1) student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, and other subjects at the State’s discretion, for all students and all subgroups of students identified in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); (2) graduation rates for all students and all subgroups; and (3) school performance and progress over time, including the performance and progress of all subgroups?

2.A.i.a PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	Until major components of the CCRPI for school accountability are finalized, the panel cannot determine whether the proposal is coherent or whether it meets the requirements for a waiver.

2.A.i.a PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses: <i>0 Yes, 7 No</i>	
Strengths	<p>GaDOE has articulated a range of indicators relevant to career and college readiness and are building their system from the perspective of college and career readiness.</p> <p>While not included in the rating system to determine school status, the additional information generated will support districts and schools to develop more targeted action plans. These indicators include school climate and financial efficiency.</p> <p>Some members of the panel conclude that the use of red, yellow and green flags for subgroup performance will serve as a potentially effective approach to communicating strengths and weaknesses within overall school performance.</p> <p>The selected indicators include: student achievement in reading/language arts, math and other subjects; graduation rates; and school performance and progress over time.</p>
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	<p>Some members see the large number of indicators reflected in the flag system as an obstacle to conveying a coherent and clear message.</p> <p>Because subgroup performance does not play a role in the achievement indicator of the CCRPI, subgroup performance is underweighted in the proposed system.</p> <p>There are major components of the accountability system that have yet to be determined including the weighting of achievement, progress and gap closure in overall CCRPI values; the weighting of each indicator within achievement, progress and gap closure; the performance targets for expected and exemplary benchmarks; and the growth model.</p> <p>Subgroup graduation rates are not incorporated into overall CCRPI determinations.</p>
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Make the policy decisions needed to complete the proposal and explain the rationale for those decisions.

- b. Do the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system create incentives and provide support to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students?

2.A.i.b PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The performance flag system may provide useful information about subgroup performance; however, there are concerns that the information is underweighted in the proposed accountability system. In addition, there are a number of components of the system not yet defined which will play a role in how the proposed system creates incentives and provides support to close achievement gaps for all subgroups of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	Public reporting of subgroup performance via the performance flags may highlight needs for subgroup interventions and examples of strong practice. Focusing on the lowest 25% of students, in terms of the gap closure indicator, ensures attention to the students who most need the intervention and support.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	No subgroups are considered in the status achievement indicator that GaDOE indicated, in the call of 12/8, is likely to account for 70% of the overall CCRPI. No thresholds have yet been set for expected or exemplary performance within the Progress category. The lack of subgroup graduation rates in any portion of the CCRPI means that a school could earn a high CCRPI with low graduation rates for some subgroups. The proposed CCRPI indicators for supports and interventions for elementary and middle schools include EL students demonstrating “positive movement from one performance band to a higher performance band” and students with disabilities “served in general education environments greater than 80% of the day.” The first fails to quantify the measure. The second indicator is an indicator of access, not performance. Within the gap closure measure, the weighting of within-school gaps and school-to-state gaps is not yet defined and will have a critical impact on incentives for improvement. The growth measure is not yet defined. This will have significant implications for subgroup performance expectations.

<p>2.A.i.b PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No</p>	
<p><i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i></p>	<p>Conduct simulations to inform decisions about the weighting of within-school and school-to-state gaps. Better define the “supports and interventions” indicators.</p> <p>Establish the weighting of the gap closure measure of CCRPI at a level sufficient to incentivize gap closure.</p> <p>Conduct simulations to determine what happens when the 25th percentile as a whole improve and what happens to performance of each subgroup within the 25th percentile.</p> <p>Examine the performance gap between the 25th percentile and 75th percentile to determine if the 75th percentile is a sufficiently high standard.</p> <p>Some members of the panel recommend including subgroup performance on the achievement indicators of CCRPI.</p>

- c. Does the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system include interventions specifically focused on improving the performance of English Learners and students with disabilities?

<p>2.A.i.c PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No</p>	
<p><i>Rationale</i></p>	<p>The proposal envisions an effective approach to professional development for teachers but lacks specificity around implications of the system for these subgroups .</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>Focusing on the lowest 25% of students in terms of performance ensures attention to the students who most need the intervention and support.</p> <p>There appears to be a coherent plan for providing professional development for all teachers of diverse student populations including English learners and students with disabilities.</p>

2.A.i.c PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>There needs to be a coherent plan for providing professional development for school and district leaders, including school counselors, similar to that described for teachers, so that they have the capacity to deliver strong interventions.</p> <p>The proposed CCRPI indicators for supports and interventions for elementary and middle schools include EL students demonstrating “positive movement from one performance band to a higher performance band” and students with disabilities “served in general education environments greater than 80% of the day.” The first fails to quantify the measure. The second indicator is an indicator of access, not performance.</p> <p>The growth measure is not yet defined. This will have significant implications for subgroup performance expectations.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Conduct simulations to determine what happens when the 25th percentile as a whole improve and what happens to performance of each subgroup within the 25th percentile.

- d. Did the SEA provide a plan that ensures that the system will be implemented in LEAs and schools no later than the 2012–2013 school year?

2.A.i.d PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE’s request includes an additional planning year, pushing full LEA implementation to 2013-14, which is one year beyond the waiver requirement. The panel sees this as reasonable, to ensure coherence in implementation, though it is not in compliance with the requirements for the waiver.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.ii Option A.

ONLY FOR SEAs SELECTING OPTION B: If the SEA elects to include student achievement on assessments other than reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system by selecting Option B, review and respond to peer review questions in section 2.A.ii. If the SEA does not include other assessments, go to section 2.A.iii.

- 2.A.ii** Did the SEA include student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools?
- Did the SEA provide the percentage of students in the “all students” group that performed at the proficient level on the State’s most recent administration of each additional assessment for all grades assessed?
 - Does the SEA’s weighting of the included assessments result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve the State’s college- and career-ready standards?

2.A.ii (INCLUDING QUESTIONS a AND b)	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i>	
NA	
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.A, Option A</i>	

2.B Set Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives

2.B *Note to Peers: Staff will review Options A and B.*

Did the SEA describe the method it will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics, for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups, that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts?

If the SEA selected Option C:

Did the SEA describe another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups?

- Did the SEA provide the new AMOs and the method used to set these AMOs?
- Did the SEA provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs?

- iii. If the SEA set AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, do the AMOs require LEAs, schools, and subgroups that are further behind to make greater rates of annual progress?
- iv. Did the SEA attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups? (Attachment 8)
 - *Are these AMOs similarly ambitious to the AMOs that would result from using Option A or B above?*
 - *Are these AMOs ambitious but achievable given the State’s existing proficiency rates and any other relevant circumstances in the State?*
 - *Will these AMOs result in a significant number of children being on track to be college- and career-ready?*

2.B AND 2.B, OPTION C (INCLUDING QUESTIONS i–iv) PANEL RESPONSE Tally of Peer Responses: NA	
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.B, Option A or Option B	

2.C Reward Schools

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.C.i and 2.C.ii.

2.C.iii Did the SEA describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools?

- *Has the SEA provided a reasonable explanation of why its proposed recognition and, where applicable, rewards are likely to be considered meaningful by schools? For example, has the SEA consulted with LEAs and schools in designing its recognition and, where applicable, rewards?*

2.C.iii PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 2 No	
Rationale	The highest performing 5% of Title I schools will be identified through the achievement category of the CCRPI. Also, the top 10% of Title I schools based on the achievement gap closure of the CCRPI will be identified as “high progress” Title I schools. These schools will be recognized at a conference as well as with monetary awards based on state allocations.
Strengths	GaDOE will be identifying and rewarding 15% of its Title I schools.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Without clearly-defined achievement and gap-closure measures, the panel had a difficult time assessing whether the schools identified will be high achieving and high progress. Recognition is limited to Title I schools. A rationale for having priority and focus schools also identified as reward schools is absent. Some members of the panel are concerned that school rewards are not differentiated by school size.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Consider recognizing non-Title I schools. Further clarify the rationale for rewarding priority and focus schools.

2.D Priority Schools

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.D.i and 2.D.ii.

- 2.D.iii** Are the interventions that the SEA described aligned with the turnaround principles and are they likely to result in dramatic, systemic change in priority schools?
- a. Do the SEA’s interventions include all of the following?
- (i) providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget;
 - (ii) ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs;
 - (iii) redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration;
 - (iv) strengthening the school’s instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards;
 - (v) using data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data;
 - (vi) establishing a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students’ social, emotional, and health needs; and
 - (vii) providing ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement?

2.D.iii.a (INCLUDING QUESTIONS (i)-(vii)) PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE has done a thorough job of aligning its interventions for priority schools with turnaround principles.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between GaDOE and the district will delineate district responsibilities for supporting priority schools.</p> <p>The MOA requirements align well with turnaround principles including data analysis, professional development, rethinking the use of time for both students and teachers, and an expectation of assessing the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in priority schools.</p> <p>The MOA has a provision requiring the screening of teachers entering priority schools, a promising way of ensuring stronger instruction in these schools. The phone call of 12/8 described a comparable process for principal review.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	

- b. Has the SEA identified practices to be implemented that meet the turnaround principles and are likely to —
 - (i) increase the quality of instruction in priority schools;
 - (ii) improve the effectiveness of the leadership and the teaching in these schools; and
 - (iii) improve student achievement and, where applicable, graduation rates for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students?

<p>2.D.iii.b (INCLUDING QUESTIONS (i)-(iii)) PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 2 Yes, 5 No</p>	
<i>Rationale</i>	For each turnaround principle, GaDOE has identified several practices for priority schools. However, without further consequences for priority schools that do not improve over time, the likelihood of systemic change is diminished.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between GaDOE and the district will delineate district responsibilities for supporting priority schools.</p> <p>The MOA has a provision requiring the screening of teachers entering priority schools, a promising way of ensuring stronger instruction in these schools. The phone call of 12/8 described a comparable process for principal review.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	A school can be identified as priority indefinitely without a guarantee of interventions beyond turnaround, such as closure, takeover, or management change. Without significant, well-defined consequences for continued failure to improve, the intervention may not result in systemic change in these schools.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Consider defining consequences for schools that continue to be identified as priority schools year after year.

- c. Has the SEA indicated that it will ensure that each of its priority schools implements the selected intervention for at least three years?

2.D.iii.c PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	Because the MOA is in force for only two years, there is not an assurance that interventions aligned with turnaround principles will continue for three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Per the phone call of 12/8, the MOA is only required to be in effect for two years. While priority schools will receive support from the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) for an additional two years, the proposal does not specify the nature of the support or that the support will be consistent with the turnaround principles.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Extend the required duration of the MOA to three years to ensure that interventions consistent with the turnaround principles will be in effect for three years.

- 2.D.iv** Is the SEA's proposed timeline for ensuring that LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year reasonable and likely to result in implementation of the interventions in these schools?

- *Does the SEA's proposed timeline distribute priority schools' implementation of meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in a balanced way, such that there is not a concentration of these schools in the later years of the timeline?*

2.D.iv PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The proposal calls for the identification of all priority schools in 2013-2014 and the implementation of the interventions and supports at that time, a year ahead of the deadline.
<i>Strengths</i>	The proposed timeframe includes a full planning year that has the potential to result in effective implementation.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	

- 2.D.v** Did the SEA provide criteria to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status?
- a. Do the SEA’s criteria ensure that schools that exit priority status have made significant progress in improving student achievement?
 ➤ *Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit priority status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?*

2.D.v and 2.D.v.a PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA provided criteria; however, the Panel believes the criteria are too low and too quickly attained to ensure sustained improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Schools are exited from priority status after one year of achieving a CCRPI value above the 5 th percentile, which the panel believes is a low standard, both in terms of the achievement criteria (i.e. above the 5 th percentile) and the fact that schools must only achieve at that level for one year, which is not an indication of sustained improvement. Continuity of support for exiting schools is not well defined. Lack of clarity about MOA implementation once exiting priority school status and alignment with turnaround principle implementation (e.g. it is unclear what happens to the MOA for a school identified as priority that moves from the 5 th to 6 th percentile and subsequently re-enters priority status by falling back to 5 th percentile).
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The state should consider strengthening the exit criteria, both in terms of the achievement expectation and the duration.

2.E Focus Schools

2.E.i Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State’s Title I schools as focus schools?

2.E.i PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The state did identify its method. 10% of Title I schools with the largest school-to-state gap will be identified as focus schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	

2.E.ii Did the SEA include a list of its focus schools?

- a. Did the SEA identify a number of focus schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State’s Title I schools?
- b. In identifying focus schools, was the SEA’s methodology based on the achievement and lack of progress over a number of years of one or more subgroups of students identified under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments that are part of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system or, at the high school level, graduation rates for one or more subgroups?
- c. Did the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of focus schools that have —
 - (i) the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup or subgroups and the lowest-achieving subgroup or subgroups or, at the high school level, the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate; or
 - (ii) a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate?

2.E.ii (INCLUDING QUESTIONS a-c) PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The state will identify ten percent of all of its schools. However, the GaDOE must ensure the at least ten percent of Title I participating schools are receiving focus designation and add a graduation rate requirement to be in compliance with the waiver request requirements.
<i>Strengths</i>	The state will identify ten percent of all of its schools, not just Title I schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Some panel members think that calculating school-to-state gaps on the basis of the 75th percentile of achievement statewide is too low.</p> <p>While is it not a requirement of the waiver request, some panel members feel that the lack of a graduation rate component in focus school identification is a weakness.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>Per the panel’s recommendation in Principle 2a, ensure that whatever standard used here is also used for the accountability system as a whole.</p> <p>A graduation rate component should be included in the identification criteria.</p> <p>Revise waiver request to state that it is 10% of Title I schools and that the 10% does not include Title I-eligible schools.</p>

2.E.iii Did the SEA describe the process and timeline it will use to ensure that each LEA identifies the needs of its focus schools and their students and provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement to improve the performance of students who are furthest behind?

- *Has the SEA demonstrated that the interventions it has identified are effective at increasing student achievement in schools with similar characteristics, needs, and challenges as the schools the SEA has identified as focus schools?*
- *Has the SEA identified interventions that are appropriate for different levels of schools (elementary, middle, high) and that address different types of school needs (e.g., all-students, targeted at the lowest-achieving students)?*

2.E.iii PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA adequately describes a process and timeline for LEA support of focus schools by clearly delineating the non-negotiable actions and interventions.
<i>Strengths</i>	Through the MOA process, district responsibilities for focus school interventions are clearly delineated. The proposed timeframe includes a full planning year that has the potential to result in effective implementation.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	

2.E.iv Did the SEA provide criteria to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status?

a. Do the SEA’s criteria ensure that schools that exit focus status have made significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps?

➤ *Is the level of progress required by the criteria to exit focus status likely to result in sustained improvement in these schools?*

2.E.iv and 2.E.iv.a PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The state did provide exit criteria for focus school status – perform above the 10 th percentile on achievement gap closure. The peers believe that this standard is too low and too quickly achieved to signal sustained improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Revisit focus school exit criteria, including both the required level of achievement and the duration of that achievement.

2.F Provide Incentives and Support for other Title I Schools

- 2.F** Does the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools that, based on the SEA’s new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps? Are those incentives and supports likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students?

2.F PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The proposed plan appears to have strong professional development resources for schools and individual educators. However, there are not strong expectations for school and district improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	The School Keys resources are available online. RESA’s provide regional supports. Professional development delivery systems are well-developed. School Improvement Specialists are available to provide onsite support and assistance to schools.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is not a well-defined plan engaging district leaders and building district capacity to turnaround low-achieving schools. Because there are no defined categories beyond reward, focus and priority, there is a large percentage of schools for whom expectations and incentives are unclear. There appears to be an over-reliance on public reporting as the primary accountability mechanism for most schools in the state, and the public reporting tool is under-developed at this time.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Consider more clearly articulating improvement expectations for schools that are not identified as focus or priority schools. Develop a strategy for developing LEA leadership for school turnaround comparable to the strategy used to develop the knowledge and strategies used for the college and career ready standards implementation.

2.G Build SEA, LEA, and School Capacity to Improve Student Learning

2.G Is the SEA’s process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, likely to succeed in improving such capacity?

- i. Is the SEA’s process for ensuring timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools likely to result in successful implementation of these interventions and in progress on leading indicators and student outcomes in these schools?
 - *Did the SEA describe a process for the rigorous review and approval of any external providers used by the SEA and its LEAs to support the implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools that is likely to result in the identification of high-quality partners with experience and expertise applicable to the needs of the school, including specific subgroup needs?*

2.G.i PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 3 Yes, 4 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The GaDOE has processes in place to build school capacity for turnaround and improvement. However, with substantially large number of schools expected to be identified as priority schools, stronger strategies for developing district capacity to do this work more effectively should also be considered.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA appears to build internal capacity and coherence through coordinating services across programs that deliver school improvement and school turnaround services. A method for delivering school improvement support through school improvement specialists and School Keys is well-developed.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is not a well-defined plan engaging district leaders and building district capacity to turnaround low-achieving schools.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Develop a strategy for developing LEA leadership for school turnaround comparable to the strategy used to develop the knowledge and strategies used for the college and career ready standards implementation.

- ii. Is the SEA’s process for holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their priority schools, likely to improve LEA capacity to support school improvement?

2.G.ii PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	Based on the information provided, there does not appear to be a systematic process for holding LEA’s accountable.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Develop a more robust and articulated process for building LEA capacity and accountability.

- iii. Is the SEA’s process for ensuring sufficient support for implementation in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources) likely to result in successful implementation of such interventions and improved student achievement?

2.G.iii PANEL RESPONSE	
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 7 No	
Rationale	There is a ten percent set-aside for professional learning support in priority schools, and five percent set-aside in priority and focus schools for implementing flexible learning programs. However, because of the addition of a large number of schools to turnaround, GaDOE’s strategy for repurposing existing resources appears to be insufficient.
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	<p>The proposal appears to provide fewer resources devoted to turnaround efforts and does not provide information on how resources will be leveraged to support a higher number of schools in turnaround or improvement status.</p> <p>The plan does not articulate that any state or local funds be repurposed to support school turnaround and improvement.</p> <p>The strategy cited in the Plan is the same as current strategy; however, it amounts to fewer resources and more schools/districts.</p>
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Consider leveraging SEA and LEA resources across the Title1 programs.

Principle 2 Overall Review

Is the SEA’s plan for developing and implementing a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and improve the quality of instruction for students? Do the components of the SEA’s plan fit together to create a coherent and comprehensive system that supports continuous improvement and is tailored to the needs of the State, its LEAs, its schools, and its students? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> <i>0 Yes, 7 No</i>	
<i>Rationale</i>	<p>GaDOE is developing an accountability system that is based on multiple, meaningful indicators of college and career readiness that are differentiated between and aligned across grade spans. However, critical aspects of the proposed accountability system have not yet been defined. Articulating clear explanations of the decisions in these areas and the rationale supporting these decisions will be critical to a determination of whether the proposed system is likely to create clear expectations for raising achievement and closing gaps. Moreover, there is concern that the weighting of subgroup achievement is too low.</p> <p>There are strong elements to the proposed turnaround interventions, including a clear articulation of district responsibilities for their priority and focus schools, many of which align with the turnaround principles. However, the panel is concerned that the improvement criteria identified for exiting priority and focus status are insufficient, both in rigor and duration. There is concern that there are no clear consequences for continued identification as priority or focus.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The proposed indicators within the CCRPI are meaningful measures of college and career readiness.</p> <p>The Factors for Success and Star Ratings for financial efficiency and school climate will provide additional meaningful public information.</p> <p>The turnaround interventions include a clear articulation of district responsibilities for their priority and focus schools, many of which align with the turnaround principles. These include data analysis, professional development, different use of time for students and teachers, and an expectation of assessing the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in priority schools.</p>

PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> <i>0 Yes, 7 No</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Critical elements of the accountability system have not yet been defined, including the weighting of the numerous indicators within the CCRPI, targets for Expected and Exemplary benchmarks on the indicators, and the student growth model.</p> <p>Members of the panel are concerned about the lack of status achievement for subgroups within the CCRPI calculation, especially in light of the fact that the status achievement is expected to be weighted heavily (roughly 70% per the state call on 12/8). While the system of Performance Flags for subgroups will provide valuable public reporting, some members of the panel feel that status achievement for subgroups must be a represented within the indicators that will drive primary accountability determinations, supports, and interventions. In addition, some members of the panel are concerned that the metrics for the within-school gap calculation, particularly identifying top performers as students at the 75th percentile threshold, are too low.</p> <p>The panel is concerned that the improvement criteria identified for exiting priority and focus status are insufficient, both in rigor and duration. Moreover, there are no clear consequences for multiple, consecutive years of identification as priority or focus.</p> <p>There are no defined expectations for achievement, or defined supports and interventions, for districts.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>Complete specifications for the CCRPI calculations, including indicator weighting, benchmark expectations, and the student growth model, and provide a rationale for the decisions made in those areas.</p> <p>Include status achievement for subgroups within the achievement indicator in the CCRPI.</p> <p>Revisit the exit criteria for priority and focus school identification, in terms of both rigor and duration.</p> <p>Consider stronger consequences for multiple consecutive years of identification as a priority school.</p> <p>Establish defined expectations, interventions, and supports for districts.</p>

Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

3.A Develop and Adopt Guidelines for Local Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

3.A.i Has the SEA developed and adopted guidelines consistent with Principle 3 through one of the three options below?

If the SEA selected Option A:

If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

- i. Is the SEA’s plan for developing and adopting guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to result in successful adoption of those guidelines by the end of the 2011–2012 school year?

3.A.i, OPTION A.i	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i>	
NA	
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B or Option C</i>	

- ii. Does the SEA’s plan include sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?

3.A.i, OPTION A.ii PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i>	
NA	
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B or Option C</i>	

Note to Peers: Staff will review iii.

If the SEA selected Option B:

If the SEA has already developed and adopted one or more, but not all, guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

Note to Peers: Staff will review i and iii.

- ii. Are the guidelines the SEA has adopted likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? (See question 3.A.ii to review the adopted guidelines for consistency with Principle 3.)

3.A.i, OPTION B.ii PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 1 Yes, 6 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE intends to build on its Race to the Top “Great Leaders Great Teachers” plan to complete development of guidelines for educator evaluation and support systems that meet the 2011-2012 deadline called for in the waiver request requirements. So far, the guidelines articulate three key components: teacher and leader assessment on performance standards, student growth and academic achievement in both tested and non-test subjects and grades, and surveys of instructional practice (for teachers) or governance and leadership (for principals).
<i>Strengths</i>	Given the intended integration of the Georgia Performance Standards into the observation rubrics in TKES and LKES, there is potential for the evaluation process to lead to improvements in instruction. The emphasis on piloting and further developing a robust induction model will support new educators as they work to improve their practice.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	While the State’s Plan asserts that current and proposed guidelines will lead to improvements in the quality of instruction, it does not provide sufficient detail on what data will be surfaced or how it will be used to improve student achievement.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Provide more explicit examples of how the various components of the state’s evaluation system will lead to useful data for teachers and leaders to increase the quality of instruction and improve student achievement.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option C</i>	

- iv. Is the SEA's plan for developing and adopting the remaining guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to result in successful adoption of these guidelines by the end of the 2011–2012 school year?

3.A.i OPTION B.iv PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	Georgia's Race to the Top plan is the foundation for its proposed work on educator evaluation. The plan includes activities, milestones and deadlines for completion designed to lead to the completion of guidelines by 2011-12. Based on what is presented in the state's waiver request, however, the plan will not lead to guidelines for a coherent system of educator evaluation because there is no operational framework within which the different proposed components will operate.
<i>Strengths</i>	The teacher and leader performance standards and accompanying rubrics are a strong foundation for developing a more comprehensive evaluation system that incorporates student learning in a significant way.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There is no plan evident to articulate an operational framework that undergirds a comprehensive educator evaluation system. The guidelines being developed are not sufficiently explicit or detailed to enable districts to develop and implement high quality educator evaluation regulations.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	While work is well underway on the development of guidelines for specific components of its evaluation system, that work would be strengthened by articulating more comprehensive and coherent guidance on how the overall system is to be implemented at the state, district and school level.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option C</i>	

- v. Did the SEA have sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines? Does the SEA’s plan include sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of the remaining guidelines?

3.A.i OPTION B.v PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE has ensured sufficient involvement of educators in the development of the initial guidelines and in its plan for their further development and implementation.
<i>Strengths</i>	1,500+ educators participated in the initial pilot of the CLASS Keys and Leader Keys, the observation component of TKES and LKES. Educators are well-represented on the on-going committees established to support further development and implementation of guidelines for TKES and LKES.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not Applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option C</i>	

If the SEA selected Option C:

If the SEA has developed and adopted all guidelines consistent with Principle 3:

- i. Are the guidelines the SEA has adopted likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? (See question 3.A.ii to review the adopted guidelines for consistency with Principle 3.)

3.A.i, OPTION C.i PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> NA	
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option B</i>	

Note to Peers: Staff will review ii.

iii. Did the SEA have sufficient involvement of teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines?

3.A.i OPTION C.iii	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i>	
<i>NA</i>	
<i>Rationale</i>	
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A or Option B</i>	

ONLY FOR SEAs SELECTING OPTION B OR C: If the SEA has adopted guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by selecting Option B or C in section 3.A, review and respond to peer review question 3.A.ii below.

3.A.ii For any teacher and principal evaluation and support systems for which the SEA has developed and adopted guidelines, consistent with Principle 3, are they systems that:

a. Will be used for continual improvement of instruction?

➤ *Are the SEA’s guidelines likely to result in support for teachers that will enable them to improve their instructional practice?*

3.A.ii.a PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 4 Yes, 3 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE’s plan includes a description of several promising strategies likely to result in improvements in instructional practice. However, some Panel Members believe the Plan did not present an overarching theory of action resulting in a coherent approach to evaluation and continuous improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The observational rubrics will help guide continuous improvement because they describe practice against standards at four levels of performance.</p> <p>The emphasis on piloting and further developing a robust induction model will support new educators as they work to improve their practice.</p> <p>GaDOE’s partnership with the Center for Education Integrating Science, Mathematics and Computing is designed to support math and science teachers to improve their instruction.</p> <p>A substantial investment of Race to the Top resources is being made to support training of evaluators from the 26 RTTT pilot districts.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	GaDOE’s plan to develop guidelines for its comprehensive evaluation system does not explicitly link the data about student learning that is to be used in evaluating teachers with the other components of the system to support improved instructional practice.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Articulate how the guidelines for a comprehensive system will connect student learning data with continuous instructional improvement.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

b. Meaningfully differentiate performance using at least three performance levels?

- Does the SEA incorporate student growth into its performance-level definitions with sufficient weighting to ensure that performance levels will differentiate among teachers and principals who have made significantly different contributions to student growth or closing achievement gaps?

3.A.ii.b PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 2 Yes, 5 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The existing guidelines call for four performance levels on the observational rubric. On the 12/8 call, GaDOE indicated that the same four performance levels would be applied to the entire system once fully developed.
<i>Strengths</i>	Performance levels are identified for the observation and statewide student growth measure.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The plan does not currently articulate how performance levels will be applied across the other components (e.g. SLOs, Survey) and combined into an overall rating. The plan does not include information on how performance ratings will be used to differentiate among educators contributing to increases in student growth or closing achievement gaps.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Further develop and articulate the State’s plan for how performance levels will be applied across all components of TKES and LKES, and combined into an annual measure of teacher and leader effectiveness.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

c. Use multiple valid measures in determining performance levels, including as a significant factor data on student growth for all students (including English Learners and students with disabilities), and other measures of professional practice (which may be gathered through multiple formats and sources, such as observations based on rigorous teacher performance standards, teacher portfolios, and student and parent surveys)?

- (i) Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that all measures that are included in determining performance levels are valid measures, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA?

3.A.ii.c and 3.A.ii.c(i) PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 1 Yes, 6 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE's guidelines call for the use of multiple valid measures with student growth representing a significant factor, but lack articulated processes for validation for each measure.
<i>Strengths</i>	A rubric for setting student learning objectives (SLO) has been developed and disseminated. Only those SLOs scored as exemplary or proficient will be approved for use by GaDOE.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	There does not appear to be information in the proposal on a validation process for the survey of instructional practice. The proposal is silent on validation of student growth measures to be used by districts that do not use the state growth model.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Develop the validation process for all measures at the state level and criteria for validating measures at the district level.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

- (ii) For grades and subjects in which assessments are required under ESEA section 1111(b)(3), does the SEA define a statewide approach for measuring student growth on these assessments?

3.A.ii.c(ii) PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE is developing a statewide approach for measuring growth using statewide assessments.
<i>Strengths</i>	Race to the Top districts will be required to use the statewide approach.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The proposal calls for a student growth measure based on statewide assessments and it is currently under development. Based on the 12/8 phone call, Non-Race to the Top districts are not currently required to use the statewide approach.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Complete development of the student growth measure. Develop a mechanism for ensuring statewide implementation.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	No text

(iii) For grades and subjects in which assessments are not required under ESEA section 1111(b)(3), does the SEA either specify the measures of student growth that LEAs must use or select from or plan to provide guidance to LEAs on what measures of student growth are appropriate, and establish a system for ensuring that LEAs will use valid measures?

3.A.ii.c(iii) PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 3 Yes, 4 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE has specified the use of student learning objectives (SLO) for non-tested grades and subjects and developed a process for their validation.
<i>Strengths</i>	GaDOE has developed a rubric for evaluating and approving district-developed SLO's.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The proposed rubric for setting SLO's is not included in the proposal. The proposal does not include evidence of valid instruments from which one can infer that educators contributed to the changes in student performance as measured by those instruments. If SLO's have the attributes of the example provided in the proposal, there may be unintended consequences during pre-test administration.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	One consideration for the further development of the state's model is to address the possible unintended consequences during pre-test administration.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

d. Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis?

3.A.ii.d PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 7 Yes, 0 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	Per the State's ESEA Waiver Application, teachers and leaders will be evaluated annually.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

- e. Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback, including feedback that identifies needs and guides professional development?
- *Will the SEA's guidelines ensure that evaluations occur with a frequency sufficient to ensure that feedback is provided in a timely manner to inform effective practice?*
 - *Are the SEA's guidelines likely to result in differentiated professional development that meets the needs of teachers?*

3.A.ii.e PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	The proposal asserts that the systems will result in timely and useful feedback to guide classroom/school performance and professional learning but does not describe how the system will operate to do so.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	In the further development of the guidelines include expectations and support for evaluators to provide useful feedback on a regular basis.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

- f. Will be used to inform personnel decisions?

3.A.ii.f PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Rationale</i>	GaDOE asserts that its evaluation systems will be used to inform personnel decision and provides some examples of how they will do so and for what decisions.
<i>Strengths</i>	GaDOE intends to implement a performance based compensation system in 2013-14 in Race to the Top districts. GaDOE plans to provide relocation incentives based on teacher effectiveness to encourage movement to high need areas.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	In its Plan, GaDOE has identified a limited range of uses for using its evaluation data for making personnel decisions.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Further articulate how the evaluation system will inform a broader range of personnel decisions.
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option C</i>	

3. B Ensure LEAs Implement Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems

3.B Is the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines likely to lead to high-quality local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems?

- *Does the SEA have a process for reviewing and approving an LEA's teacher and principal evaluation and support systems to ensure that they are consistent with the SEA's guidelines and will result in the successful implementation of such systems?*
- *Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that an LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements its teacher and principal evaluation and support systems with the involvement of teachers and principals?*
- *Did the SEA describe the process it will use to ensure that all measures used in an LEA's evaluation and support systems are valid, meaning measures that are clearly related to increasing student academic achievement and school performance, and are implemented in a consistent and high-quality manner across schools within an LEA?*
- *Is the SEA's plan likely to be successful in ensuring that LEAs meet the timeline requirements by either (1) piloting evaluation and support systems no later than the 2013–2014 school year and implementing evaluation and support systems consistent with the requirements described above no later than the 2014–2015 school year; or (2) implementing these systems no later than the 2013–2014 school year?*
- *Do timelines reflect a clear understanding of what steps will be necessary and reflect a logical sequencing and spacing of the key steps necessary to implement evaluation and support systems consistent with the required timelines?*
- *Is the SEA plan for providing adequate guidance and other technical assistance to LEAs in developing and implementing teacher and principal evaluation and support systems likely to lead to successful implementation?*
- *Is the pilot broad enough to gain sufficient feedback from a variety of types of educators, schools, and classrooms to inform full implementation of the LEA's evaluation and support systems?*

3.B PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> <i>0 Yes, 7 No</i>	
<i>Rationale</i>	The proposal identifies activities planned to support district implementation, but does not provide sufficient guidance and accountability for implementation.
<i>Strengths</i>	GaDOE will hire and train 15 trainers to work directly with the Race to the Districts to support effective implementation and later with up to 60 additional districts.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	The guidelines for statewide LEA implementation are not yet developed. The proposal does not provide documentation of the technical assistance that will be required to implement a comprehensive and coherent statewide system.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Develop more comprehensive guidelines that will provide the level of guidance districts will need to implement the new educator evaluation system effectively. Develop and implement a strategy for ensuring effective statewide implementation of the guidelines.

Principle 3 Overall Review

Is the SEA's plan for the SEA's and LEAs' development and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation and support systems comprehensive, coherent, and likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

PRINCIPLE 3 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE <i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> <i>0 Yes, 7 No</i>	
<i>Rationale</i>	Georgia's Race to the Top Plan is the foundation for its proposed work on educator evaluation in response to the requirements of the ESEA Waiver. While work is well underway on the development of specific components of its evaluation system, that work would be strengthened by articulating more comprehensive and coherent guidance on how the overall system is to be implemented at the state, district and school levels.

PRINCIPLE 3 OVERALL REVIEW	
PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Tally of Peer Responses:</i> 0 Yes, 7 No	
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The teacher and leader performance standards and accompanying rubrics are a strong foundation for developing a more comprehensive evaluation system that incorporates student learning in a significant way.</p> <p>The emphasis on piloting and further developing a robust induction model will support new educators as they work to improve their practice.</p> <p>A substantial investment of Race to the Top resources is being made to support training of evaluators from the 26 RTT pilot districts.</p> <p>A rubric for setting student learning objectives (SLOs) has been developed and disseminated.</p>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<p>Sufficient data is frequently not included to give the panel confidence that the state's current and proposed guidelines will adequately link evaluation system data with improvements in instruction.</p> <p>There is no plan evident to articulate an operational framework that undergirds a comprehensive educator evaluation system.</p> <p>The plan does not currently articulate how performance levels will be applied across multiple measures and combined into an overall rating.</p> <p>The proposal is silent on the how some of the proposed measures will be validated at the state and district level.</p>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>The state should consider reworking its proposed guidelines to include a conceptual and operational framework along with more detail on how the evaluation system will inform instruction and improve student achievement.</p>

Overall Request Evaluation

Did the SEA provide a comprehensive and coherent approach for implementing the waivers and principles in its request for the flexibility? Overall, is implementation of the SEA’s approach likely to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement? If not, what aspects are not addressed or need to be improved upon?

OVERALL REQUEST EVALUATION PANEL RESPONSE	
Rationale	GaDOE has in place promising efforts to transition to the new college and career ready standards. However, the plans for the accountability system proposed in Principle 2 and the Educator Evaluation system proposed in Principle 3 are incomplete at this time.

OVERALL REQUEST**EVALUATION PANEL RESPONSE***Strengths**Principle 1:*

GaDOE has laid a strong foundation for the transition through its phasing out of the old graduation requirements, bringing in end-of-course examinations at the high school level, and partnering with the American Diploma Project and Georgia postsecondary institutions to ensure high school assessments have college ready indicators.

Outreach and dissemination to build awareness of the new standards have been strong.

Instructional plans for addressing the transition to the new standards is strong, including for teachers of students with disabilities or English learners.

The proposal acknowledges the different levels of professional development required for ELA and mathematics.

Development and dissemination of instructional materials for each grade and subject is likely to result in stronger educator capacity to teach to the common core standards.

GaDOE's reorganization that established a "college readiness unit" is evidence of coherence around the goal of college and career readiness for all students.

Principle 2:

The proposed indicators within the CCRPI are meaningful measures of college and career readiness.

The Factors for Success and Star Ratings for financial efficiency and school climate will provide additional meaningful public information.

The turnaround interventions include a clear articulation of district responsibilities for their priority and focus schools, many of which align with the turnaround principles, including data analysis, professional development, different use of time for students and teachers, and an expectation of assessing the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in priority schools.

Principle 3:

The teacher and leader performance standards and accompanying rubrics are a strong foundation for developing a more comprehensive evaluation system that incorporates student learning in a significant way.

The emphasis on piloting and further developing a robust induction model will support new educators as they work to improve their practice.

A substantial investment of Race to the Top resources is being made to support training of evaluators from the 26 RTT pilot districts.

A rubric for setting student learning objectives (SLOs) has been developed and disseminated.

OVERALL REQUEST EVALUATION PANEL RESPONSE	
<p><i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i></p>	<p><i>Principle 1:</i> Limited attention to professional development and support for principals to lead the transition work; however some panel members appreciated that GaDOE is using lessons learned to change its approach to principal support.</p> <p>Limited information is provided about IHE’s role in supporting the transition to the new standards.</p> <p><i>Principle 2:</i> Critical elements of the accountability system have not yet been defined, including the weighting of the numerous indicators within the CCRPI, targets for Expected and Exemplary benchmarks on the indicators, and the student growth model.</p> <p>Members of the panel are concerned about the lack of status achievement for subgroups within the CCRPI calculation, especially in light of the fact that the status achievement is expected to be weighted heavily (roughly 70% per the state phone call on 12/8). While the system of Performance Flags for subgroups will provide valuable public reporting, some members of the panel feel that status achievement for subgroups must be represented within the indicators that will drive primary accountability determinations, supports, and interventions. In addition, some members of the panel are concerned that the metrics for the within-school gap calculation, particularly identifying top performers as students at the 75th percentile threshold, are too low.</p> <p>The panel is concerned that the improvement criteria identified for exiting priority and focus status are insufficient, both in rigor and duration. Moreover, there are no clear consequences for multiple, consecutive years of identification as priority or focus school.</p> <p>There are no defined expectations for achievement, or defined supports and interventions, for districts.</p> <p><i>Principle 3:</i> Sufficient data is frequently not included to give the panel confidence that the state’s current and proposed guidelines will adequately link evaluation system data with improvements in instruction.</p> <p>There is no plan evident to articulate an operational framework that undergirds a comprehensive educator evaluation system.</p> <p>The plan does not currently articulate how performance levels will be applied across multiple measures and combined into an overall rating.</p> <p>The proposal is silent on the how some of the proposed measures will be validated at the state and district level.</p>

OVERALL REQUEST	
EVALUATION PANEL RESPONSE	
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	