ESEA Flexibility

Peer Panel Notes

State Request: Idaho

Date: 3/27/12

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
Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• The Idaho State Department of Education (ISDE) meaningfully engaged and solicited input from teachers and their representatives throughout the process of developing its request for ESEA flexibility using focus groups, stakeholder meetings and a public website. Stakeholders included ISDE representatives, legislators, parents, business leaders, community members, school board associations, associations of school administrators, the Idaho Education Association (IEA) and other groups. • ISDE provided a variety of communications to build awareness of the flexibility plans, and directly involved teachers and their representative organizations in review and input sessions. Attachment 2 (pp. 2-21, *Public Comments for Suggested Change and ISDE response*) documents the interaction, including ISDE's responses to issues raised or needed clarification. • ISDE noted that significant modifications were made based on the input of stakeholders.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Strengths	• Various technological media were used to disseminate information regarding the flexibility request including a public comment website, Twitter, a blog, and Facebook. The education community was well represented in the person of teachers, principals, superintendents, parents, students, board members and legislators, and representatives of professional education organizations, colleges and universities, correctional institutions, advocacy groups for students with disabilities, children's homes, the Indian Education Committee, the Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs, and so on. Special education and English Learner representatives were involved. All stakeholder comments and ISDE's responses are included in the appendix and summarized on pages 15-16 of the request. • While the timeline was constrained, it appears that ISDE made a concerted effort to build awareness of the flexibility request and invite comment on its development as described in the Consultation Plan to Engage Stakeholders and the chart on pages 10-13. Of particular note is the review of the draft request by the Committee of Practitioners and the Special Education Advisory Panel. • The ISDE used multiple outreach approaches from face to face meetings to calls to webinars to solicit feedback on the request. • State Superintendent Luna was heavily involved in public meetings and other aspects of stakeholder input.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Although interaction with tribal schools was mentioned in other sections of the request and a few comments regarding tribal schools were reported, the mechanism for involving tribal schools was not adequately described. Since many tribal schools are One-Star schools under Idaho's accountability system, their input is particularly important. • Given the rural demographics of the State, the heavy reliance on technology is a logical choice, but no evidence is provided that all stakeholders had access and opportunity to give input on the request. • While ISDE should consider all feedback, it is not obligated to make every change requested. The statement that ISDE "addressed all concerns" (p. 14) is an inaccurate statement and implies that the balance of power between ISDE and stakeholders may be tilted to stakeholders.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• It may enhance stakeholder buy-in and support of successful implementation if ISDE were to publicize the process used to synthesize stakeholder input and the changes that were made to ISDE's request based upon that input. • ISDE should provide evidence of participation by key stakeholder groups by the various mechanisms for input to determine if mechanisms were differentially effective in reaching target groups. • ISDE should develop plans to continue to solicit stakeholder input throughout development and implementation of activities related to all three principles.

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
Tally of Peer Responses: 5 Yes, 1 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE met with several types of stakeholder groups, including those organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, for input and feedback on the flexibility request. Feedback that was received was integrated into the flexibility request. • The consultation process allowed for a broad range of stakeholder input in a variety of ways (focus groups, a website, and formal meetings) throughout the process of developing the request and to respond to the final draft. Brief mention is made of the involvement of tribal affairs, but specific efforts to engage tribal representatives were not explained. • No evidence of meeting with parents and community-based organizations was presented.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Strengths	• ISDE's draft request was posted on ISDE's website and the public had 21 days to comment on it. • ISDE held focus group discussions with five key stakeholder groups; each focus group consisted of six to eight individuals and lasted about one hour and 15 minutes. The focus group was led by an independent third party who reviewed the waiver process with participants and then asked for reactions to and input on each section. ISDE staff was on hand to answer clarifying questions, take notes, and audio record each meeting. Each focus group consisted of community members (parents, legislators, community groups, and the business community), school board trustees, local superintendents and district-level administrators, teachers and principals, and State Board of Education members. Key education stakeholder groups – the Idaho Education Association, the Idaho Association of School Administrators, the Idaho School Boards Association, and the Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs – selected participants for these focus groups. Evidence is provided regarding changes made based on input from diverse groups (p.15 and att. 2). Special education, English Learner advocates and Hispanic Affairs were consulted. ISDE is on record for inviting input from American Indian populations and schools; however, the response was limited (att. 2 and p. 12).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Limited evidence of meeting with community-based organizations or parents was presented. • Diversity of the parents involved and the type of communities represented were not clear. • Brief mention is made of the involvement of tribal affairs. It does seem that the public comment option elicited responses related to One-Star schools on tribal lands, but specific efforts to engage tribal representatives were not explained in detail.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should specify the process it used to solicit input from tribal schools and justify that the heavy reliance on electronic dissemination effectively reached all target groups, including representatives of students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-achieving students. • ISDE should clearly outline future plans for outreach to parents and advocacy groups for students with disabilities, English Learners, low-achieving and Native American students. • ISDE should develop plans to solicit stakeholder input, including from diverse groups, throughout development and implementation of the activities related to all three principles.

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   **Part A:** 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?

Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.

1.B Panel Response, Part A
Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes, 4 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• The SEA will transition to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) by 2013-2014. Over the next two years, ISDE will build capacity at the SEA, district and school levels to ensure the transition to the CCSS increases the quality of instruction in every classroom and raises achievement for all students. • ISDE is a governing member of the SMARTER Balanced assessment consortium. All of the State's institutions of higher education (IHEs) agreed to participate and to place all students who meet achievement standards for proficiency on the State's high school assessments into credit bearing courses. Implementation is linked to changes in teacher and administrator evaluation systems and a new instructional management system that are under development and unlikely to be operational by 2013-2014.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Strengths	• ISDE analyzed the alignment between Idaho's current standards and the CCSS in mathematics and English/language arts (ELA). Results of the gap analysis were used to inform the public and to build a plan for transitioning to the CCSS. • Various types of professional development have been offered throughout the State for teachers and administrators to prepare for the transition to the new system. • ISDE will adopt the World-Class Instructional Design in Assessment (WIDA) English Language Development (ELD) standards in 2013-14. • Teachers and administrators will be required to take Mathematical Thinking for Instruction (MTI) course for re-certification. • ISDE received verification from each IHE and from business leaders that students meeting proficiency levels on the CCSS would be prepared for postsecondary education and the workforce. ISDE worked with Idaho Association of Colleges of Teacher Education to ensure that the CCSS will be integrated into teacher preparation programs. • The SEA has conducted extensive outreach on college- and career-ready standards to build support among leaders from the business community, higher education, and multiple other stakeholder groups (pp. 26-27).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• No mention of ELA was made in Principle 1. ISDE does not provide evidence of professional development offerings for ELA. • It is unclear how the information acquired in the gap analysis was used in aligning or creating new curricular materials. • The legislature will not adopt the WIDA ELP standards until January 2013. . A timeline for implementation of WIDA standards is presented but it is vague and possibly unrealistic. • It is unclear whether ISDE has the resources and capacity to provide the professional development and support necessary to transition to and implement the CCSS. Schoolnet assessment tools will not be available in all districts until 2015-16, a year after the new assessments are implemented.

7

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE needs to provide more detail with respect to ensuring that teachers will be prepared to implement the CCSS by 2013-14. ISDE should also consider providing more detail with respect to how it will ensure that teachers will be prepared to implement the WIDA standards after their adoption. ISDE should describe the mechanisms used to offer professional development and implementation support and the resources and capacity that will be available for these tasks. • ISDE should consider what stopgaps will be in place to disseminate assessment tools and resources in the period before they are available on Schoolnet. • ISDE should consider how and when to revise certification assessments to align with the CCSS. ISDE should ensure there are plans in place to evaluate the success of the SEA's comprehensive transition plan.

Part B: Is the SEA's plan likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with the college- and career-ready standards?

Note to Peers: See ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance for additional considerations related to the types of activities an SEA includes in its transition plan.

1.B Panel Response, Part B
Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes, 4 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• Over the next two years, ISDE will build capacity at the SEA, district and school levels to ensure the transition to the CCSS increases the quality of instruction in every classroom and raises achievement for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students. Implementation is linked to changes in teacher and administrator evaluation systems and a new instructional management system that are under development and unlikely to be operational by 2013-2014.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Strengths	• There is a focus on adopting WIDA ELP standards and implementing them in 2013-14. A needs assessment was conducted to better serve English Learners and resulted in improving ELP program services by developing the Idaho Toolkit and organizing ELP standards workshops. The toolkit provides districts with historical foundations, legal requirements for teaching English Learners, content standards, research on effective and culturally responsive programs and instructional practices for English Learners. • ISDE will assist school districts and public charter schools in implementing the learning and accommodation strategies necessary to ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to achieve college- and career-ready standards. • ISDE has a strong plan for ensuring that students with disabilities have the opportunity to achieve to the new standards through the use of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), including a database of lesson plans aligned to the standards that are UDL-compliant, and integration of technology into all classrooms. • Conducting local gap analyses between implementation of Idaho's current content standards and the CCSS provides a good baseline for working with local schools. • ISDE, with new supporting legislation (Students Come First), is exploring text to speech technology to support inclusion of students with disabilities (p. 24). • The plan includes solid provisions for professional development involving all classroom teachers as they transition to the implementation of the CCSS, with a focus on teachers of English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students. Response-to-Intervention (RTI), Schoolnet and classroom technology integration will be helpful to this effort (pp. 30-33). • The plan includes thoughtful professional development for principals (p. 42). • Superintendents who serve a high percentage of at-risk students will receive first priority for joining a professional learning community for school administrators (p. 43). • ISDE has acquired significant financial resources to support its professional development effort. • The SEA works well with IHEs to ensure that they understand the new standards, expand opportunities for high school students, develop teacher preparation programs that are aligned to the new standards and prepare effective teachers for all students.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The request does not indicate that ISDE will develop high quality instructional materials aligned with the new standards. • The specific processes for conducting gap analyses and supporting students with disabilities to master the CCSS is not clear. UDL is mentioned, but the extent of implementation and how it will be deployed is not clearly described. Assessment tools will not be available until 2015-16 and Schoolnet resources will not be available until 2015-2016. The timeline does not seem consistent with the narrative (p.25). It is not clear how the rubrics described in the timeline will be used or by whom. Plans for supporting English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students are not clearly described. • While ISDE has considered the needs of English Learners and students with disabilities, it appears that representatives of those groups are not always integrated into the mainstream of awareness and professional development initiatives. ISDE sent 10 stakeholders to a national conference on CCSS adoption and no special education representative was included (p. 27).
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• Specific plans for supporting English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students should be clearly developed and publicized to schools. ISDE should reconsider its timeline for implementing ELD standards; given that the WIDA ELD standards will not be adopted until 2013, it is unlikely that implementation will be achieved by 2013-2014 without extraordinary intervention. ISDE should consider clarifying how its professional development activities for K-12 and IHEs will be coordinated toward a common goal. ISDE should align timelines for local alignment, adoption, professional development and technical assistance activities. Plans for transitioning the assessment systems should be clearly detailed. • ISDE should consider what stopgaps will be in place to disseminate assessment tools, instructional materials and resources in the period before they are available on Schoolnet. Perhaps the Idaho Education Network (IEN) could be used as an interim delivery mechanism. • ISDE should consider what will be used in lieu of standard assessments if the waiver requested in Principle 2 to remove certain English Learners from achievement calculations is granted.

10

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
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 1.C, Option A or Option C*
Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

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

Tally of Peer Responses: 3 Yes, 3 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE has taken several important steps for transitioning to and implementing college-and career-ready standards and developing and administering annual assessments that measure student growth via professional development for teachers and administrators, teacher preparation programs, working with IHEs, and being a part of the SMARTER Balanced assessment consortium. • While the plan addresses all of the major components, sufficient detail on mechanisms to support and monitor implementation is not provided. It is not clear that ISDE has adequate resources or robust capacity to enable it to achieve the very demanding timelines of the plan.
Strengths	• ISDE has established timelines for implementing college-and career-ready standards. There are many professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators. The standards will be integrated into teacher preparation programs. ISDE is adding interim assessments that can guide instruction and raise achievement for all students. • Dual credit is a good approach to addressing concerns about students not going on to higher education (p. 45). • The IEN may be a useful tool for students, particularly in rural areas, that can provide exceptional opportunities and instill love of learning (p. 45).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• While the plan addresses all of the major requirements, the specific strategies for supporting implementation are not discussed. It is troubling that Schoolnet resources will not be available until after the implementation deadline. It is unclear that ISDE resources are sufficient to conduct the planned professional development. • The rationale for choosing Fractional Average Daily Attendance (ADA) warrants further explanation with regard to its impact on dual enrollment (p. 46). Peers expressed concern that it could create a disincentive that could limit participation in dual enrollment and may have a negative impact on funding for K-12 schools.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should identify priorities and benchmarks for implementation, given the very ambitious timeline. Specific strategies for delivering professional development and monitoring implementation should be provided. Mechanisms for coordinating the multitude of professional development efforts at SEA and local levels should be explicit to ensure that they are directed at the same goal and well deployed across the State. • ISDE should consider other options to encourage dual enrollment other than fractional ADA.

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? (*note to Peers, please write to this question after completing 2.A.i.a and 2.A.i.b*)

2.A.i Panel Response
Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes, 4 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE's plan has many laudable features, but lacks sufficient grounding in empirical data and is dependent upon very high levels of ISDE support to local schools and districts. Specific plans for delivering the support are not provided and it is unclear that ISDE has sufficient capacity and resources to provide the level of support required to meet the ambitious timeline. Sufficient detail is not provided regarding how achievement gaps will be closed and strategies for including and reporting students with disabilities and English Learners in the accountability system are not described.
Strengths	• ISDE proposes a single accountability system to be used for all schools regardless of Title I status. The Five Star system uses four metrics: (1) absolute performance, (2) academic growth, (3) growth to standards for all and target groups, and (4) post-secondary and career readiness. Support mechanisms focus on lowest-performing students and schools. ISDE has had declining numbers of schools identified for improvement since 2008, increasing student achievement, higher than average NAEP scores and modest gains for students with disabilities and English Learners. ISDE has established a commitment to working with local districts. ISDE has included demonstrably effective components (Colorado's Growth Model, the WISE tool, the Center on Innovation and Improvement's (CII) dashboard) into the system. • ISDE has a strong plan for increasing graduation rate that includes administering college entrance and placement examinations to all 11th graders (p. 66) and promoting advanced opportunities such as Advanced Placement and dual enrollment (p. 67).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The Five star criteria are not empirically validated or linked to attainment of annual measurable objectives (AMOs) or other performance descriptors. Plans for providing support linked to the needs of individual schools are not specific. Specific strategies for closing the achievement gap are not identified (p.58, Table 5). • ISDE does not indicate how it will monitor the integrity of its system, specifically how it will assess whether individual measures contribute to overall scores in a way that is transparent and promotes effective practices

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
	at the school and district level to improve student outcomes. • ISDE's system includes both standards-based and normative data. More development of the system is needed to ensure that the benefits of this dual-prong strategy is realized.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide validation for criteria used to determine star status and weighting of the various measures in the accountability system. One possible strategy would be for ISDE to develop performance-based descriptors for each of the Five-Star levels. • ISDE should provide evidence of the effectiveness of key components of the accountability system for achieving subgroup improvement, given modest improvement for some subgroups in the State. • ISDE should clarify the extent to which its system balances standards-based versus normative performance data. It may be useful to involve the TAC or other experts in determining the best way to blend the methods.

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: *2 Yes, 4 No*

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE's accountability system is unified and is based upon the three components described above; however, the rationale and/or empirical bases for point allocations (on a 1-5 scale) are not clear. Measures and metrics for career readiness are not robust. Plans for accommodating students with disabilities or English Learners on SAT and ACCUPLACER or offering alternative assessments on these or the State assessments are not detailed. It is not clear how professional development, technical assistance or other supports will be coordinated or staged.

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Strengths	• ISDE's accountability systems (for the transition period and then the new system) include four measures as well as the rate of participation in State assessments. The four measures are: (1) reading, mathematics, and language arts proficiency designations, (2) graduation rates, (3) growth and growth toward proficiency for all students and subgroups, and (4) college readiness. The Five-Star rating scale is easily understood by educators and the public. Accountability measures are described in Table 4 (p. 57). Metrics and measures are described. Strategies for determining school and district targets are provided. All 11th graders will take SAT or ACCUPLACER. ISDE will pay for dual enrollment up to 36 credits (p. 65). There is a timeline and plan for integrating the two systems. An accountability report card will be issued annually. The differentiated system of support includes differentiated rewards, sanctions, and consequences. The WISE tool is used to guide the improvement planning process. Diagnostic reviews will be conducted to assess local capacity. The ISDE Statewide System of Support is already established and will be used to provide professional development and technical assistance. Rewards and sanctions are defined at the district and school levels. • Support mechanisms for all schools and districts focus with the greatest intensity on the lowest-performing districts. The Statewide System of Support's processes and programs are charged with determining what the lowest-performing schools and districts need, matching resources and supports to those needs, and working to build the capacity of a district in order to improve the outcomes of its schools. Minimum "n size" for the purpose of public reporting is set at 10 (p.63) to ensure transparency of all students' performance. The use of a growth model strengthens the system compared to using only achievement of all students and subgroups. ISDE says it is emphasizing moving students who are farthest behind faster than their peers (pp. 100 and 106). This is important in order to close achievement gaps. The Adequate Student Growth Percentile (AGP) within the Growth to Achievement and Growth to Achievement Gaps metrics requires more growth by those students that are further behind in order to make adequate growth.

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The rationale or empirical bases for the point allocation (1-5) are not described. For example, on pages 68-69, it appears that since 0 is not a valid score in the system, schools that obtained the lowest rating on a single measure could actually achieve Four or Five-Star status. • If the additional waiver request related to English Learners (discussed in the request as limited English Proficient (LEP) students) is granted, English Learners will be excluded from proficiency calculations in reading and ELA for three years. Plans for accommodating English Learners or students with disabilities on SAT or ACCUPLACER or providing alternative assessments are not provided. Career readiness metrics are lacking. Although the extensive System of Statewide Support is an advantage, it is not clear how services will be coordinated or staged to achieve the desired outcomes. One-Star schools may have difficulty negotiating this complex system without assistance. • The statement that ISDE's system addresses the needs of students who are low-achieving but not in a designated subgroup is compelling but it is not clear how this will be implemented (p. 55). • The explanation for including subgroups on page 62, coupled with the reduction in "n size", seems to be a reasonable strategy for promoting inclusion of subgroups, but ISDE should carefully monitor the unintended consequences, ensure that the needs of all minority groups are accurately represented, and document that this strategy brings more students into the accountability system while promoting effective service delivery. • Clear communication and user guides will be needed to ensure the system's transparency beyond the overall Star rating and to facilitate desired improvements in instruction and student achievement for school and district efforts. • ISDE did not provide a clear rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new system. The rationale for the median AGP is a combination of median student growth percentile (SGP), a normative measure relative to the growth of other schools with similarly performing students in the State, and AGP, which is criterion-referenced growth relative to the proficiency target for each student – so AGP seems to be defined two different ways. • It is not clear that it is educationally sound to use a normative measure of growth relative to performance of similarly performing schools. If all schools in the comparison group are performing poorly, then this seems to be formalizing low expectations based on the status quo, rather than setting the stage for improvements. • Given that the Idaho Student Longitudinal Data System has been in existence just one and a half years, a longitudinal comparison is not possible at this time. Also, some metrics, such as college entrance or placement examinations have not yet been administered, so data are not available for all students. Therefore, all metrics that were available were set based on a 2010-11 data and current Idaho State Board of Education strategic goals. It is clear that longitudinal performance will provide a more complete picture and that will allow the State to set new targets that more accurately reflect higher standards.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide a rationale or empirical basis for point allocations (1-5 point system). It would be helpful to have projections based on existing data to justify the cut points proposed. • Potential positive and negative consequences associated with the collapsing of subgroups into a single "high risk" category in the accountability system should be considered in more detail. • Plans for coordinating and staging support to One- and Two-Star schools should be linked to desired outcomes in those schools using a theory of action or other rubric. • It would be useful to understand the recent reorganization of ISDE and how offices and departments are now better organized to work together to implement this plan. • ISDE should develop and deliver clear communication and user guides to ensure the system's transparency beyond the star rating and to facilitate desired effects on school and district efforts. • ISDE should carefully monitor the unintended consequences, ensure that needs of all minority groups are addressed, and document that this strategy brings more students into the accountability system while promoting effective service delivery. • ISDE should provide a clear rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the Five-Star system. ISDE should consider the consequences of using a normative measure of growth relative to the performance of similarly performing schools, particularly with respect to whether ISDE is institutionalizing low expectations for students in low-achieving schools. When longitudinal data become available in the State, ISDE should recalibrate any metrics within its system based on longitudinal data.

b. Does the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system create incentives and provide support that is likely to be effective in closing achievement gaps for all subgroups of students?

2.A.i.b Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE's plan for recognition, accountability and support has many meritorious components, utilizes valid tools and support systems, and is differentiated for different types of schools, but too little empirical evidence is provided to support its effectiveness in closing achievement gaps. The plans for including students with disabilities and English Learners in the accountability system are underdeveloped.
Strengths	• Four- and Five-star schools are afforded more flexibility in planning and in the use of discretionary funds. This serves as a positive incentive for schools to continue their improvement efforts. For example, a school that reaches the Four Star category has demonstrated effective school performance and can choose the type of planning process for continued improvement. The school may choose to use a planning tool outside of the State system. Further, there is no requirement for school choice or supplemental tutoring services, but the school can provide these if they best serve given student needs (p. 94).ISDE has lowered the minimum "n size" to 25 for making accountability determinations. This lowering of the threshold will serve to highlight achievement gaps that may have previously been masked by low "n size" counts. ISDE states that the Statewide System of Support has effectively raised achievement and reduced numbers of low-performing schools since implementation. ISDE utilizes proven tools (WISE, CII's dashboard) to support implementation at the local level.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The Statewide System of Support is extensive, but it is not clear how it will be coordinated or staged so as not to overwhelm One-Star schools. English Learners are excluded from reading and ELA accountability determination for the first three years of schooling. Students with disabilities and English Learners must adhere to standard accommodations for SAT and ACUPLACER; no alternative assessments are identified. Strategies for monitoring statewide implementation of the system are not provided. • It is not clear what ISDE means by saying that schools that are "nearing" expectations receive the same incentives as those that meet or exceed them. This is potentially problematic, depending on how "nearing" is defined (p.94). • As presented, proposed incentives might not suffice to encourage schools to aspire to the top two star levels.

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide the evidence of the effectiveness of the Statewide System of Support for closing achievement gaps, especially for subgroups, which have shown only modest improvements since 2008. • ISDE should describe how the Statewide System of Support will be coordinated or staged so that schools have access to the right supports at the right time to meet identified needs. • ISDE should explain how students with disabilities and English Learners who are excluded from the assessment system are represented in the accountability system. • ISDE should describe the strategy it will use to monitor statewide implementation of the various components of the system at the local level. • ISDE should provide additional incentives that might further encourage schools to aspire to the highest star levels.

c. *Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.A.i.c*
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?

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

b. 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?

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

2.A.ii.b PANEL RESPONSE

☒ Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.A, Option A

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

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 through one of the three options below?

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?

i.   Did the SEA provide the new AMOs and the method used to set these AMOs?

ii.   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, Option C (including Questions i–iv) Panel Response
☐ Not applicable because the SEA selected 2.B, Option A or Option B
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE states that the AMOs in its system are imbedded in each of the metrics in the matrix as well as the overall performance measure for schools and districts (p. 98); however, ISDE did not include in its request achievement targets that were set separately in ELA and mathematics for the State and all districts, schools, and subgroups. The peers' comments on the metrics in ISDE's matrix are set forth above in Section 2.A.
Strengths	• None indicated.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• ISDE did not present the AMOs as defined by ESEA Flexibility guidelines. These must be submitted for both mathematics and ELA.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE must establish and validate, at a minimum, AMOs, as defined in the ESEA flexibility guidance, in mathematics and ELA.

2.C   Reward Schools

2.C.i   Did the SEA describe its methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools?

2.C.i PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: NA

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE will replace its current reward system with a single reward for all schools that earn Five-Star school status. The methodology used to identify reward schools is identical to that used for identification in the Five-Star accountability system. The methodology for differentiating between highest performing school and high progress schools is not described.
Strengths	• The criterion for Five-Star status is very high and therefore recognizes outstanding performance.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• It is not clear that Title I schools will actually be included in Five-Star status.

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

2.C.iii   Are the recognition and, if applicable rewards, proposed by the SEA for its highest-performing and high-progress schools likely to be considered meaningful by the schools?

➢   *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: 1Yes, 5 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE will replace its current reward system with one reward for all schools that earn "Five Star School" status under ISDE's next-generation accountability system. In this brief section, it is not clear that the rewards proposed are considered meaningful by the highest performing and high progress schools. It is not clear if high-performing schools participated in the focus groups to determine recognition and rewards.
Strengths	• Five-Star schools will be recognized through statewide announcement, school wide assemblies, and a symbol of recognition. Teachers and leaders may earn "pay for performance" bonuses. • A school must be a Five Star School in order to be nominated for national awards, such as the National Blue Ribbon Award or Distinguished School Awards. In addition, staff in Five-Star Schools will receive financial rewards. ISDE has implemented a Statewide pay-for-performance plan for certificated staff at school buildings. One way in which staff can earn pay-for-performance bonuses is if entire schools reach specific achievement or normative growth goals. In refining the awards system, ISDE consulted extensively with members of the Idaho State Board of Education, representatives of the community, and representative of districts in focus groups in determining the key ways in which to recognize schools and districts. Additionally, ISDE plans to conduct two (regional) focus groups in Spring 2012 with stakeholders to solicit suggestions for additional reward strategies for high-performing schools and to assess the potential support (as well as the likelihood of being able to implement same) for the additional strategies that are put forth. The goal of this effort is to determine a richer, fuller range of potential rewards (p.107).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The application states that "representatives of districts" participating in focus groups were asked about key ways to recognize schools and districts, but no data are provided to substantiate the choices made. Extent of participation of high performing/high progress schools in the focus groups is not clear. • The achievement of Five-Stars is not defined in terms of standards-based achievement. Communities and schools, students and parents need to know in concrete standards terms what it means to achieve a Five-Star rating.

24

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide a more detailed analysis of district - and school input into the reward system for highest performing and high progress schools. • ISDE should consider ways in which the reward designation could benefit students, such as transcript designation, that may be helpful when they apply for postsecondary education. • ISDE should consider other options for recognition such as publishing names of Five-Star schools in local papers, providing certificates of success to educators AND students, partnering with local businesses for rewards, such as free pizza or bowling, etc.

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

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE will have each One-Star school and --its district develop turnaround plans using the WISE tool, but the resources and supports necessary to do this are not well described.
Strengths	• Every One-Star school is required to submit a turnaround plan with the assistance of the SEA and a turnaround coach. The WISE tool must be used by both schools and districts as a basis for their turnaround plans. • The ISDE has defined a comprehensive range of interventions from school closure to a transformational model that focuses on specific improvement targets, such as leadership development. These options could enable districts to choose the most efficient and effective set of interventions. • The SEA has demonstrated that it will take steps to ensure 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 (through new State law that was enacted in 2011); and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs (p. 113). • The SEA has demonstrated that schools will use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data (p. 115); • The total number of One-Star schools identified in the preliminary data equals 5.29% of the Title I schools in Idaho and includes 29 schools.One-Star schools meet the definition of a priority school as found under the Peer Review Guidance. The One-Star schools, although based on a multitude of measures rather than just achievement, include the same lowest five percent of Title I schools in terms of all student proficiency, all Title I or Title I eligible schools with a graduation rate of less than 60%, and the Tier I and Tier II schools currently using SIG funds to implement school intervention models with very few exceptions (pp. 108-109).

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• There are several turnaround models mentioned in the plan. It is not clear who selects which turnaround model is best for a school or the criteria for selection. It is not clear whether SEAs or districts have sufficient resources to monitor the development or implementation of the plan. • While One-Star schools must review the performance of the current principal, it does not state that the criteria used for deciding whether to retain her/him is based on her/his track record of improving achievement and having the ability to lead the turnaround effort. It is also not clear that principals will be provided with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget. • The SEA has demonstrated that One-Star schools add time for collaboration but the time comes before and after school and does not appear to include a redesign of the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration. • It is not clear the extent to which strengthening the school's instructional program is based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards (p. 114). • The provisions related to 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 appears to emphasize manners and school culture but does not address safety and discipline concerns (pp. 115-16). • The mechanisms for family and community engagement, such as maintaining a file of communication, seem perfunctory and insufficient. It is unclear what is meant by "frequent opportunities" for engagement to be offered by the principal.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should describe in more detail how State and local resources will be allocated to assist districts and schools in the development and implementation of turnaround plans. • ISDE should clarify and make it explicit that the criteria used for deciding whether to retain a principal is based on her/his track record of improving achievement and having the ability to lead the turnaround effort (p. 113). • ISDE should clarify that in every case (not just "if necessary"); principals will be provided with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum, and budget. • Given the newness of the State law, it would be helpful to know the progress of implementation to date. For example, how often have principals refused the hire or transfer of a teacher to date? • ISDE should provide detail on how they plan to monitor the extent to which schools actually strengthen the instructional program based on student needs and ensure that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards (p. 114). • ISDE should specify the kinds of "frequent opportunities" offered by the principal for parent and community engagement. "Community" should be defined as more than just "staff" of the school and include external individuals and organizations, rather than just internal, input, feedback and involvement (p. 116).

b. Are the identified interventions to be implemented in priority schools 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?

29

2.D.iii.b (including questions (i)-(iii)) Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 0Yes,6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• The WISE tool will serve as the basis of turnaround planning. The WISE tool is designed to improve instruction through research based practices. However, how specific supports will be provided to schools, based upon WISE results, is not detailed.
Strengths	• The WISE tool forms the basis of intervention in the schools. • The interventions to be implemented in priority schools are intended to improve the effectiveness of the leadership and teaching in these schools. Especially promising is the concept of the Capacity-Builder, an external coach selected on the basis of demonstrated effectiveness who will work with administrators in One-Star schools. • Before the One-Star school writes a Turnaround Plan, ISDE will conduct an Instructional Core Focus Visit to collect evidence of practice. This evidence shapes the Turnaround Plan. • Table 30 School Level Turn Around Plan Timeline for Entrance, Requirements, and Exit lays out the requirements for schools over the intervention cycle (pp. 118-119). • The ISDE states that it will monitor and hold districts and schools accountable for implementing through the intervention cycle, but mechanisms for doing so are not clear.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• "One on one" support from the SEA is not well defined. Capacity Builders are mentioned, but the extent of their role/nature of involvement is not described in detail. Specific strategies for improving the performance of subgroups are not described. • More information is needed to determine whether or not the identified interventions to be implemented in priority schools are likely to improve student achievement and, where applicable, graduation rates for all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and the lowest-achieving students. It is promising that One-Star schools will use research-based practices but, in general, it seems like this section could benefit from more specificity (p. 117).

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide more detail on how interventions will be selected, how teachers and leaders will be supported to implement them, and how subgroup needs will be addressed.ISDE should describe how they will monitor the statewide implementation of One Star school improvement efforts. • ISDE should describe the specific strategies and mechanisms that will be used to ensure academic improvement for student with disabilities, English Learners and other low-achieving students. • ISDE should consider carefully whether or not reliance on "one on one" coaching is sufficient to meet the multiple needs of One-Star schools.

c. *Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.D.iii.c*

2.D.iv Does the SEA's proposed timeline ensure that LEAs that have one or more priority schools will implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year?

➢ *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
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDEs timeline is ambitious. It is not clear that State and local resources are adequate to support statewide implementation by 2014-2015. Instructional resources delivered via Schoolnet are under development, but will not be available until 2015-2016. There are no specific plans to stage interventions to priority schools. • ISDE attests to sufficient monitoring and support to ensure that LEAs with multiple schools identified as Priority schools will complete the interventions but the process appears the same for single or multiple schools within an LEA (p. 120).
Strengths	• A list of priority schools will be identified in Spring 2012. Instructional core visits will be used to monitor timely implementation of interventions in addition to local use of the WISE tool. • The SEA will ensure that Districts implement meaningful interventions in One-Star schools (i.e., priority schools) over the course of a graduated process to occur no later than 2014-2015.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• There is a lack of specificity in the plan, making it difficult to judge how implementation is intended to progress over time. Very little empirical data are provided in the application. The description on p. 121 does not specifically address how the SEA and the LEA will compensate for issues of capacity to carryout multiple interventions in the same time period. • The timeline allows minimal time for the SEA to conduct the Instructional Core Focus Visits that will be required to make determinations about leadership capacity and develop recommendations for local planning. After the recommendations from the Instructional Core Focus Visits, the timeline allows districts limited time to plan for district requirements, consult with families and the community, and to make important decisions regarding school governance.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide data on the projected number and needs of turnaround schools, including the needs of schools with English Learners, students with disabilities and low-achieving students, and how specific State and local resources will be allocated to accomplish stated goals according to the proposed timeline. • ISDE should streamline identification and planning procedures as much as possible to allow for rapid implementation for priority schools.

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
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• Criteria are provided, but there is no empirical evidence to ensure that schools that exit priority status are likely to experience sustained improvement. • It is not clear whether schools that exit priority status within the three-year period would still be required to implement the interventions.
Strengths	• Criteria are explicit: In order to be removed from One-Star status, a school must achieve a Three-Star rating or better for 2 consecutive years. • Because the exit criteria is based on all four dimensions of the accountability system, when a school receives a higher star rating, it illustrates that the school's performance has improved throughout and includes more than just students reaching proficiency. It includes all student and subgroup growth; growth to proficiency; and, for high schools, it also includes three measures of postsecondary and workforce readiness.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• No evidence is provided to validate these criteria or to demonstrate that achievement of exit status is related to sustainability of effective practices. • It is unclear whether schools that exit priority status within the three-year period would still be required to implement the interventions.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE has experienced a decline in the number of schools targeted for improvement since 2008. ISDE should use data from those schools to validate the selection of exit criteria. • ISDE should clarify whether schools that exit priority status within the three-year period would still be required to implement interventions.

2.E   Focus Schools

Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.i, 2.E.i.a, and 2.E.ii

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? If the SEA's methodology is not based on the definition of focus schools in *ESEA Flexibility* (but is instead, *e.g.*, based on school grades or ratings that take into account a number of factors), did the SEA also demonstrate that the list provided in Table 2 is consistent with the definition, per the Department's "Demonstrating that an SEA's Lists of Schools Meet ESEA Flexibility Definitions" guidance?

   a.   Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.i.a.

   b.   Is the SEA's methodology for identifying focus schools educationally sound and likely to ensure that schools are accountable for the performance of subgroups of students?

2.E.i.b Panel Response
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDEs method for identifying focus schools results in less than 10% of the schools falling into this category. A portion of the Star rating system takes into account subgroup performance. It is unclear the extent to which subgroup performance drives the accountability system. While the proposed methodology is educationally sound, it can be improved with the Two-Star designation being defined in standards-based terms. Likewise, the current model will hold schools accountable for performance of subgroups, but the model would be strengthened if educators focused on AMOs or benchmarks to be achieved.
Strengths	• ISDE has defined Two-Star schools as those that have low overall achievement and have a notable proficiency gap for subgroups. This is measured through the growth to achievement and growth to achievement subgroups. The One and Two-Star schools also encompass all schools that have a graduation rate <60% (p.123).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• A Two-Star rating does not meet the ESEA definition of "focus school," which is a Title I school in the State that, based on most recent data available is contributing to the achievement gap in the State. The total number of Two-Star schools in Idaho does not equal 10% of the Title I schools in the State, which is an ESEA requirement. • "Notable proficiency gap" is not defined. • The current process used to identify focus schools does not identify which actions needed to be taken to improve performance.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should examine the extent to which subgroup growth and other metrics related to achievement gaps are distributed in the currently identified Two-Star schools and use that information to refine the identification process and define notable proficiency gaps. ISDE should change the current identification process to achieve the 10% identification rate required by the ESEA.

2.E.ii *Note to Peers: Staff will review 2.E.ii*

2.E.iii Does the SEA's process and timeline ensure that each LEA will identify the needs of its focus schools and their students and implement interventions in focus schools at the start of the 2012–2013 school year? Did the SEA provide examples of and justifications for the interventions the SEA will require its focus schools to implement? Are those interventions based on the needs of students and likely to improve the performance of low-performing students and reduce achievement gaps among subgroups, including English Learners and students with disabilities?

➢ *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

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Rationale	• The ISDE has established an intervention process and timeline (Table 32) that requires diagnosis, needs assessment, immediate support for students through tutoring or school choice, and development of a Rapid Intervention plan to improve school performance. Evidence is cited of the experience with this strategy through the Building Capacity Project (p. 129), and Table 33 Average Percentage Student Proficiency Gains for schools with capacity builders. • ISDE provided only limited data to indicate that other interventions are effective or appropriate for different levels of schools or different school needs (p. 129)
Strengths	• Every Two-Star school is required to submit a Rapid Improvement Plan (RIP). They must offer school choice options, supplemental tutoring, financial set asides for professional development (10% district Title IA set aside). Definitions are provided and funding mechanisms are identified. • Regardless of the school's RIP the SEA will require every Two-Star School to follow specific guidance to offer school choice options, supplemental tutoring services and financial set-asides for professional development to make sure the needs of all low-achieving students are met. Two-Star schools must follow this guidance in the school year immediately following their identification. (See the Timeline in Table 32 for more detailed information p.128)
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The RIP is the framework for monitoring progress and should be based upon effective practices. The WISE tool is used as the basis of the RIP. Schools must make actionable plans for 20 indicators. District responsibilities are detailed, however, the process by which they will be supported to choose indicators and conduct planning is not clear. • ISDE has not demonstrated that the interventions it has identified are effective at increasing student achievement in the schools ISDE has identified as focus schools. The application is mostly focused on process, not on the substance of the interventions. More information is needed to make a determination about the interventions and their appropriateness.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• The process and SEA's role in monitoring the Two-Star schools was clearer than the description of the One-Star process. ISDE may want to develop parallel descriptions of monitoring for One and Two-Star schools. • The description of resources and supports lacks sufficient detail. ISDE should identify the resources and supports available to Two-Star schools to implement their RIP. A case study would be helpful to illustrate how resources and supports have been identified and delivered to result in desired improvement. • ISDE should add a description of interventions and evidence that they are effective and appropriate for various grades and various types of schools and students (p. 126). • ISDE should clarify that interventions will begin in the first semester of 2012.

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

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• Under ISDE's accountability plan, a school can exit from the Two-Star category once it makes enough progress to rank as a Three-Star School or higher for two consecutive years. Once identified, Two-Star Schools will remain in the Two-Star category unless they meet the exit criteria or drop into the One-Star category. It is not clear that the exit criteria reflect significant progress in narrowing achievement gaps. No data are provided to indicate that exiting focus status will result in sustained improvement.
Strengths	• The criteria are specified. • Table 34 illustrates the sequence of events from entrance to exit related to the RIP associated with focus schools.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Evidence that support the selection of these criteria is not provided. • It might not be advisable to wait two years to determine a status change from focus to priority school.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide a rationale and evidentiary base for the exit criterion so that districts and schools can clearly understand what achievement patterns and graduation rate status exemplify at each level.

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

2.F.i   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?

2.F.i Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• The peer concerns are related to an earlier weakness noted in ISDE's request. The criteria for assigning star status are not empirically based, so the idea of Three-Star status being satisfactory is not clearly established. Further, because ISDE has not identified AMOs, as defined by ESEA flexibility guidance, AMOs cannot serve as a basis for this definition.
Strengths	• ISDE is proposing a single comprehensive system of recognition, accountability and support that applies to all schools regardless of Title I status. Three-Star schools have access to improvement resources at no cost. Three-Star schools must submit a continuous improvement plan using WISE and address indicators that align with areas of need. Title I set asides are optional. Online progress reports are required.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Although many resources are available to Three-Star schools, it is not clear that there are sufficient incentives to encourage them to improve. • It is not fully articulated how ISDE will provide a rubric for peer review sessions to monitor the implementation of the continuous improvement plan.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should rethink incentives for attaining Four- and Five-Star status and assure that the criteria for attaining Three- Star status truly reflects "satisfactory" performance. It might be helpful to use past data to analyze progression from three to four stars. • ISDE should consider involving Four- and Five-Star schools in the peer review process for Three-Star schools as a form of recognition for reward schools and support to Three -Star schools. • ISDE should investigate the consequences of allowing schools to annually change status without proving sustained gains.

2.F.ii Are those incentives and supports likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities?

2.F.ii Panel Response

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• Based upon the information provided, it is unclear that the incentives and supports are likely to improve achievement, close gaps, etc.
Strengths	• Schools and districts have access to professional development and other resources at no cost, planning and discretionary funding flexibility, and a few other incentives. • Furthermore, schools will submit and districts will be required to review, the school's Continuous Improvement Plans each year, provide feedback and approve the plans prior to submitting such plans to the ISDE.ISDE will provide a specific rubric for Three-Star Schools, and the district will use this rubric to conduct peer review sessions either within the district or through partnerships with other school districts. The peer review will promote implementation of the Continuous Improvement Plan.The district will make online reports on its progress and support of the Three-Star School through the WISE Tool. ISDE will work with Three-Star Schools by reviewing the Continuous Improvement Plan, monitoring District reports in the WISE Tool, and providing schools with access to technical assistance through the Statewide System of Support.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Given the limited benefits of Four and Five-Star status, it is not clear that schools and districts would have strong incentives to move out of Three-Star status. • Sub-group specific interventions are not explicitly mentioned in the supports for all Title I eligible schools. • The format for the peer review process is not clearly described and does not address special populations or subgroups.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should solicit stakeholder input as to what would enhance Three-Star schools motivation to move into four or Five-Star status. Perhaps incentives at the district level would be effective. • ISDE might look for models of SEA-school unit interactions that are efficient in supporting changes in schools. For example, focusing interactions on leadership training, working with clusters of schools or regional support rather than responding to individual school needs.

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?*

   ii.   Is the SEA's process for ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools 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?

   iii.   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 (including i, ii, and iii) Panel Response
Tally of Peer Responses: 1 Yes, 5 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• The ISDEs Statewide System of Support and the Idaho Building Capacity Project are the primary mechanisms for building capacity at school and district levels. Membership on SMARTER Balanced and CCSS governance bodies will likely build SEA capacity. Partnerships with IHEs will also increase capacity. • The ISDE appears to be attempting to take an active role in both holding schools accountable and supporting their implementation of school improvement interventions. However, concerns about the relationship between star status and the types of services and supports that are received by schools, the capacity for the SEA and external partners to provide necessary support, and limitations in the accountability system regarding achievement gap and subgroup measures limit the potential of ISDE to increase capacity at state and local levels.
Strengths	• The CII evaluation has documented that ISDE has improved working relationships with schools since 2008. Evidence indicates that some schools not identified for improvement are asking for state technical assistance.. ISDE has existing relationships with three IHEs. There are plans to create awards for hard to fill and leadership positions. • Professional development will be provided to promote leadership capacity at all levels. • The WISE tool is used for guiding improvement in One and Two-Star schools and there are plans to review school improvement plans at districts and state levels. • The use of student achievement data, diagnostic information and Capacity Builders described on pages 142-3 may be helpful to this effort. • ISDE described a process for the rigorous review and approval of any external providers used by the SEA and its districts 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. The current higher education providers all have demonstrated a record of success and new providers will be subject to rigorous screening, as described on page 143. • There are plans to leverage Title I set-asides for priority and focus schools for supplemental tutoring and professional development.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• ISDE and districts are responsible for monitoring school and district plans but the process and criteria for doing so are not clear. • There are concerns about the capacity of the ISDE and the three IHEs to provide all the sufficient support for implementation of the interventions required. • The lack of AMOs in the accountability system limits their ability to hold districts accountable for improving school and student performance.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should encourage identification of new external providers, given that only three IHEs bear the responsibility of serving all districts. • ISDE should routinely collect and report data on the effectiveness of various strategies for improving achievement (e.g. RTI training, Idaho Building Capacity Project, State monitoring of school improvement plans) as a means of judging effectiveness of the proposed system. Perhaps an external evaluation will be useful for this purpose. • ISDE should refine their proposed accountability system to increase capacity to hold districts accountable to improve school and student performance especially in the area of AMO monitoring and gap analysis. • ISDE should work with districts on principles of maximizing resource allocations towards priority initiatives to increase the district's capacity.

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?

43

PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE has potential to provide appropriate and effective interventions. These efforts could provide incentives and be successful in helping districts and schools reach higher levels of achievement. Given the very short timeline for implementation, it is not clear that ISDE or districts have the resources and capacity to implement the systems in ways that will result in sufficient, lasting improvement.
Strengths	• ISDE has integrated several effective components (CO Growth Model, WISE, CII dashboard) into its accountability system. They propose a unified system of accountability with a Five-Star rating system. They have established criteria for placement and exit in the Five-Star system.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The system as described has two primary weaknesses: 1) the evidentiary base for the design of the system is weak or missing and 2) it is not clear that ISDE, districts, schools and external partners have the capacity to implement the plan. The star designation does not carry a standards based definition and is not focused on the extent to which students perform and progress through benchmarks reflected in the AMOs as defined in the ESEA flexibility guidance. See principle one and two for additional comments. The accountability system does not sufficiently represent and support the achievement of subgroups such as students with disabilities, English Learners, and the low-achieving students.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should provide evidence of the validity and effectiveness of key components of its proposed system for improving achievement of all students including students with disabilities, English Learners and low-achieving students. ISDE should clarify the roles and responsibilities of ISDE, districts, schools and external partners in the proposed systems and indicate the financial and substantive resources that will be available to guide implementation. Given the comprehensiveness and complexity of the accountability and intervention strategies, it would be useful to employ an external evaluation to provide feedback on the integrity of the elements within the system.

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 two options below?

If the SEA selected **Option A**:
If the SEA has not already developed and adopted all of the 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
☐ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B*
Tally of Peer Responses: 4 Yes, 2 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE's plan for developing and adopting guidelines for local teacher evaluation and support systems is likely to result in successful adoption of those guidelines by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. However, it is uncertain whether similar adoption for principal evaluation and support systems will occur within the timeline.
Strengths	• The teacher evaluation system is well underway. The administrator evaluation systems are in the beginning stages of development. A state data system will allow the tracking of performance evaluations over the life cycle of an educator's career (p. 168).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Student growth measures are still in the infant stages of development and may not be ready according to the proposed timeline (pp. 172-173). The data system is under development.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should consider a stopgap plan if the currently-planned growth measures are not ready for inclusion by 2012-13. ISDE should consider how it will work to monitor and intervene if districts' data do not reflect expectations for high-quality implementation (i.e., student and teacher measures do not demonstrate a logical relationship between one another, required observations are not performed each year for each teacher, etc.) • A technical review of proposed use of student achievement and growth data in the system seems warranted. Perhaps the Idaho TAC could be engaged in this review.

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

45

3.A.i, Option A.ii Panel Response
☐ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option B*
Tally of Peer Responses: 6 Yes, 0 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• The SEA has drawn on educators to provide input at all stages of design, development and piloting of the teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, but the SEA should be considerate of involving educators at key decision points throughout the process. The process for developing administrator guidelines also involves regular meetings of stakeholders.
Strengths	• The Teacher Evaluation Task Force was composed of key stakeholders (teachers, parents, school administrators, board trustees, legislators, representatives of higher education) and made several recommendations that were accepted and made a part of the rule changes. • For administrators, a focus group meets monthly to give input on the evolving framework. There is also a small working group of administrators involved in the development of the principal evaluation system. • Additionally, ISDE administered a survey to gather information from teachers and principals on design and implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems. PEAC work groups include representatives from various educator groups (i.e. Pupil Services personnel, teachers, and principals.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Growth measures in non-tested grades and subjects (NTGS) will require additional input from a wide range of educators; it is not clear how extensive educator involvement will be solicited in this important endeavor beyond the Capacity Taskforce (p. 172). It is unclear who will serve on the Evaluation Capacity Taskforce. • The timeline for the development of administrator guidance is very tight, potentially limiting involvement by administrators.

| *Technical Assistance Suggestions* | ISDE should ensure adequate representation and input from educators in NTGS as alternative growth measures are vetted and approved. ISDE should devise a system for continued stakeholder involvement as the evaluation guidelines are implemented. ISDE should provide more information about the extent to which stakeholders are included in the process of developing the guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems. Page 148 references stakeholder involvement but does not provide sufficient detail as to what this entails. |

iii.   *Note to Peers: Staff will review iii.*

If the SEA selected **Option B**:
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 B.i Panel Response
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*
Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

ii.   *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 B.iii Panel Response
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*
Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

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

3.A.ii   Are the SEA's guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 — *i.e.,* will they promote systems that:

   a.   Will be used for continual improvement of instruction ?
   ➢   *Are the SEA's guidelines likely to result in support for all teachers, including teachers who are specialists working with students with disabilities and English Learners and general classroom teachers with these students in their classrooms, that will enable them to improve their instructional practice?*

3.A.ii.a Panel Response
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*
Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	.
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

   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

☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	.
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

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(i) Panel Response

☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

(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

☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

(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

☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

d.   Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis?

3.A.ii.d Panel Response

☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

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

☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*

Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

f.   Will be used to inform personnel decisions?

3.A.ii.f Panel Response
☒ *Not applicable because the SEA selected 3.A, Option A*
Tally of Peer Responses: X Yes, X No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	
Strengths	
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	
Technical Assistance Suggestions	

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 (i.e., process for ensuring inter-rater reliability)?*

➢ *Does the SEA have a process for ensuring that teachers working with special populations of students, such as students with disabilities and English Learners, are included in the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation and support systems?*

➢ *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
Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE has a timeline for implementing the evaluation policy for teachers that involved stakeholder, including teachers, participation. • Evidence of effectiveness and validity will not be available until May 2012. Much of the proposed system is contingent upon legislative approval.
Strengths	• ISDE proposes 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. Plans that do not meet the guidelines are returned to the district and must be revised accordingly (p. 184). • The pilot of the teacher evaluation systems appears 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 since it will occur in each district for a full school year prior to implementation (p. 190).
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• The growth measures may not be ready and training may be lacking to be able to successfully implement the new evaluation systems for teachers of both tested and non-tested grades and subjects according to the proposed timeline in 2012-13. • A significant issue exists to verify the validity and variety of the student performance results used in the evaluation decision. Validity evidence is contingent upon a single focus group. • No evidence that the SEA has a process for ensuring that teachers working with special populations of students, such as students with disabilities and English Learners, are included in an LEA's teacher and principal evaluation and support systems. • Evidence of implementation and effectiveness is not available for many aspects of the proposed teacher and principal evaluation systems. • Much of the likely impact is contingent upon legislative approval. • Implementation relies heavily on ISDE staff. It is unclear if resources and capacity are sufficient.

Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should conduct a technical review of the student assessment and other achievement data to be used in the evaluation process. This technical review should bring together assessment/testing specialists, and teacher evaluation specialists. • ISDE should ensure that teacher and administrator evaluation systems include information on special populations of students.

Principle 3 Overall Review

If the SEA indicated that it has not developed and adopted all guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 by selecting Option A in section 3.A, 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?

If the SEA indicated that is has adopted guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with Principle 3 by selecting Option B in section 3.A, are the SEA's guidelines and the SEA's process for ensuring, as applicable, LEA development, adoption, piloting, and implementation of 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
Tally of Peer Responses: 2 Yes, 4 No

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• A timeline of events related to ISDE implementation of evaluation policy is provided (Table 37, pp. 183-84), but no empirical evidence of progress in implementation is included.
Strengths	• There is an implementation and capacity building timeline. The system places emphasis on targeted professional development, growth for educators. Resources are provided to support understanding and use of the Charlotte Danielson rubric, including in-person training.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• Based on the information provided, it is difficult to judge the quality and consistency of implementation of the new teacher and principal evaluation systems. ISDE plans to monitor professional development in districts, which may prove difficult as quality will be hard to determine. It is not clear what bar for approval will be used for student growth measures established by LEAs for use in their evaluation systems. Plans for training educators on the new growth measures are not evident in the proposal. The ISDE narrative (p. 170) indicates that the teacher evaluation process for special education teachers is not completed.

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should monitor and provide objective evidence of progress in implementation of the evaluation system.

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

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Rationale	• ISDE has developed a robust accountability system that has potential to provide appropriate and effective interventions. These efforts could provide incentives and be successful in helping LEAs and schools reach higher levels of achievement. While the plan addresses all of the major components, sufficient detail on mechanisms to support and monitor implementation is not provided. It is not clear that ISDE has adequate resources or sufficient capacity to enable it to achieve the very demanding timelines.A timeline of events related to ISDE implementation of evaluation policy is provided (Table 37, pp. 183-84), but no empirical evidence of progress in implementation is included.
Strengths	• ISDE has established timelines for implementing college-and career-ready standards. There are many professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators. The standards will be integrated into teacher preparation programs. ISDE is adding interim assessments that can guide instruction and raise achievement for all students. • Dual credit is a good approach to addressing concerns about students not going on to higher education (p. 45). • The Idaho Education Network (IEN) could be a useful tool for students, particularly in rural areas, that can provide exceptional opportunities and instill love of learning (p. 45). • ISDE has integrated several effective components (Colorado's Growth Model, the WISE tool, CII's dashboard) into its accountability system. It proposes a unified system of accountability with a Five-Star rating system. It has established criteria for placement in and exit from various star ratings within the Five-Star system. • There is an implementation and capacity building timeline. The system places emphasis on targeted professional development, growth for educators. Resources are provided to support understanding and use of the Charlotte Danielson rubric, including in-person training.

Response Component	Peer Panel Response
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	• While the plan addresses all of the major requirements, the specific strategies for supporting implementation are not discussed. It is troubling that Schoolnet resources will not be available until after the deadline for implementing assessments aligned to college- and career-ready standards. It is unclear that ISDE's resources are sufficient to conduct the planned professional development. • The Fractional ADA warrants further explanation with regard to its impact on dual enrollment, including the rationale behind it (p. 46). Peers expressed concern that this could be a disincentive that could limit participation in dual enrollment. • The star designation does not carry a standards-based definition and is not focused on the extent to which students perform and progress through benchmarks reflected in the AMOs as defined in the ESEA flexibility guidance. See Principles 1 and 2 for additional comments. • The accountability system does not sufficiently represent and support the achievement of subgroups such as students with disabilities, English Learners, and low-achieving students. • Based on the information provided, it is difficult to judge the quality and consistency of implementation of the new teacher and principal evaluation systems. The ISDE narrative (p. 170) indicates that the teacher evaluation process for special education teachers and teachers of English Learners has not been completed.

Response Component	*Peer Panel Response*
Technical Assistance Suggestions	• ISDE should identify and monitor benchmarks for implementation, given the very ambitious timeline. Specific strategies for delivering professional development and monitoring its effectiveness should be provided. Mechanisms for coordinating the multitude of professional development efforts at the State and local levels should be explicit to ensure that they are directed at the same goal and well deployed across the State. • ISDE should consider options to encourage dual enrollment other than fractional ADA. • ISDE should provide evidence of the validity and effectiveness of key components of its proposed system for improving achievement of all students including students with disabilities, English Learners and low-achieving students. • ISDE should clarify the roles and responsibilities of ISDE, districts, schools and external partners in the proposed recognition, accountability, and support systems and indicate the financial and substantive resources that will be available to guide implementation. • Given the comprehensiveness and complexity of the accountability and intervention strategies, it would be useful to employ an external evaluation to provide feedback on the integrity of the elements within the system. • ISDE should monitor and provide objective evidence of implementation of the teacher and principal evaluation systems.