

# ESEA Flexibility

## Peer Panel Notes



**State Request:** Oregon

**Date:** March 26, 2012

## 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) engaged teachers and their representatives in the process of developing the components of the Oregon flexibility request.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement began in January 2011 with the development of a new vision for education in Oregon. (p. 9).</li> <li>• 4 flexibility workgroups were formed with teachers well represented (p. 9).</li> <li>• Survey sent and approximately 3000 respondents identified themselves as teachers. (p.10)</li> <li>• Responses shaped the thinking of the workgroups in crafting the request (p. 10).</li> <li>• The work groups are very practitioner oriented.</li> <li>• Oregon provided a list of revisions to the waiver application as a result of the individual and group outreach, surveys, and public comments received from teachers and their representatives (p. 10-11)</li> <li>• The SEA included teacher association membership in the workgroup and on the team that reviewed the request.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outreach activities utilized technology, which although efficient could limit participation of some cultural and linguistic groups.</li> <li>• Favored one language group, no outreach to other language groups in the State.</li> <li>• The outreach efforts did not sufficiently address the unique needs of English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	For those groups not participating in technology and webinars, ODE may want to use focus groups. ODE may want to think about publicizing the impact that all of these constituencies had in the development of the waiver request to continue the good will.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Oregon meaningful engaged and solicited comments from diverse communities.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workgroups represented all aspects of the community (p. 9).</li> <li>• Survey sent out -- 6,000 respondents---about 3,000 non teacher respondents (p. 10).</li> <li>• Feedback solicited via web site and via mail to ensure broad representation.</li> <li>• Results published (att. 2).</li> <li>• Changes to proposal based upon feedback (pp. 10-12).</li> <li>• Meet with representatives for English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Conducted Webinars jointly sponsored by Superintendent and governor with responses published on website (p.12).</li> <li>• Information shared with Committee of parishioners and opinions were solicited (p.10).</li> <li>• Provided details of their work through webinars and outreach to groups such as tribal groups (See Att. 3, at 1199-1200).</li> <li>• Describes the outreach to Native Americans groups.</li> <li>• Breadth of outreach to a variety of groups.</li> <li>• The SEA sent email notification of the waiver and an invitation to provide input to a long list of groups (p. 1199-1200).</li> <li>• The SEA had a broad State appeal to solicit input including from rural and urban areas.</li> <li>• The SEA engaged at least one youth group with the Superintendent’s advisory team.</li> <li>• The SEA did reach out to a wide variety of groups in conducting presentations.</li> <li>• The SEA has continued to solicit input from these groups as they are creating/developing new parts of the flexibility request.</li> <li>• The SEA provided a list of its revisions as a result of the input it received from its outreach to communities.</li> <li>• The SEA seems to be working on a broader reform agenda and built on the existing structures that the SEA had in place.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unable to determine if Civil Rights and Hispanic Advocacy Groups were specifically solicited even though minority and Hispanic populations have increased significantly in the State.</li> <li>• The outreach to education groups does not seem to include those communities most likely to be impacted by the waiver –high poverty communities, people and families of color, language minorities, and students with disabilities. The SEA needs to explain how it reached out to these groups.</li> <li>• The SEA did not indicate reaching out to migrant families or migrant groups.</li> <li>• The SEA talks about the changing population of the schools, particularly the increase in the African American population, but does not specifically address outreach efforts to this group.</li> <li>• The SEA did not reach out to the students with disabilities parent network, but stuck with the Superintendent’s advisory committee.</li> <li>• Many people do not respond to the survey online.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

### 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: 5 Yes, 1 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Oregon has established a strong foundation for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon adopted CCSS October 2010(p 19 att.4).</li> <li>• Oregon established a stewardship team that began in 2010 dedicated to insuring effective implementation of CCSS--identified focus for each year to insure effective implementation (p. 21). The stewardship team provided a good foundation for implementing the CCSS.</li> <li>• Detailed time line for State implementation (p 22).</li> <li>• Alignment of CCSS and Oregon’s existing standards and description of the standards in plain language so that the public would be able to understand them (pp. 23-24).</li> <li>• Conducted extensive outreach activities (p. 27).</li> <li>• Extensive profession development outlined including a Toolkit for administrators (p.29) and job-embedded professional development (p. 30).</li> <li>• Alignment with Early Childhood and Institutions of Higher Education (p. 31).</li> <li>• Increased rigor of assessments to complement new standards (p. 32).</li> <li>• SEA investment in providing access to accelerated learning opportunities by adopting standards since these programs are locally controlled (p. 32).</li> <li>• The SEA has a process for adopting and approving the use of open-source resources. Peers indicated that this is notable.</li> <li>• The SEA has already conducted a cross-walk with its existing standards and makes this available to teachers.</li> <li>• The SEA examined its requirements for earning a high school diploma at the beginning of its standards alignment work.</li> <li>• The SEA described the alignment with Pre-K, access to accelerated learning opportunities, and appears to have some meaningful collaborations with their higher education institutions. The peers liked the depth that the ODE had in its activities.</li> <li>• The K-12 standards are set in a way that will allow students to transition to higher education.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA is relying on the LEAs with huge budget constraints.</li> <li>• There is concern that the SEA may not be able to meet the timeline.</li> <li>• For the section on students with disabilities, the SEA focused on accommodations and did not sufficiently address how this subgroup will access the subject matter content in the CCSS. (p. 26)</li> <li>• There does not seem to be a clear pathway to ensure that teacher preparation institutions will begin preparing new teachers to teach the common core within the timeline.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

**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: 4 Yes, 2 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Oregon is building on an existing foundation and is in the process of developing the necessary tools to ensure that all students have access to learning through the CCSS.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon CCSS Stewardship Team has representatives from stakeholder groups including special education and English Learners groups (p. 28).</li> <li>• Provides a plan to conduct gap analysis of English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards which will serve as basis for transition plan (p. 24).</li> <li>• Extensive training for teachers of students with disabilities (p. 26).</li> <li>• On-going process of evaluating accommodation factors (p. 26).</li> <li>• Provides list of activities that will form the foundation of plan (p. 27).</li> <li>• The SEA is engaged in the ongoing process of evaluating the accommodations. However, this will not be sufficient for addressing very low-performing students.</li> <li>• The SEA gives a lot of attention to its Career and Technical Education (CTE) standards, with its work with teachers and focus on workforce development. Peers indicated that this is likely to increase access to two year options for students.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does CCSS Stewardship Team have representatives from Civil Rights groups?</li> <li>• Plan not yet developed for alignment of ELP standards. (pp. 24-25).</li> <li>• The SEA understands what they need to do for ELs, but there is not much of a plan for executing the plan.</li> <li>• There is a lack of specificity on the targets for increasing graduation rates. There is little effort to address that. How are you getting to that through assessments?</li> <li>• There is attention to the content, but not attention to training teachers for teaching English Learners, particularly the strategies for teaching English Learners and students with disabilities</li> <li>• There is concern about the plan for conducting professional development for higher education and teacher preparation faculty and whether this is realistic. There is concern about a clear pathway to ensure teachers completing their teacher preparation programs will be prepared to teach CCR standards, particularly for English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA may want to provide further detail regarding how it selected the subgroups within the English Learner population for graduation and career-readiness to ensure that there is a mechanism for post-secondary readiness within the English Learner population. (p. 25)

## 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

### 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: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Oregon has a strong foundation for the transition to college and career expectations for all students and of particular note is the involvement of the governor's office in the process.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive outreach activities.</li> <li>• The work the SEA conducted through the American Diploma Project and the stewardship team created a strong foundation for the SEA's work.</li> <li>• The fact that the SEA's alignment activities with CCRS occur at the early childhood level and the CTE level provides a continuum of activities ranging from early childhood level through the CTE level (2 year).</li> <li>• The professional development and resource activities were a strength.</li> <li>• Practitioners were feeling involved in all levels of the process from the mapping to the professional development.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to monitor the planned work for English Learners and students with disabilities.</li> <li>• The SEA discusses how its LEAs are involved in innovative work, but there is no real plan for ensuring that its small, rural LEAs will have the resources to carry out that work.</li> <li>• The SEA’s plan does not address how it will ensure that teacher preparation programs are preparing candidates to teach CCR standards particularly in regard to students with disabilities and English Learners.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA may want to discuss the resources required to effectively accomplish this plan. This would be helpful in determining if it is realistic.</li> <li>• The SEA would benefit from having more clarity, such as how they are ensuring subgroups of English Learners have access to the rigorous content, on the implementation of the CCR standards and their integration with the English Language Proficiency standards.</li> <li>• Could the SEA describe how students with significant cognitive disabilities will access the CCR standards? The SEA is silent on this issue.</li> </ul>

## 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: 0 Yes, 6 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA has proposed a strong system of differentiated recognition that is comprehensive and includes many factors into the rating system, such as attention to subgroups. However, it is not clear that the system is fully finalized. Without a viable growth model the system does not meet the requirements for flexibility. There are a number of additional concerns with the accountability system, such as how subgroups are identified for interventions and the lack of clear steps to hold LEAs and schools accountable for student achievement.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA has a strong history of the report card and using it.</li> <li>• The SEA had broad stakeholder input.</li> <li>• The achievement compacts have the potential for holding all LEAs and schools accountable for improved student achievement.</li> <li>• The SEA has a strong tradition of progress monitoring and formative assessments.</li> <li>• The SEA has calculated that 94% of the schools are able to achieve a rating under the current cut points for priority, focus and model schools. The other 6% are due to low “n size.” The SEA intends to include 4 years of averages/data and to use feeder schools for grade 3 and asserts that 100% of Oregon schools will be rated by 2012/13.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA is designing an accountability system but acknowledges that it relies on LEAs to develop and support the professional development and interventions that need to be put in place.</li> <li>• The SEA’s plan has not sufficiently demonstrated that it has the capacity to implement Colorado’s growth model if it is adopted.</li> <li>• A large number of small schools will not receive ratings, including graduation ratings and subgroup graduation ratings (p. 69-71). It is unclear what the SEA will be doing for these schools. This issue is reflected in the lack of clarity in how the SEA will apply its minimum “n size.”</li> <li>• Peers are concerned that while schools may get a rating, there may be subgroups that are not included in the rating and this may mask some subgroup performance (see pp. 60 and 72).</li> <li>• There is a lack of specificity on the targets for increasing graduation rates.</li> <li>• Without seeing the data, peers cannot determine whether the SEA will account for 100% of schools in the rating system and whether subgroups will adequately included in their rating due to the minimum n of 30.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<p>Based on the information provided in the phone call, the peers are recommending that the SEA analyze their data using its adapted growth model to demonstrate that they will have ratings for 100% of their schools and that subgroups are adequately accounted for in their calculations.</p>

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

**2.A.i.a Panel Response**

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	<p>Oregon has a number of both legislative and other leadership initiatives under way that address accountability, such as the Achievement Compacts. Oregon has established a 40/40/20 Goal; has adopted the New Oregon Diploma (pp. 39-41) and has established the Oregon Education Improvement Board (OEIP) through legislative action that appears to respond directly to the governor and will have broad oversight of the implementation of the proposed accountability changes. However, the proposed rating of only model (reward), focus, and priority schools does not reflect a full accountability model. Additionally, the peers are concerned that the rating system will not include all small schools nor include all subgroups. Furthermore, the SEA oversight and leverage in the Achievement Compacts is not evident.</p>
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon included in their model a growth percentile and an adequate growth percentile. For instance, a growth percentile of 35 would indicate the student showed at least as much or more progress than 35 percent of students at the same grade and with a similar test score history. Such a student could be considered to be showing below average growth. The model also determines the growth required in order for a student to be at standard within four years, expressed as an adequate growth percentile. Students whose actual growth percentile exceeded his or her adequate growth percentile would have shown growth that, if sustained, would mean the student would be at or above standard within four years.” (p. 55)</li> <li>• Oregon is considering possible expansion of subgroup accountability for those exited from ELL services (p. 45).</li> <li>• The development of the report card for the 2012-2013 school year includes a robust focus on reporting growth to standard and more valuable information on college and career readiness.</li> <li>• The index for determining the overall rating of the school was described. It was well defined and includes participation rates.</li> <li>• Oregon included the progress of subgroups by focusing on the progress of subgroups in their measurement of LEAs and schools.</li> <li>• Requiring Achievement Compacts with the LEAs and schools is a positive because it creates an agreement with the SEA and funding is tied to the compact which is a method of holding LEAs accountable.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<p>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon is considering renewing the 2-year exemption from assessments for English Learner students and implementing a growth model for English Learners based on alternative measures such as ELPA, which do not meet federal requirements.</li> <li>• The SEA suggests that it will adapt the Colorado growth model in order to include more students in subgroup accountability, however, there is not enough information about subgroup size and current exclusion rates due to small N to know how or if the growth model will enable better accountability.</li> <li>• There is confusion about exactly which subgroups will be included in growth calculations. There is no mention of the Alternate Assessment for students with significant cognitive disabilities and how those students might be included.</li> <li>• It is not clear how graduation rate is calculated; is it the 4 year cohort or will Oregon switch to a 5 year cohort?</li> <li>• Minimum “n size” for achievement calculations is 42 (p.58). The “n-size” is 30 students for growth rates (p. 62) and 20 students for graduation rates, and it appears that participation rates will only be calculated if a minimum “n size” is achieved. These minimum “n sizes” may eliminate some small schools or subgroups for ratings. Note: Based on details provided over the phone, Oregon indicated that they will account for small schools and subgroups by either using four years of data, alternative assessments, or calculations with a smaller n-size. The peers continue to be concerned about the use of large minimum n in the calculation for the ratings.</li> <li>• Oregon has not finalized plans for accountability as evidenced throughout the proposal. For example, “While the model for incorporating subgroup performance into our overall accountability system is still to be discussed, the Colorado model for including subgroup growth as a significant measure is promising and is reflected in our proposal for designating model (reward), priority, and focus schools.” (p. 45)</li> <li>• “Because Oregon will develop an official rating system within the process of refining a new Oregon School Report Card, only model, focus and priority schools will actually be given a rating through this process. However, because the model is based on five levels of performance, we will describe the two intermediate levels, for illustrative purposes only, as Satisfactory A and Satisfactory B.” (p. 51). Thus 75% of schools do not fit into the model, priority, or focus school categories. The proposed rating of only model, focus, and priority schools does not reflect a full accountability model.</li> <li>• It is not clear how the publishing of the report card will be used for support. For example, how will LEAs be held accountable in the compacts if they do not meet their goals? Are there any consequences if the LEA does not meet its goals?</li> <li>• Peers are uncertain that even if the growth model is adopted that the SEA has the capacity to implement. The SEA needs to provide an assurance of the growth model and information about the SEA’s capacity to implement.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Technical Assistance Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA should provide an example of how the outcomes of the components will be displayed on a report card (p.42).</li> <li>• The SEA discusses a consortium that they are part of to develop formative and interim assessments. The peers suggest that the SEA continues their work to ensure that these assessments are valid and reliable for English Language Learners.</li> </ul>

- 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA proposes a well described system for identifying the intensity and nature of supports to be delivered to schools that are not meeting standards and assumes that schools/LEAs must engage in continuous improvement. However, it is not clear what the trajectory nor target is for growth. Per the telephone call, the SEA proposes that it will establish two targets—one based on 40-40-20 and one based on achievement ratings—there is no evidence that these are aligned and that this will identify achievement gaps. In addition, interventions were not specific to meet the needs of certain subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tailoring to local needs and relying on local involvement throughout the LEA is particularly strong and recognizes basic principles of system improvement.</li> <li>• The construction of the index seems good.</li> <li>• The combined subgroup may mean greater identification of more schools due to the minimum n-size.</li> <li>• The SEA increases the percentage of schools that are model schools to ensure that they have Title I schools included in that group. This creates a strong incentive for schools</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth appears to be measured for all and a “disadvantaged group” that only includes race/ethnicity and no other subgroup although there are references to other subgroups throughout. Need to better clarify the precise treatment of subgroups...including the 3 n-sizes that will be used to determine calculation in growth, vs. achievement, vs. graduation vs. “participation”.</li> <li>• There are questions remaining as to whether the SEA has the capacity, data, or legislation required to implement the system.</li> <li>• It is unclear how Oregon will set the AMOs.</li> <li>• The extended assessments provided to the most severely cognitively disabled students are not included in the growth model (p. 60).</li> <li>• There is a lack of coherence in the plans for the assessments of English Learners. Oregon indicated that the ESEA/Next Generation Workgroup recommended further examination of the following: 1) The renewal and extension from one year to two of the exemption allowed for English Learner students on OAKS English/language arts, and the expansion of that exemption to other subjects (math, writing, and science); and 2) Implementing a growth model for English Learner students that is based on alternate measures, such as the English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) (p. 45). These recommendations would weaken the identification of English Learners for interventions and English Learner proficiency should not be substituted as an alternate measure.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should think comprehensively about its assessments of English Learners. The SEA could collaborate with other SEAs to identify methods for assessment and inclusion of English Learners in the accountability system.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

## 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Oregon did not provide the AMOs or the method for districts to set the AMOs in at least reading and math for grades 3-8 and high school and by subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Oregon's system of accountability will be focused primarily at the district level...Oregon will not attempt to set AMOs for all schools through the achievement compact. Rather, a district will set goals through the process described above, and then be held accountable for ensuring its schools are equitably contributing to the district's overall goals.” (p. 48) This indicates that the SEA has not set goals.</li> <li>• Each LEA can negotiate its AMOs. The SEA has not indicated the process for approving locally determined AMOs to ensure that the AMOs are sufficiently rigorous.</li> <li>• The peers do not consider the 40-40-20 goal to be precise enough to guide LEA development of AMOs for reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 and high school and by subgroup.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	If the SEA wants to allow LEAs to create their own AMOs, the SEA should create more detailed guidelines for the development of the AMOs, provide technical assistance to the LEAs, and oversight to assure rigorous AMOs.

## 2.C Reward Schools

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

### 2.C.i PANEL RESPONSE

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA described a weighting system for determining model (reward) schools. But some peers felt that it is not clear how the growth model is being applied to determine model schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of participation targets is a strength. There are high participation targets and the protection that schools that don't meet the target have reduced ratings. This may guarantee the inclusion of all students in the assessments.</li> <li>• For the high school rating system, it is impressive that the SEA uses 50% for graduation rate, including 15% for subgroup graduation rate.</li> <li>• There is a clear focus on growth with 50% of the rating for elementary and middle schools focused on the treatment of subgroups on growth. This strengthens the rating system, with a school not getting points for not meeting goals for subgroups.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The growth and achievement cut points for being a model school may identify too many schools unless these cut points are raised over time.</li> <li>• There is no clear explanation for why and how the SEA has set the growth and achievement cut points.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The rewards for model (reward) schools are likely to be considered meaningful by the schools.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the primary distinctions for model schools will be their qualifications to serve as mentors within the focus areas in which they have demonstrated exemplary practices and to receive payment for those services. Where possible, model schools will be matched with priority and focus schools within their region for the sake of efficiency (p. 53).</li> <li>• ODE will call upon the leaders and educators at model schools as experts and presenters for professional development opportunities across the State (p. 53).</li> <li>• The SEA will reach out to model schools for input on policy decisions. Local school boards will be encouraged to invite these model school leaders and educators to present best practices for district-wide improvements at board meetings and district professional development events.</li> <li>• Districts with one or more model schools will be considered candidates for innovation grants (p. 54).</li> <li>• The Governor’s Office will offer special recognition to model schools in the potential forms of a recognition event, a press release, and/or a letter of acknowledgement and award. In addition, model schools will be candidates for the superintendent’s ‘closing the achievement gap’ awards (p. 54).</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

## 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: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA provided interventions that are aligned with the turnaround principles and although general, are likely to lead to systemic change in priority schools if implemented as described.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ODE and the Governor will push for removal of local and other barriers and move forward to recruit School Appraisal Teams and School Support Teams consisting of the most accomplished and passionate educators from across the entire education community (p. 77).</li> <li>• Oregon’s cycle of improvement contains the following elements: 1) annual self-evaluation to identify areas of challenge; 2) within challenge areas, an externally-guided deeper diagnosis to determine the primary causes of these challenges and to identify supports and potential interventions; 3) based on persistence of poor performance, results of the deeper diagnosis, trends in achievement, and gaps in growth, an annual determination of the level of external interventions necessary to result in substantial improvements (described below as the intervention level); 4) a Comprehensive Achievement Plan, developed together by the district and school, with educator and community input, and approved by ODE, to drive research-based interventions and set improvement goals; 5) implementation and monitoring of implementation. (p. 78)</li> <li>• For districts with priority or focus schools, a Regional Network Coordinator will provide support to the district in completing the self-evaluation, and will assist in the selection of a School Appraisal Team to conduct the indicated deeper diagnoses (p. 79).</li> <li>• ODE provided a table to show their key areas of effectiveness and how they relate to Turnaround Principles and provided Examples of Interventions (p. 80-81).</li> <li>• The Comprehensive Achievement Plan must be submitted to ODE for approval. Approval will be based on fidelity to the federal turnaround principles, as well as sufficiency of the district’s plan for an identified school (p. 83).</li> <li>• Most of the networks and support system are already in place and well-established in the State. Therefore, the SEA does not need to create new systems.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The interventions provide a great deal of flexibility in the consequences for schools at the most intensive level of direct intervention (pp. 85-86). The SEA indicates that if schools cannot achieve improvement with the most intensive (level 3) intervention, then the governor and State superintendent will seek authority from the legislature to close schools or initiate “governance” changes. While local input is a good thing, there are really weak sanctions for persistently failing schools.</li> <li>• The SEA indicates that the LEA might implement some of the interventions, but they are recommended.</li> <li>• The waiver request does not indicate how the SEA will ensure that the LEA will implement the turnaround principles.</li> <li>• There is concern that if the LEA or school is having problems, it will be difficult for the LEA or school to identify and develop solutions to address the problem through the self-evaluation.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

- 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?

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

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

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	In this section, Oregon did not provide enough specific details to determine that they would address the above requirements and there is no assurance that these interventions will actually occur.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal provides evidence that the SEA already has in place some interventions (PBIS, RTI) that will be important to include. There appears to be a strong focus on teachers and teaching.</li> <li>• The SEA indicates that it will engage in the comprehensive alignment of standards, assessments, and instructional content.</li> <li>• As indicated in 2.G, the SEA has a well-developed school support system and so it seems that the SEA has the capacity to support schools and districts in implementing the system.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The description of the Continuous Improvement Network is too broad for the peers to understand the roles of all participants and how it will actually intervene in priority and focus schools (p. 95).</li> <li>• The SEA did not provide enough detail about how it will ensure that interventions are implemented appropriately for all students and subgroups.</li> <li>• The SEA did not provide specific interventions for addressing graduation rate problems.</li> <li>• The SEA indicates that they have strained resources and does indicate how it will prioritize implementation of interventions in that climate.</li> <li>• The SEA should provide more detail about its diagnostic tools.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should consider standardizing its diagnostic tools across LEAs or provide a menu of valid diagnostic tools.

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: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA has a realistic and achievable timeline (p. 88).
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the 2014-15 school year, districts will engage in full implementation supported by the Continuous Improvement Network, the Regional Network Coordinator, coaches, and any district and school support providers approved in the Comprehensive Achievement Plan (p. 88).</li> <li>• Oregon’s plan of three levels of interventions based on identified needs would assure that there is not a concentration of schools in the later years of the timeline.</li> <li>• Many of the interventions are in place.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The procedure for directing or targeting interventions to the correct group of schools is not clear.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

**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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA did not clearly define the exit criteria to ensure that schools exiting make significant progress.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no clear explanation of how a school exits priority status.</li> <li>• If the SEA is going to use measurements of educator behavior or formative student success indicators in determining if a school will exit priority status it needs to define how it will measure these indicators and include them.</li> <li>• The SEA did not define significant progress in clear terms.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Peers recommend more emphasis on improved academic achievement for the exit criteria.

## 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The peers are unclear about the identification of focus schools and therefore cannot determine if the methodology is educationally sound, as described in the request. It is not clear that focus schools are those with low subgroup achievement. This process may mask schools with a higher school rating in the aggregate, but with low achievement of a particular subgroup.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon plans to identify 10% of schools at each level – elementary, middle, and high schools – for focus status which would allow for focus interventions at all levels.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA’s methodology for identifying focus schools is not clear, as described on pages 90-91. Further, it is not clear that the system described will identify the schools with the largest subgroup achievement gaps.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

**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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA has a timeline and process, however, the peers have a concern about the timeline because implementation will not begin until the second semester of the 2012-2013 school year. Additionally, the interventions do not differentiate by subgroup and therefore are unlikely to improve the performance of low-performing students and subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA does not provide specific interventions for any subgroup, such as, what will be done to address low subgroup achievement if that is the reason a school is identified. The peer reviewers were unable to determine how ODE is addressing low graduation rates for English Learners, students with disabilities, etc. Not having interventions for these specific groups defeats the purpose of having focus schools.</li> <li>• The peer reviewers had a concern about the timeline because implementation will not begin until the second semester of the 2012-2013 school year.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should provide examples of and justifications for the interventions for specific subgroups to the LEAs.

**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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA did not clearly define the exit criteria for focus schools to ensure that schools making significant progress with subgroups are then exited from focus designation.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon does not define the level of change that needs to be achieved with subgroups for schools to exit focus status.</li> <li>• See comments under 2.D.v</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers would like to see more about improved academic achievement for the exit criteria. For example, the SEA could use rigorous growth to standard to show that a subgroup is on a trajectory to meet that target to exit focus status.</li> <li>• The SEA should define rigorous and sustained growth.</li> <li>• The SEA should examine the data from those schools that are improving academic achievement for subgroups, investigate the best practices for interventions, and share those best practices with other schools</li> </ul>

## 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: 6 Yes, 0 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Peers acknowledge that Oregon is continuing to refine the system and that there will be changes. If implemented as described, peers believe the supports and incentives described in the request and on the phone will improve student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA is using several powerful evidence-based interventions and models Statewide, as detailed on page 96. The overall network of support that conceptualizes pushing out into the regions and then into the LEAs seems to be an effective plan.</li> <li>• On the call with the SEA, the SEA described coaching and mentorship by the Regional Networks. This is important because of the small size and minimal resources of the districts. The SEA also indicated plans to use a computer-based network to allow LEAs to complete the self-evaluation. This will allow the SEA to monitor its schools and districts more easily.</li> <li>• On the call the SEA clarified that it will raise some of the base funding to incentivize districts to use evidence-based practices. Peers liked that this is not solely about punishment and creates a big incentive.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA’s longitudinal system described on page 102 does not appear to be in place yet, therefore it will be hard to see if schools are closing the gaps.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should continue to develop the longitudinal system.

**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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
---------------------------	----------------------------

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	As the SEA is still developing its system of interventions, it was difficult for the peers to ascertain whether those incentives and supports were likely to improve student achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for all students, including English Learners and students with disabilities.
<i>Strengths</i>	None.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The interventions are not sufficiently differentiated specific to certain subgroups.</li> <li>• The SEA does not appear to address the needs of English Learner students who are dual-identified as students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Based upon the information that we currently have, it is too early to tell whether the differentiated accountability system can accurately track performance for some subgroups.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should examine what is working for schools and districts that are successful with English Learners and students with disabilities and identify those strategies to be used in other schools. They SEA may want to use mentors from the model schools that are successful in English Learners and students with disabilities.

## 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: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA does propose a process for building capacity in its PK-20 system. The peers are concerned that the SEA does not address monitoring of LEAs and holding LEAs accountable for student achievement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievement Compacts will be required of all districts in 2013-14 (p.103).</li> <li>• Oregon will focus on district rather than school accountability. If this works correctly, this will build district capacity to build the school’s capacity.</li> <li>• The fact that the SEA is attaching budget decisions to help build capacity may provide incentives that lead to systemic improvement.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lack of SEA resources will likely be an impediment to the scope and intensity of the interventions. However, if the SEA can activate a network of LEAs to provide the “peer” support, the model has the components to potentially improve student achievement.</li> <li>• Peers are concerned with what is happening in the transition period between the current system and the new accountability system. It appears as if the SEA has described a reduction on mandates while the LEA’s develop the compacts and while the SEA further develops its measurement for its accountability system. Peers expressed concern about freeing LEAs of these requirements before the compacts and accountability system measurements are in place.</li> <li>• It is not clear how Oregon will monitor and provide support for the Achievement Compacts.</li> <li>• The SEA does not address monitoring of LEAs and holding LEAs accountable for student achievement.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA needs to develop a system to monitor, support, and hold accountable LEAs for improving student achievement; this might include revising the Achievement Compacts to have clear requirements for what the LEA must do to achieve their AMOs.

## Principle 2 Overall Review

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

**PRINCIPLE 2 OVERALL REVIEW PANEL RESPONSE**

Tally of Peer Responses: 0 Yes, 6 No

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Oregon's proposed accountability system for 2012-2013 is still under-developed. Some of the components are strong, especially for focus and priority schools, but it is not clear how certain elements such as the Achievement Compact will work. The issues requiring clarification include the growth model as well as the accountability at the HS level including the setting of targets or estimates of the trajectory for various student groups. One of the biggest concerns is that of setting rigorous graduation targets (40-40-20) of each subgroup but not back mapping that to where a group must be in terms of achievement and growth in order to reach that target.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall intervention model of the Continuous Improvement Network has broad support. The interventions for the priority schools were strong and aligned to the system.</li> <li>• The proposed new report card was comprehensive and clear and contained a lot of useful information for improving student achievement. Peers felt that parents and the community would be able to understand this system.</li> <li>• The rewards for the model schools will likely be seen as meaningful for the schools. The other initiative to use budgeting as part of a capacity building effort is strong (p. 101).</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peers are concerned about the lack of alignment between the achievement cut scores and the trajectory to the graduation goal of 40-40-20.</li> <li>• There is a lack of differentiation of interventions for focus schools and other Title I schools, specifically interventions for graduation rates.</li> <li>• The identification of focus schools based on subgroup gaps is not clear.</li> <li>• Currently, Oregon does not have a longitudinal data system in place that is operationalized.</li> <li>• The exit criteria for priority and focus schools described were not specific in terms of achievement.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	In order for the proposed accountability system to meet its intentions, the SEA needs to develop strategies that will enable them to hold LEAs accountable for improving student achievement.

**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

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	The SEA has a plan to get the guidelines adopted. Although all peers are convinced that adoption will occur, some peers are concerned that adoption will not occur by June 2012.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon recently passed Senate Bill 290 which mandates that a multi-measure evaluation system that includes measures of student growth be adopted.</li> <li>• For the past year, ODE has been working collaboratively with key stakeholders and organizations to create a supportive State policy infrastructure focused on educator effectiveness that leads to improved student learning (p. 106).</li> <li>• Core teaching standards and educational leadership/administrator standards were adopted by the State Board of Education on December 2, 2011 (p. 108).</li> <li>• Three significant bills passed during Oregon's 2011 Legislative session have provided a solid policy platform to build an evaluation and support system that is consistent with the principles for ESEA flexibility. Oregon provided details of those bills (p. 106).</li> <li>• In October 2011, the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup was established through the ESEA Flexibility Waiver process. The purpose of the workgroup is to create State guidelines that establish the parameters for local educator evaluation and support systems. This was the foundation from which the SEA could start the development of guidelines (p. 116).</li> <li>• Stakeholders have been involved in the process which increases the likelihood that guidelines will be adopted.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some peers are concerned that there are large questions that require the approval of multiple stakeholders (superintendent, union, and chair of the school board) making adoption of the guidelines challenging under the current timeline.</li> <li>• ODE needs to create a more detailed timeline for State adoption of a framework for evaluation across the State. The current timeline does not discuss the major challenges that remain or the process for overcoming those challenges.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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

### 3.A.i, Option A.ii Panel Response

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

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

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Teacher and their representatives have been involved in the process of creating these guidelines.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senate Bill 290 (SB 290) states “the standards will be customized based on the collaboration of teachers and administrators and the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees of the school district.” Having the involvement of teachers and the sign-off of teacher representatives codified into State law is a guarantee that teachers will be involved in the process (p. 106).</li> <li>• The request further states that the standards that are used to evaluate teachers and administrators shall be customized based on the collaborative efforts of teachers and administrators of the school district and the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees of the school district. Teachers will continue to be involved in the development and ratification of the State evaluation framework.</li> <li>• In 2011 Oregon created the Educator Effectiveness Workgroup which is made up of representatives from teachers and administrators and is tasked with the creation of State guidelines that establish the parameters for local educator evaluation and support systems that comply with SB 290 (p.116). This is an example of the depth to which teachers and administrators have been engaged in the process of creating the evaluation framework.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	None.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	None.

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	Not applicable.
Strengths	Not applicable.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Not applicable.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Not applicable.

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	Not applicable.
Strengths	Not applicable.
Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity	Not applicable.
Technical Assistance Suggestions	Not applicable.

**ONLY FOR SEAs SELECTING OPTION B:** 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

(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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

(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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	Not applicable.
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Not applicable.

## 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*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Currently Oregon does not have a process in place for ensuring that all LEAs implement a valid and reliable evaluation system.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEAs will sign assurances that they are implementing evaluation systems.</li> <li>• Oregon is planning on providing technical assistance to districts, including but not limited to the supports outlined on page 121.</li> <li>• The pilot system of selecting strong LEAs to implement the evaluation systems first should be an effective method for providing clear examples of best practices and lessons learned for other LEAs.</li> <li>• In Senate Bill 252, there are incentives for school districts to design and implement career pathways, compensation models, and evaluation processes for teacher effectiveness.</li> <li>• The SEA will review the LEA's school board policies to ensure that the LEAs will comply.</li> </ul>

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEAs currently only need to sign an assurance stating that they are implementing a system, but there is no process for approval or verification of the validity of the measurement system being used.</li> <li>• A majority of the major pieces of the Oregon plan for implementing a system of evaluation (p. 120) have not been accomplished. Given the amount of work left to be completed, it is unlikely that Oregon will complete and implement an evaluation system or a pilot system by the 2013-2014 school year.</li> <li>• The State has a very broad framework for LEAs and provides little oversight into the actual design that each LEA uses which raises questions about the process for ensuring teachers who work with special populations will be properly evaluated and supported.</li> <li>• The timeline that is given does not leave very much time for LEAs to align their evaluation systems to the State framework (p. 120).</li> <li>• Oregon did not describe its 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.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	Oregon is considering a peer review council to approve local district evaluation systems. The peers believe that this has the potential to improve LEA evaluation systems and should be implemented.

### 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 it 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: 0 Yes, 6 No*

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
---------------------------	----------------------------

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
<i>Rationale</i>	Although Oregon has involved their educators in the development, design and approval of the measures included in their state waiver application, it is not clear that Oregon will successfully implement the system prior to the deadline. Nor is it clear that Oregon has provided LEAs with enough of a framework or enough time to align their systems with the State requirements. Finally, Oregon does not have systems in place to guarantee that LEA systems properly evaluate and support teachers and administrators with valid measures.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SEA involved educators in the development of the guidelines.</li> <li>• The SEA has a plan in place to adopt those guidelines.</li> <li>• There are several pieces of State legislation that will require LEAs to develop systems.</li> <li>• There is a collaborative framework that the SEA is building on.</li> <li>• The SEA has a process to pilot the system before it is implemented and incentives in place to encourage the pilots.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LEAs currently only need to sign an assurance stating that they are implementing a system, but there is no process for verification of the validity of the measurement system being used.</li> <li>• Mechanisms for assuring validity such as inter-rater reliability and validity of student achievement and growth need to be addressed.</li> <li>• How the evaluations will apply to all teachers including those teaching English Learners and students with disabilities need to be addressed.</li> <li>• The SEA does not have a system to ensure that all LEAs implement an evaluation system with fidelity.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The SEA should reconsider the portions of their timeline related to LEA alignment of evaluation systems.

### 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

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
---------------------------	----------------------------

<i>Response Component</i>	<i>Peer Panel Response</i>
Rationale	Oregon’s flexibility request is comprehensive, demonstrated involvement of practitioners and stakeholder throughout the process, and acknowledges all the principles required for the waiver. Nevertheless, the peers identified serious weaknesses in the proposed plan, particularly in Principles 2 and 3. These include the underdeveloped differentiated accountability system and the lack of State oversight to ensure that LEAs will implement each of these Principles as proposed.
<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involvement of teachers, principals, educators, and a diverse group of stakeholders in the development was thorough and well documented.</li> <li>• Principle 1: Oregon provided a quality timeline and plan for implementation of the CCSS. Oregon provided details of their extensive planning and implementation of the CCSS through alignment, professional development activities and resource development.</li> <li>• Principle 2: The strongest feature is Oregon’s understanding of how to improve instruction through a comprehensive network of supports that exist in the State and the identification of a regional system of school improvement.</li> <li>• Principle 3: The enabling legislation and the involvement of stakeholders is a strong foundation for the development of the teacher and leader evaluation guidelines.</li> </ul>
<i>Weaknesses, issues, lack of clarity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principle 1: The ELP standards and ELP assessments were not aligned to implementation of the Common Core standards. The SEA did not provide a disaggregation of language proficiency which did not allow the reviewers to determine if they effectively aligned their content to standards.</li> <li>• Principle 2: The SEA is unable to assure implementation of the reforms proposed in the waiver due to the fact that its AMOS and strategies are locally determined and there is not sufficient State oversight. The SEA has not sufficiently convinced the peers that the accountability system will improve the ratings of small schools and address the progress of subgroups. The process for identifying and intervening in focus schools is unclear and the criteria for exiting priority and focus status is not provided and does not appear to have any requirement to improve achievement.</li> <li>• Principle 3: The SEA’s flexibility request does not demonstrate the SEA has systems to ensure that LEAs implement evaluation and support systems in accordance with the State’s developing guidelines. The SEA’s plan does not address how the SEA will ensure that the educators will be evaluated on meeting the needs of diverse populations.</li> </ul>
<i>Technical Assistance Suggestions</i>	The peers have provided the technical assistance in the appropriate sections. Please see technical assistance provided above.