

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

---

STATE: Alabama



**U.S. Department of Education**

## Background

Peer reviewers apply their professional judgment and experiences when responding to the questions in response to the criteria below. Consistent with section 1111(a)(4)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), peer reviewers will conduct an objective review of State plans in their totality and out of respect for State and local judgments, with the goal of supporting State- and local-led innovation and providing objective feedback on the technical, educational, and overall quality of a State plan, including the validity and reliability of each element of the State plan. Peer reviewer notes inform the written determination of the Secretary regarding the consolidated State plan.

### Role of the Peer Reviewers

- Each peer reviewer will independently review a consolidated State plan with respect to the criteria for Title I, Part A and Title III, Part A and record his or her responses to the questions. Each peer reviewer will note where changes may be necessary for a State educational agency (SEA) to fully address statutory and regulatory requirements and may also present suggestions to improve the State plan or to highlight best practices. Each peer reviewer will create his or her individual recommendations to guide the in-person review. These individual recommendations are submitted to the Department but will not be shared with the State.
- A panel of peer reviewers will meet in person to discuss each SEA's plan. The panel of peer reviewers will generate one set of peer review notes that reflects its collective review and evaluation of the SEA's consolidated State plan, but the panel is not required to reach consensus. The notes should reflect all peer reviewer perspectives on each requirement.

After the peer review is completed, each SEA will receive the final peer review notes that include the peer reviewers' responses to the questions and any recommendations to improve the SEA's consolidated State plan. The peer review notes: 1) constitute the official record of the peer review panel's responses to questions regarding how an SEA's State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements; 2) provide technical assistance to the SEA on how to improve its State plan; and 3) recommend to the Secretary what, if any, additional information to request from the SEA. Taking into consideration the peer reviewers' recommendations, the Department will provide feedback to each SEA that outlines any areas the SEA must address prior to the Secretary's approval of its consolidated State plan. If a State plan cannot be approved, the Department will offer the SEA an opportunity to revise and resubmit its State plan and have a hearing, consistent with ESEA section 8451.

Consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department will make publicly available all peer review guidance, training, and final panel notes. The names of peer reviewers will be made publicly available at the completion of the review of all consolidated State plans. The peer reviewers for any individual State will not be made publicly available.

### How to Use This Document

The peer review criteria are intended to: 1) support States as they develop their consolidated State plans, and 2) inform peer reviewer panels as they evaluate each consolidated State plan. This document outlines the required elements that an SEA must address in its State plan in order to fully meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. If an SEA has provided insufficient information for peer reviewers to determine whether any requirement is fully addressed, peer reviewers should indicate that the SEA has not fully addressed that requirement and identify what additional information or clarification may be needed. Note that responses to some elements are required only if the specific circumstances addressed in the question are applicable to the SEA submitting the consolidated State plan (*e.g.*, if the SEA establishes an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in addition to a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate

in item A.4.iii.b.2 below). For these particular questions, if the circumstances addressed in the question do not apply to the SEA, the SEA is not required to answer the question in order to fully address the statutory and regulatory requirements.

## **Instructions**

Each peer reviewer should include individual review notes in the space provided below each consolidated State plan requirement. For each consolidated State plan requirement, a peer reviewer will provide:

- **Peer Analysis**: Describe the peer reviewer's justification for why an SEA did or did not meet the requirement;
- **Strengths**: Summarize the strengths of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement;
- **Weaknesses**: Summarize the weaknesses of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement, including issues, lack of clarity, and possible suggestions for technical assistance; and
- **Assessment**: Determine if the SEA met the State plan requirement (indicated by Yes/No)
  - If the peer reviewer indicates 'No' above, the peer reviewer must describe the specific information or clarification that a State must provide in order to meet the requirement.

The peer reviewer notes should address all of the required elements of each State plan requirement in this document, but need not address each element individually (*i.e.*, the peer reviewer notes should holistically review A.3.i about the SEA's definition for native languages, incorporating each of the four bulleted items in this element but need not individually respond to each bullet).

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

### A.1: Challenging State Academic Standards and Assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

**A.3.i: Definition**

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA defines languages other than English that are present to a significant extent as those languages that account for 2% or more of the total student population. The SEA states that Spanish is the only language that meets the criteria.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA set the threshold at 2%, which is lower than most states, but recognizes that it is important to remove the language barrier in testing the content areas.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not describe how it set the threshold at 2% or the methodology it used to determine the definition. And while it lists the top 5 languages and the number of students who speak them, the SEA did not provide the percentages of the total student population.</p> <p>The response did not consider how languages were considered other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of English Learners (EL), across LEAs and by grade level.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide a more in-depth description of the process for considering languages other than English, and languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels, LEAs, migrant, non-native born, and Native American.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA does not have any existing assessments that it makes available in languages other than English.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it will provide Spanish assessments at the beginning of SY18-19.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not specify the content areas and grade levels of these Spanish assessments.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- Does the SEA's description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA's description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
  - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
  - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and

- 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (e.g., legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it will offer assessments in Spanish in spring of 2019 and it will convene an EL Advisory Committee representing different ethnicities and geographical areas across the State in SY2017-2018 to gather input.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The timeline does not include the content areas and grade levels of Spanish assessments to be developed. It does not describe how the SEA will collect and respond to public comment about the assessment development.  The SEA provided no discussion of actual test development using such a brief timeline.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Two peers noted that the SEA should describe how it will include the response to public comment, consultation with educators, consultation with parents and families of English Learners, and students.

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA lists each of the major racial and ethnic groups in its accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	

<i>this requirement</i>	
-------------------------	--

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Not Applicable.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that the minimum n-size that it determined for accountability is 20. On page 14, the SEA provides a table showing the N count comparison for each subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although the SEA provides a table showing N count comparisons for each subgroup on page 14, the SEA does not explicitly state that the minimum n-size of 20 will be applied to all students and for each subgroup.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should affirm that it will use a consistent n-size for all subgroups.

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

- Is the selected minimum number of students statistically sound?<sup>2</sup>

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it selected the minimum n-size of 20 after conducting analysis of various minimum n sizes over all accountability subgroups and determined that 20 would provide statistical reliability across accountability

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

	measures and protect the privacy of those subgroups that are too small to report.
<i>Strengths</i>	N.A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although the SEA asserts the reliability of the minimum N size, the SEA does not elaborate on how it determined the reliability of the minimum N size.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provided a concise description of how it determined the minimum number of students. Listening tours were held across the State related to the development of the ESSA State Plan and the SEA collaborated with the ESSA Accountability Workgroup to determine a minimum N count for accountability reporting purposes.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides a table of n-size comparison between n=20 and n=30 to illustrate that using 20 would include 636 subgroups throughout the State.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it suppresses the aggregate data reporting for subgroups with n<20.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA did not provide an argument, data, or evidence regarding how suppressing groups under 20 will protect student privacy.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should provide a cogent argument that suppressing groups under 20 protects student privacy.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s minimum number of students for reporting purposes is 10; lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes (20).
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although the SEA states that it will suppress aggregate data not meeting the minimum N size, the SEA’s response does not specifically discuss student privacy or statistical reliability.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	The SEA should provide further detail as to whether or not the SEA’s minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is consistent with the requirements in ESEA, including with respect to privacy and statistical

---

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that its long-term goal is to decrease the percentage of non-proficient students in ELA and math by 50% by 2030. This goal is set for all students and each subgroup. Subgroups with lower baselines will have trajectories with larger annual increases.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The timeline of 12 years may not be an ambitious goal in light of annual percentage point increases.</p> <p>Various tables throughout this section use different timelines, as well as Appendix B. Some of the timelines conflict with the narrative of the response, which makes it difficult to determine the State’s intent.</p> <p>One peer reviewer noted that no long-term goals were listed, and that the interim goals in Appendix B are watermarked “draft.”</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should review its response, related charts, and appendices to provide consistent timelines and dates.</p> <p>One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should clearly provide the percent proficient by subgroup for the long-term goal as aligned to the last year of its timeline for decreasing gaps. Please ensure that these numeric goals are not labeled “draft.”</p>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA does provide three-year increase expectations for all students and for all subgroups. A chart is provided in Appendix B showing the interim goals for reading and math.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Various tables throughout this section use different timelines, as well as Appendix B. Some of the timelines conflict with the narrative of the response, which makes it difficult to determine the State's intent.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should review its response, related charts, and appendices to ensure consistent timelines and dates.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that its goal is to lower the achievement gaps by decreasing the percentage of non-proficient students in each subgroup by 50% by the end of the 2030 school year. This means that subgroups with lower baselines will be expected to have larger annual increases in proficiency. The SEA will publish the accountability results annually and monitor the actual progress every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA's response does not clarify that the same goals apply to all levels and across all schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that its long-term goal for 4-yr ACGR is to decrease the percentage of non-graduating students by 50% by 2030 for all students and each subgroup. Subgroups with lower baselines will be expected to have larger annual increases.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Various tables throughout this section, as well as Appendix B, use different timelines. Some of the timelines conflict with the narrative of the response, which makes it difficult to determine the State’s intent.</p> <p>The timeline of 12 years may not be an ambitious goal in light of annual percentage point increases.</p> <p>The baseline presented in the response is not the most current year of graduates.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should review its response, related charts (page 17), and appendices (page 66) to provide consistent timelines and dates.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will include 5-yr ACGR in its accountability system to calculate a summative graduation rate indicator score. Their goal for the 5-yr ACGR is to increase the 5-yr rate to 95% by 2030 for all students and each subgroup. The 4-yr ACGR will be weighted 80% and the 5-yr ACGR will be weighted 20% to calculate the final score.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The use of the five-year rate is vague as to how schools will be held accountable for this measure.</p> <p>The State's long term goals for the 4-year cohort graduation rate exceed the state's 95% extended year graduation rate goal. This appears to lessen the rigor of the extended year graduation rate.</p> <p>The SEA did not provide baseline data for subgroups on the extended graduation rate measure.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should provide clarification of the 95% long term goal for the extended year graduation rate as to whether the goal applies to all students and each subgroup. If the goal applies to each subgroup, the SEA should reconcile the extended year ACGR goal with the four year ACGR goal for each subgroup, such that the extended year ACGR goal is more rigorous than the 4-year ACGR goal.</p> <p>The SEA should provide baseline data for all students and subgroups on the extended graduation rate measure.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA includes the interim progress targets for the 4-yr ACGR for all students and each subgroup in Appendix B.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not include the interim progress targets for subgroups in the 5-yr ACGR.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide the interim progress targets for subgroups in the 5-yr ACGR.
--	---

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that its goal for the 4-year ACGR is to lower the graduation rate gaps by decreasing the percentage of non-graduating students in each subgroup by 50% by the end of the 2030 school year. This means that subgroups with lower baselines will be expected to have larger annual increases.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA did not provide any baseline data or interim goals for the extended year ACGR for each subgroup which makes it difficult for the peer reviewers to determine if the proposal meets the requirements. Additionally, the SEA does not provide a discussion of how the 95% long-term extended year ACGR goal closes the statewide graduation rate gaps.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide baseline data and interim goals for the extended year ACGR for each subgroup. Additionally, the SEA should provide a discussion of how the long-term extended year ACGR goal closes the statewide graduation rate gaps.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides the definition of progress to be used in its calculations for long-term and interim goals – that of increasing the percentage of ELs making progress toward proficiency. The State determined timeline appears to be seven years (page 19), with some students expected to take less time. The SEA’s English proficiency assessment went through a standard setting study in 2016 in order to meet the rigorous language demands of College and Career Readiness standards.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA seems to provide a target for 2017, instead of baseline data. Without the baseline data, it is difficult to determine the ambitiousness of the long-term goals.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide baseline data aligned to interim and long-term goals.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it will recalculate the interim targets when it has two years of data, but does include a table with interim progress targets starting with 40% for 2017 to 85% in 2023 with an annual growth of 7.5 percentage points.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not explain why its timelines for the long-term goals for ELA/math proficiency and graduation rate extend to 2030, but the EL proficiency target chart ends in 2023. (page 19)</p> <p>The chart on page 19 does not clearly label a long-term goal.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	As a measure for academic achievement, the SEA will measure student proficiency for both reading and mathematics in Grades 3-8 and once in high school. The percent of students who are proficient in reading and mathematics on the state administered assessments will be calculated annually for Grades 3-8 and high school then reported within the SEA’s accountability system. Growth at the high school level will be included with a focus on actual learning gains of students within the high school academic achievement indicators.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not address the validity or reliability of its academic achievement measure; nor does it address the weighting of reading proficiency and math proficiency.</p> <p>The SEA does not explicitly state that it will calculate the proficiency for reading and math for each subgroup, although it is implied by their long-term goals in previous sections.</p> <p>The SEA does not address the 95% participation requirement in this section, but does address it in a later section.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	The SEA should address the validity and reliability of its academic achievement measure as well as the weighting of reading proficiency and math proficiency.

<i>provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should clearly state that it will calculate the proficiency for reading and math for each subgroup.
---	---

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

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

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it will include a growth measure for elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools for reading and math. The growth will be calculated for all students and each subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not describe the methodology for calculating their growth measure. The SEA does not provide any assurance that the indicator will be calculated in the same way for all schools. The SEA states in the narrative that growth will not be used in high schools. However, the chart on page 21 shows growth being used at the 10 <sup>th</sup> grade level.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should describe the methodology for calculating their growth measure, including using the same indicator and calculating it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State.

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

- Does the SEA describe the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?

- Does the description include how the SEA calculates the indicator including: 1) that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all LEAs, across the State; 2), if applicable, whether the SEA chooses to lag adjusted cohort graduation rate data; and 3) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (e.g., consistent with the provisions in ESEA section 8101(23) and (25), which permit averaging graduation rate data over three years for very small schools)?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the indicator based on the SEA’s long-term goals?
- Is the indicator based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate?
- If the State, at its discretion, also includes one or more extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, does the description include how the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is combined with that rate or rates within the indicator?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description include how the State includes in its four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates students with the most significant cognitive disabilities assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a State-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25)?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA plans to increase the four-year cohort graduation rate to 94% by 2030 (Projected calculation pg. 22). Additionally, it will include five-year cohort graduates in the new accountability system (Projected calculation pg. 22). Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed using an alternate assessment aligned to alternate academic achievement standards under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and awarded a state-defined alternate diploma under ESEA section 8101(23) and (25).
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not describe how the state-defined alternate diploma will be incorporated into their graduation rate indicator along with the 4-year and 5-year ACGR metrics.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Does the SEA describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same indicator across all LEAs in the State?
- Is the indicator valid and reliable?
- Is the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator aligned with the State-determined timeline described in A.4.iii.c.1?

- Does the indicator consistently measure statewide the progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12?
- Does the SEA’s description include the State’s definition of English language proficiency, based on the State English language proficiency assessment?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will calculate the percentage of growth EL students have made using the state ELP assessment based on established targets. Utilizing the established progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency targets, districts, schools and the State will include 5% of this score in the summative indicator score.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not describe the progress in achieving ELP indicator.</p> <p>The SEA does not indicate which grade levels will be included in this indicator.</p> <p>The SEA does not state that the ELP indicator for EL progress is valid or reliable.</p> <p>Although the SEA defines its English language proficiency as receiving a 4.8 on its ELP assessment, it does not describe the SEA’s definition of EL growth.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should describe the Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicator used in its statewide accountability system, including that the SEA uses the same ELP progress indicator across all LEAs in the State.</p> <p>The SEA should indicate whether or not its methodology is valid and reliable in using its ELP progress indicator.</p> <p>The SEA should discuss how the indicator consistently measures statewide progress of all English learners in each of grades 3 through 8 and in the grade for which such English learners are otherwise assessed under ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I) during grades 9 through 12.</p> <p>The SEA should include the description of the State’s definition of English language growth, based on the State English language proficiency assessment as part of its response to this section.</p>

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

*Note: Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator. For*

any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA's description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA chose chronic absenteeism as one School Quality or Student Success indicator within its accountability system for schools with a Grade 12 and for schools without a Grade 12. The SEA has defined chronic absenteeism as the percentage of students having 15 or more absences in a given school year. Three peer reviewers found this metric to be valid, reliable, comparable, and able to provide meaningful differentiation in school performance. Its goal is to decrease the overall chronic absenteeism rate to no greater than 5% by 2030 for all districts, schools and the state; it is displayed on the chart on page 23.</p> <p>The SEA will also include its college and career ready indicator for high schools. Three peer reviewers found these metrics to be valid, reliable, comparable, and able to provide meaningful differentiation in school performance. There are six ways that students can be declared as college and/or career ready:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark score on the ACT</li> <li>• Scoring 3+ on an AP/4+ on an IB exam</li> <li>• Scoring silver level or above on ACT Work Keys</li> <li>• Earning a transcript college credit in high school</li> <li>• Earning an Industry Credential</li> <li>• Being accepted for enlistment into any branch of the military</li> </ul> <p>The SEA's goal is to increase the college and career readiness rate for all students in a cohort to 94% by 2030.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is to be commended for its progressive process to meet the needs of all students within its college and career system.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Although the SEA stated that it intends to use chronic absenteeism, which is a commonly used metric, the SEA did not specifically discuss that the indicator is valid, reliable, comparable, and provides meaningful differentiation in school performance.</p> <p>Although the SEA stated that it intends to use reasonable college and career readiness metrics, which are frequently used, the SEA did not specifically discuss that the indicator is valid, reliable, comparable, and provides meaningful differentiation in school performance.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should discuss how each component of the indicator is valid, reliable, comparable, and provides meaningful differentiation in school performance.
--	--

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes the formation of the Office of School Improvement and Turnaround (OSIT) and the support this office will be providing to schools and districts based on their Comprehensive and Targeted services designations. Schools and districts will receive differentiated levels of support according to the classification assigned by the SEA utilizing a review of multiple sources of data to determine the specific classification of all schools within the State.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not clearly describe its system of meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the State on an annual basis. This system should go beyond the Comprehensive and Targeted services designations to meaningful differentiation between any two schools.</p> <p>The SEA does not provide assurances that the differentiation will occur on an annual basis, using the most recent year’s data, and that the measures will be used consistently across all schools and all subgroups.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should clearly describe its system of meaningful differentiation of all public schools in the state on an annual basis. This system should go beyond the Comprehensive and Targeted services designations to meaningful differentiation between any two schools.</p> <p>The SEA should provide assurances that the differentiation will occur on an annual basis, using the most recent year’s data, and that the measures will be used consistently across all schools and all subgroups.</p>

A.4.v.b: Weighting of Indicators

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA has developed proposed weights for all indicators included within its ESSA State Plan. All indicators within the plan are calculated based upon a 100-point scale. The SEA has identified the weights for schools without a Grade 12 and for schools with a Grade 12 to be applied in determining the summative score for each district, school and the State. The Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s) and individual weighting is adequately distributed overall. Representative pie charts illustrate the proposed weights for the ESSA indicators (pg. 26)
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not indicate how the weighting will be adjusted if one of the indicators is not present at the school, due to minimum N count, such as Progress in ELP.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide a discussion of how the weighting will be adjusted if one of the indicators is not present at the school, due to minimum N count such as Progress in ELP.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A, the SEA does not use a different methodology.

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s Office of School Improvement and Turnaround (OSIT) in the Division of Teaching and Learning will ensure differentiated, tiered support and intervention for every school receiving Title I, Part A funds; based upon multiple performance levels beginning SY 2018-2019. Factors to be considered in the identification of schools include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identification in the bottom 6% (no less than the bottom 5% as required by ESSA guidelines) of the schools;</li> <li>• high schools with a graduation rate more than 10 percentage points below the state average graduation rate;</li> <li>• schools with chronically low-performing subgroup(s) and schools with history of being identified among the bottom 6% for three years.</li> </ul>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA will identify more schools for support than required.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although the SEA states that identification will begin in SY 2018-2019, the SEA does not clarify that schools will be identified for CSI for the 2018-2019 school year, using data from the 2017-18 school year.  The SEA should clarify the language to be precise as to the identification of 6% of all schools versus 6% of Title I schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<del>X</del> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <del>X</del> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should clarify that schools will be identified for CSI for the 2018-2019 school year, using data from the 2017-2018 school year.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that it will identify all Title I public schools with a graduation rate that is 10 percentage points or more below the state average as Comprehensive Support schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA does not clearly show that the current criteria of 10% or more below the state average will continue to identify schools with graduation rates of 67% or less, because the State’s average graduation rate may fluctuate over time.</p> <p>The SEA does not clarify that schools will be identified for CSI for the 2018-2019 school year, using data from the 2017-2018 school year.</p> <p>The SEA should identify all schools (not just Title I schools) based on the criteria.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA should include in its criteria that any school with a graduation rate of 67% or less will be identified for CSI.</p> <p>The SEA should clarify that schools will be identified for CSI for the 2018-2019 school year, using data from the 2017-18 school year.</p> <p>The SEA should identify all schools (not just Title I schools) based on the criteria.</p>

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

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C) (i.e., based on identification as a school in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification as one of the lowest-performing five percent) that have not satisfied the statewide exit criteria for such schools within a State-determined number of years?

- Does the SEA’s methodology result in the identification of such schools?
- Does the SEA include the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will identify Title I schools with consistently underperforming subgroups of students that are performing at or below all students in the lowest performing schools, and have not improved over a three-year timeframe after implementing a targeted support and improvement plan (Targeted Support).
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA did not provide a timeline for first identification of CSI schools based on schools not exiting TSI status.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide a timeline for when it will first identify CSI schools based on schools not exiting TSI status.

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will identify schools for Comprehensive Support every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will identify any school with one or more consistently underperforming subgroup(s) annually for targeted support and improvement beginning in 2019-2020. Targeted support will include a comprehensive diagnostic audit/review of each identified school and the district, an action or improvement plan as well as support and assistance from OSIT. The SEA's methodology is based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Beginning in SY 2018-2019, any Title I school that is considered low performing will be identified once every three years for additional targeted support. Additional targeted support schools will be named again in SY 2021-2022. These schools will be identified by having one or more subgroups of students performing at or below all students in the lowest performing schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information</i>	

<i>or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	
---	--

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes that all students in grades 3-8 and high school enrolled on the first day of the testing window will be required to test. For EL students who are in their first year of enrollment who will not take the ELA test, their EL state assessment will be used to calculate the participation rate for all students and each subgroup. Schools and districts not meeting the 95% participation rate for one year will be required to complete a plan; schools and districts not meeting the requirement for two years will receive a reduction in their summative score of 2% on the report card.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not clarify that the 95% participation rate threshold applies to both all Students and each subgroup in the school or district. The unit of analysis appears to be schools and districts.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	XYes (2 peer reviewer(s)) XNo (2 peer reviewer(s))

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Two peer reviewers noted that the SEA should clarify that the 95% participation rate threshold applies to both all Students and each subgroup in the school and district.
--	---

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that the exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support is for the schools to perform above the bottom 6% and sustain improvement for 2 consecutive years.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not provide a requirement to meet at least the same or greater threshold that entered the school into CSI. There is no clarity around which year’s threshold is being used.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide clarification about the requirement to meet at least the same or greater threshold that entered the school into CSI. Additionally, the SEA should provide clarity around which year’s threshold is being used.

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

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?

- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that the exit criteria is for schools to make progress toward closing the gap between identified subgroups and sustain improvement for two consecutive years.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not provide an exit timeline for TSI schools.  The SEA’s stated exit criteria are not related to the criteria used for initial identification.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should provide an exit timeline for TSI schools.  The SEA should align its exit criteria to the criteria used for initial identification of a TSI school.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that schools that do not exit CSI status within 4 years will be designated as CSI-Returning status, and the SEA will work collaboratively with the LEAs and CSI-R schools to identify external partners to conduct reviews and needs assessments at both the school and district levels to examine all aspects of running these schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA will use external partners to get an unbiased, objective assessment of the schools and districts.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not describe how it will support schools or what its expectations/requirements are for the CSI-R schools after conducting external needs assessments.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	The SEA should describe in more detail how it will support schools and its expectations/requirements for the CSI-R schools after conducting the external needs assessments.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The OSIT will review resource allocations by assessing 11 areas such as: annual review of progress, feeder pattern trends, leadership capacity, monitoring results, etc.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not state its definition of an LEA serving a significant number or percentage of schools.  The SEA does not fully describe its process to review resource allocation.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes ( peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should state its definition of an LEA serving a significant number or percentage of schools.  The SEA should fully describe how it will review resource allocations to support school improvement. This description should include the process the SEA will use, in addition to the data elements that will be included.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will implement a process for approving, monitoring, and periodically reviewing LEA Comprehensive School Improvement plans. This will be offered through a variety of supports to schools and LEAs that will include but are not limited to on-site technical assistance, off-site training sessions, embedded professional learning, virtual learning experiences, guidance documents, and templates to support needs assessment, improvement planning, implementation, and monitoring. The State will collaborate with LEAs, business/community partners, Regional In-service Centers and national clearinghouses to identify resources.

<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the supports identified on page 32 are either already available to schools or do not clearly provide assistance to the LEAs in order to improve student outcomes.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should strengthen the supports that it makes available to LEAs serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for support and improvement. These supports should clearly be in addition to the resources already available to schools and LEAs.

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

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

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

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

- Does the SEA describe the extent, if any, that low-income children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers, which may include the State definition of ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that its research has shown low-needs schools have a higher percentage of experienced and out-of-field teachers than those found in high-needs schools, as shown in Table 5, “Teacher Comparison by Type of School” on page 32. The SEA describes its goal of ensuring that teachers have access to the best available training, research and information to improve their level of instruction and list a variety of support structures, such as Alabama Teacher Mentoring Program, and professional learning for principals, superintendents and district leaders. The SEA also describes its goal of promoting equitable staffing of Title I schools and systems, and lists a few support structures such as recruitment incentives. The SEA will collect the information through the LEA consolidated plan, compliance monitoring, and the continuous improvement plan and publicly report on the new state report card in the fall of 2017. The SEA’s definitions of ineffective, out-of-field and inexperienced teachers are provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA does not clearly describe the measures it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should clearly describe the measures it will use to evaluate and publicly report its progress with respect to how low-income and minority children are not served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers.

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

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning?

---

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

- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce incidences of bullying and harassment?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom?
- Does the SEA’s description include how it will support LEAs to reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA lists a variety of strategies and activities it plans to implement under each of the following goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foster the component of effective schools and create cultures that support effective teachers, resulting in environments where excellent teaching and learning are provided for each student (school safety)</li> <li>• Design and implement alternatives to in-school and out-of-school suspensions</li> <li>• Identify and promote activities to address bullying and other negative behaviors. Provide a safe and secure school structure that facilitates learning</li> <li>• Improve attendance and reduce trancies.</li> </ul>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>For each area, the SEA describes specific interventions that will be made available to districts and schools. For example, with bullying, there is a collaborative effort between the SEA and Alabama Education Association (AEA): Closing Achievement Gaps through Community Conversations that Lead to Collective Action. The Community Conversation focuses on helping a broad cross-section of the community engage in a discussion about how all students can be free of bullying.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes its plans to support school transitions by implementing an Early Warning System for identifying students in real time at risk, training LEAs on Innovative Pathways to Graduation Guide and RtI, expanding the</p>

	REACH advisor/advisee model statewide for grades 5-12 students, and the Jobs for Alabama's Graduates (JAG) program for students in grades 9-12 to prevent dropouts.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides a vast array of resources that are available for all students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that its entrance procedure is to test the language-minority students identified through the HLS using WIDA within 30 days if registered before the beginning of the school year, and within 10 days if registered during the school year. Students scoring below 5.0 must be classified as an EL and provided services. Students are tested annually and exit when they receive a composite score of 4.8. The SEA is working with WIDA and other WIDA consortium States in a process for determining criteria regarding what proficiency means for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA addresses the needs of ELs with the most significant cognitive disability.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Although the SEA has a clear exit procedures, its response would be strengthened by specifically indicating a classroom measure or input by the student's teacher as part of the exit process.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that it collaborates with various stakeholders to identify best practices and to provide LEAs assistance in meeting the goals in fully implementing the challenging State academic standards. The SEA provides state ESL coaches through the School Assistance Meetings for Understanding English Learners (SAMUELS) trainings, WIDA PDs, EL guidebook, and an annual PD.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	N/A
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that it monitors on an ongoing basis through annual desk audits, and a cycle based on risk assessment or a 4-yr monitoring period. The SEA also states that it provides ongoing technical assistance to all LEAs, especially to those with ELs that are not making progress in achieving EL proficiency, through workgroups, coaches, regional meetings, etc.
<i>Strengths</i>	N/A
<i>Weaknesses</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA does not clearly describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A

	subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer(s))
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	One peer reviewer noted that the SEA should clearly describe how it will monitor the progress of each eligible entity receiving a Title III, Part A subgrant in helping English learners achieve English language proficiency.