

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

---

STATE: Arizona



**U.S. Department of Education**  
April 5, 2017

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

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

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

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

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

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

- If applicable,<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>	<p>The state provides only a short explanation for how it intends to support schools and districts to ensure access for all students. P. 7</p> <p>The plan indicates how this state’s standards allow for any student to “access advanced coursework” through the incorporation of “Plus” standards. Schools also receive credit for “acceleration readiness”.</p>

---

<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).

	The plan mentions that “all [teachers] have the opportunity to offer advanced coursework to students,” but does not describe a specific strategy that is likely to provide all students in the state that opportunity
<i>Strengths</i>	Having the standards clearly articulate how to incorporate more advanced content for students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It’s not clear what EOC assessment students would take in 8 <sup>th</sup> grade. Is it only Algebra I, or are Algebra II and Geometry options? Plus, the more rigorous assessment in high school is not identified.  The plan lacks details about the plans in place to ensure all students have the opportunity to be prepared for and take advanced mathematics in middle school. There is no discussion of trainings or incentives for schools to align curriculum earlier than middle grades or research presented to suggest that the strategies in place will support the goal. More information is necessary.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	In order to meet the criteria of providing access for all students, the state should describe how LEAs get access to training and implementation of the plus standards.

### **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 plan notes that AZ is an “English-only state” and cites state law requiring all assessment and instruction take place in English. See p. 7
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not provide its definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not provide its definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population. The state is not required to provide assessments in languages other than English, but must provide its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” and define at least the most populous language other than English spoken by the State’s participating student population.

### 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>	N/A – no non-English assessments are identified.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

### A.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 plan notes that AZ is an “English-only state” and cites state law requiring all assessment and instruction take place in English. See p. 7
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not provide assessments in languages other than English, but must still 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

#### 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 plan notes that AZ is an “English-only state” and cites state law requiring all assessment and instruction take

	place in English. See p. 7
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Arizona is an “English-Only” state; therefore, it does not make every effort to develop assessments in, at 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. The SEA should discuss the efforts it is taking to develop assessments.

#### **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>	<p>This state clearly articulates how it will collect data identifying the major racial and ethnic groups.</p> <p>The SEA lists the major subgroups: American Indian/Native American, Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, and Multiple Races. The State will also use the following required subgroups in the accountability system: Economically disadvantaged students, children with disabilities, and English learners.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The list includes all racial and ethnic subgroups typically found on surveys.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

<i>fully meet 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>	There is one additional group listed at p. 8- those taking advanced math EOC assessments prior to HS.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Reviewers expressed a potential worry that high n-size may actually create non-reported groups for many schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Please clarify if this data will be disaggregated by sub-group itself or used to ensure equitable access across subgroups.</p> <p>Please describe the identified subgroup with more detail. Specifically, will reporting on the group be disaggregated or reported by racial/ethnic categories? Will it be disaggregated by course assessment taken (e.g. Alg or Geo)?</p>

**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>	N/A - The application indicates they are seeking the exception under roman numerate (ii).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.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>	<p>The SEA provides the minimum number of students (n=20) 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. The SEA does not specify that the minimum number of students is the same for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State.</p> <p>The n-size presented is small enough to hold the majority of schools accountable for performance within subgroups, and large enough to be statistically valid.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The n-size presented is small enough to hold the majority of schools accountable for performance within subgroups, and large enough to be statistically valid.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not specify that the minimum number of students is the same for all students and for each subgroup of students in the State.
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

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

A.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>	<p>The application provides few details about the statistical soundness of setting the n-size at 20. See p. 9-10. However, based on the data provided at the bottom on p. 9, the selection appears to be statistically sound.</p> <p>The SEA explains how the n-size of 20 was established: the number is large enough to provide statistically valid and reliable results, but small enough to ensure schools are held accountable. Additionally, this n-size offers privacy protection for those subgroups too small to report without disclosing personally identifiable information.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Value is large enough to ensure student privacy.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Not much statistical data provided as justification.</p> <p>This state simply argues that the value is large enough to be statistically valid and reliable, but does not state how or any concerns.</p>

---

<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.

	Using a value less than 30 for accountability purposes raises potential reliability concerns when designating a school for sanctions. Also, there is only so much money to provide for resources. Lower n-sizes may cause less money to be available for those populations who need it most.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Please describe how this n-value will ensure validity and reliability in results and not over- or under-identify schools for consequences.  Please address the increased risk of measurement error when using a value less than 30.

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 application states that the A-F Ad Hoc committee proposed the n-size and was comprised of teachers, parents, lobbyists and SBOE members. The SBOE then approved the selection.  A methodical approach towards identifying the number of schools that would be excluded if different n-sizes were applied was used, as well as a state wide communication and listening tour to collect feedback from stakeholders.
<i>Strengths</i>	Diverse engagement and involvement of different voices.  The approach was methodical and focused on making sure a feasible number of schools was included while also maintaining statistical validity and reliability.  The committee proposed the minimum n-size was representative of a diverse population of stakeholders - teachers, superintendents, parents, educational lobbyists, and state board of education members.  Very thorough explanation of how different n-sizes would affect the state's accountability system.

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

A.4.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>	<p>The application discusses balancing the desire for reporting with the need to keep student PII safe from disclosure. See p. 9 and 10.</p> <p>This state uses a value higher than 10, which further ensures privacy of student identifiable information.</p> <p>The SEA states that it suppresses aggregate data that falls below the minimum n-size to ensure that student information is protected. It also states that “additional ways to protect data are also being discussed”; however, the explanation does not go further.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Data table at p. 9 demonstrates the number of schools with a reported subgroup at each n-size level. Clear balancing of transparency and protection of PII.</p> <p>Using a value larger than 10.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must

apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state sets three long term goals at p. 12-13. The goal and rationale are clearly explained. The goals are uniformly applied throughout the state and across subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA describes 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; the description includes baseline data and timeline for meeting the long term goals.</p> <p>The SEA describes the process for setting baseline data, long term goals and measures of interim progress in the narrative, and includes numeric long term goals in Appendix A.</p> <p>Panel discussed the long timeline. While targets met the criteria of this peer review, there was concern that the timeline was not appropriate.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Strong discussion of rationale, limitations, and process of arriving at goals p. 12-13.</p> <p>Stakeholders were included as were psychometricians from across the state.</p> <p>Long term goals seem reasonable and ambitious</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Long-term goals are many years in the future despite under performance.</p> <p>It was not defined well as to how the goals were set which makes it difficult to determine if the timeline is appropriate.</p> <p>Each subgroup of students have to meet the same goals, but other than stating this, they really don’t distinguish whether this is appropriate for each subgroup. Also, it is not identified how they landed at the number of years to attain the goals.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>

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

A.4.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>	<p>The MIPs are provided at p. 54-64. The state used a robust process for setting the MIPs. See p. 11</p> <p>The SEA explains how it developed the MIPs (Measures of Interim Progress); they will be evaluating progress made by each subgroup.</p> <p>The SEA provided measures of interim progress towards meeting the long term goals for all students and each subgroup.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Leveraged collaborative process already in place to set goals.</p> <p>Very detailed measures of interim progress are provided in Appendix A.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Could use clarification around which students comprise the ‘FAY only’ group. The assumption is that this is the state’s ‘all students’ group.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Goal #1 requires proficiency gaps to be closed by 50% in ten years p. 13 and Goal #2 requires all subgroups to be proficient by 2039. Goal #1 language specifically addresses the uneven growth required by different subgroups, but notes that equal growth is not realistic or attainable p. 13. Goal #2, however, requires all groups to reach the same high levels of achievement. MIPs are measured every three years until all groups meet targets by 2039 p. 13 allowing schools time to implement necessary strategies for improvement p. 12.</p> <p>The process described is more rigorous for students the furthest behind.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Discussion of ambitious but achievable goals.</p> <p>Rigorous process defined.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Length of time to attain goals may not be ambitious enough. (e.g. timeline too long)</p> <p>Linear growth for students is not likely and plan does not address this issue when setting linear goals.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students?
- Does the SEA identify and describe the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state has set a long term goal of 90% grad rate by 2030 p. 14. A table showing MIPs for grad rate by subgroup is on p. 64. The narrative suggests that the goal is ambitious but attainable and based on current data.</p> <p>The SEA identifies and describes the long term goal for 4-year graduation rate (90%). The SEA posits that interim progress measures for each subgroup are set at three year intervals to allow time for schools to fully implement strategies to improve graduation rates</p> <p>Graduation rate goals detailed in the plan are ambitious and were set based on the state’s current graduation rates as compared to graduation rates in other high-performing states.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Development with input from a broad group of stakeholders in A-F committee.</p> <p>Goals appear to be rigorous and based on prior data.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

A.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 states that interim progress measures for each subgroup are set at three year intervals to allow time for schools to fully implement strategies to improve graduation rates. The SEA also posits that by 2030, all subgroups are expected to achieve a 90% graduation rate. In order to accomplish this ambitious goal, some subgroup populations will need to improve at faster rates than others. This is shown in Appendix A
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Little information about how groups will attain progress sufficient to meet MIPs.</p> <p>Consider providing MIPs for EL students in the Graduation Rate table included in Appendix A per footnote on page 64.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

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

**A.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>	<p>The SEA claims that by 2030, all subgroups are expected to achieve a 90% graduation rate. In order to accomplish this ambitious goal, some subgroup populations will need to improve at faster rates than others. This is shown in Appendix A.</p> <p>The long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for the four-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.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	If each subgroup makes goals, gap will be closed by 2030
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Little comparable discussion of how MIPs were set to ensure success for subgroups.</p> <p>Rather rigorous goals for some populations</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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’s long-term goal is to increase the percentage of students making progress towards English language proficiency as determined by the student-level targets from 30 percent in 2016 by 3 percent annually over 10 years to reach 60 percent of EL students making progress towards proficient by 2028.
<i>Strengths</i>	Simple and clearly stated goal.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The explanation is weak and does not take into consideration that the group of ELLs will be new every year.  Little data or research provided to justify long-term English Language Proficiency goals based on the AZELLA assessment. Without this context, reviewers cannot determine if the long-term goal presented is ambitious.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Please provide data or research to justify long-term English Language Proficiency goals based on the AZELLA assessment. Without this context, reviewers cannot determine if the long-term goal presented is ambitious.

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 provides 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>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	MIPs are provided at p. 64-65. Little detail or justification for setting, but some discussion of difference in expected rate of growth at different grade/entry level combinations at p. 16.  Peer reviewers discussed how the application could be strengthened by including details about specific research that was used to set targets.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

#### A.4.iv: 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>	<p>The plan details an accountability system that produces an A-F rating for each school in the state. P. 17 The plan also provides details for calculations and weighting at each grade level p. 17-22. All subgroups are included p. 19.</p> <p>Model incorporates weighting system based on length of time enrolled in a school. SGPs and SGTs are included at all grades.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Discussion of engagement and accompanying Progress Meter development.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The 95% participation requirement was not included.</p> <p>The formula for combining each indicator into an overall score, along with the scale to translate the score into an overall letter grade is not provided.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>95% requirement is discussed on pp 30-31, and notes that participation below 95% will factor into improvement decisions, but does not factor into the proposed accountability framework. Please clarify how the 95% participation rate will factor into the state’s accountability framework.</p> <p>According to statute, the Academic Achievement Indicator must include ELA and Mathematics achievement only. Science achievement should be removed from this indicator.</p> <p>Panel discussed the weighting system that incorporates length of time enrolled in a school. There is concern that this practice could mask the performance of vulnerable student populations (students with high mobility). This makes it difficult to determine if the indicator is valid and reliable and raises concerns about reporting for individual student subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe how the Academic Achievement indicator is based on the SEA’s long-term goals.</p>

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>	This state uses Student Growth Percentiles and Student Growth Targets for their other academic indicator.  The other academic indicators for k-8 are discussed at p 19 and 20. The state proposal treats all schools equally in weighting.
<i>Strengths</i>	The combined SGP/SGT based on the idea of proficiency within 3 year, points awarded for hitting targets, and the most struggling students receiving the most points for hitting targets.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Menu approach is not clear on how the information will be displayed to increase maximum transparency for how points are earned.  The SEA mentions that the same growth indicator is used for K-8, but does not specify if a different indicator or method of calculation is used for each grade.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	It is not clear from the plan how growth data is disaggregated for each subgroup. Please describe how the indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states how the indicator is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.</p> <p>The SEA plan does not provide a description of (i) how the indicator is based on the long-term goals; (ii) how the indicator annually measures graduation rate for all students and separately for each subgroup of students</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Formula allows for up to 7 <sup>th</sup> year graduates to be included.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>No information provided regarding how to calculate graduation rate for very small schools.</p> <p>The SEA does not address whether this graduation rate is the same across all High Schools and all LEAs in the state.</p> <p>The SEA does not discuss if and how the indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The SEA does not indicate how this graduation rate calculation is valid and reliable.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe if the indicator is based on the SEA’s long-term goals.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	This state uses a state developed assessment for determining English Language Proficiency and allows for tracking growth towards language acquisition.
<i>Strengths</i>	Goals are set through a research based approach regarding what is best at different age and grade levels.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Information regarding this indicator was found in 3 different sections of the report – page 19, page 25, page 64 – readability would be improved by consolidating information or referring to different sections.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv.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 School Quality and Success indicator provides a menu of items that can be included in up to 10% of the school score.</p> <p>The SEA describes the School Quality or Student Success indicators used in its statewide accountability system for grades K-8 and 9-12. The SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span and it describes each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies</p> <p>The plan describes Acceleration/Readiness measure to incentivize improvement on other measures of school health (which includes accelerated math testing, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade ELA achievement, subgroup improvement, SPED inclusion, and chronic absenteeism)</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Does include potential for points if school increases time spent in general ed classroom for special needs students as well as decreases chronic absenteeism.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Most ways for a school to attain points will be through increased performance on state assessments.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>No description of how the state will address the use of a menu function and ensure the indicator is uniformly applied at all schools throughout the state. Schools could earn points in any number of categories and score partial or full points. Due to lack of detail around which items would be chosen to comprise each school's individual score, reviewers found it difficult to determine if the indicator allows for meaningful differentiation. Please provide more information about how the indicator will or will not be used uniformly across schools.</p> <p>It is not clear that the indicator can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students.</p>

#### 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>	An A-F system is used that incorporates each weighted indicator. Beyond A-F ratings, the SEA does not fully describe its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State, or each subgroup of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	Easy to use and understand by all.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The description of the letter grades didn’t differentiate between B, C, and D. Only stated that each was below the “excellent (A), level.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Little information in plan about the cut scores that will be used to establish each band of performance. Without this information it is difficult to determine if differentiation will be statistically meaningful.

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 plan provides explanation of the weighting of indicators at p. 28.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Simplicity.</p> <p>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</p>

	Success indicator(s).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Plan provides no data or modeling for reference, nor logic for establishing the weights.  Unsure of whether a weight of 10% is substantial enough to meet the criteria for Proficiency and Growth for ELL students.  The state has not yet determined how to handle K-2 configurations
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not address how weighting is adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated due to the minimum number of students (i.e., what is weighting of each indicator if too few graduates or too few students to calculate growth?)

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The state has not yet determined how to handle K-2 configurations.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	The state has not yet determined how to handle K-2 configurations. Please address once this determination is made.

<i>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 provides the explanation that the lowest performing schools will be the lowest 5 percent of all Title I schools based on summative A-F total points.
<i>Strengths</i>	Simple plan for identification.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides details for identification of schools based on graduation rate on p. 29. There is discussion about how multiple extended-year cohort rates will be averaged to create a single rate that will be used for identification. P. 29 Timeline is discussed at p. 30
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Subgroups will be monitored annually and schools not exiting after 4 years will be identified as CS and I schools.</p> <p>The SEA describes its methodology to identify schools receiving Title I, Part A funds that have received additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C).</p> <p>The plan includes the year in which it will first identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state’s plan is technically and educationally sound and meets this requirement.

<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan includes few details about the technical and business rules. Reviewers commented that it was difficult to complete a thorough analysis due to the lack of details, but that the explanation provided met the core requirements.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi.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 posits that it will identify the lowest-performing five percent of all schools receiving Title I, Part A funds as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools in 2017-18. Arizona will identify all high schools in the state that fail to graduate one-third or more of their students in 2018-19. New schools will be identified every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that subgroup achievement is monitored annually. Any Arizona school that has one or more significant achievement gap(s) between subgroups and any low achieving subgroups will be identified as Targeted Support and Improvement. “Consistently underperforming” is defined as a school being identified as having one or more significant achievement gaps between subgroups and any low achieving subgroups for three consecutive years.  The plan addresses methodology at p. 29. Annual monitoring addressed a p. 30.
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan is precise and methodology provides for meaningful differentiation.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

- Does the SEA include the year in which the State will first identify such schools (*i.e.*, does the timeline comply with the Department’s guidance)?
- Does the SEA include the frequency with which the State will identify such schools after the first year of identification?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA states that in its schools “in which any subgroup of students (N20), on its own, would lead to identification as a Comprehensive Support and Improvement School by the State Board of Education adopted A-F Letter Grade Accountability System, will be identified annually as Targeted Support and Improvement beginning in 2018-19”.</p> <p>Yes, the methodology is described on p. 30.</p> <p>The start date of 2018-19 is identified along with the identification being on an annual basis.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	This explanation is clear and concise.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Little additional detail is provided to address how the state will identify schools for additional targeted support. A process is described, but it is not clear how this might play out over the next school year (<i>i.e.</i> impact non-traditional schools in the state and/or if any exceptions will apply).</p> <p>The plan includes few details about the technical and business rules. Reviewers commented that it was difficult to complete a thorough analysis due to the lack of details, but that the explanation provided met the core requirements.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

A.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 states that “a participation rate of less than 95 percent on statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments will be a factor in school improvement decisions” and that “schools will be monitored annually with interventions required if student participation stays under 95 percent for multiple years.” It does not address subgroups 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.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>No detailed discussion about differentiated approach.</p> <p>Subgroups are not identified and it is not clear how 95% participation actually factors into the accountability grade.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	Describe specifically how the state will factor 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

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	into the statewide accountability system.
--	---

**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 describes that its schools will exit Comprehensive Support and Improvement when they no longer meet identification criteria; their summative scores are no longer in the bottom 5% of all Title I schools based on the State Board of Education adopted A-F Letter Grade Accountability System. Schools identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools because of a low graduation rate will exit when the graduation rate calculation is 67 percent or more. All Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools will be expected to exit within four years of identification.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	There does not appear to be a criteria on meeting expectations for multiple years before exiting.  Quality for exit could be stronger if focused more on ensuring schools are on track for long-term goals not just meeting the bar for exceeding identification in lowest 5%.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Quality for exit criteria should be stronger, and the plan should describe how the criteria will ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success.

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>	<p>The SEA specifies that its schools “will exit Targeted Support and Improvement when they no longer meet identification criteria closing subgroup gaps and increasing subgroups achievement. Schools will be expected to exit within the four- year window”.</p> <p>The SEA’s description does include the number of years (4) within which schools are expected to meet exit criteria. The SEA did not describe if the exit criteria ensures continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>No identification about how they will track continued improvement, or how to ensure success.</p> <p>The state mentions that ‘increasing subgroup performance’ is criteria for schools exiting from targeted support. More detail around specific expectations is needed.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Quality for exit criteria should be stronger, and the plan should describe how the criteria will ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success.</p>

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 describes how qualifying schools will receive intensified technical assistance and supports. A cross-divisional team will conduct an in-depth comprehensive needs assessment of the LEA and school(s) focused on the current state of implementation of their Integrated Action Plan. It will look at leadership capacity and practices, instructional infrastructure, including instructional practices, curriculum and assessment systems, talent management, and organizational climate and culture. The SEA does not describe budgeting or extending the school day or year.
<i>Strengths</i>	Allows for a thorough evaluation of all aspects of the school to better determine the best course of action.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The State describes that schools that do not meet state requirements after 4 years will ‘receive intensified technical assistance and support’. Can this support be offered earlier on in the process? What are the specific ‘evidence-based interventions and actions’ that will identified? More detail is needed.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.viii.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 SEA describes that it will review resource allocation in each LEA through the fiscal review process and site visits. It also states that evidence of the LEA providing adequate additional resources to schools remaining in improvement status will be required and reviewed by the SEA. Assistance with consolidated budgeting and planning will be given. Additional support will be provided by cross-divisional support teams.

<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	It is not clear how “significant” is defined, nor the methodology that will be used to determine resource allocation.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The plan provides a robust set of TA from p. 32-34. The menu of items demonstrates a strong commitment to offering TA based on targeted needs.</p> <p>This state offers a wide array of supports for schools and school systems. Anything from needs assessments, to root cause analysis of data, to strategic partners, to comprehensive tiered supports.</p> <p>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. Most of the technical assistance is likely to improve student outcomes.</p> <p>The State describes existing supports available to schools and LEAs.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	A multitude of options for best addressing the different needs of schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	The plan can be strengthened by detailing how interventions will be differentiated. Please include specific

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	interventions the state intends to use, and details around how supports will be differentiated.
--	---

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides information about the measures the SEA will use to evaluate and publicly report on disproportionate rates, but does not contain information about the extent to which students are served at disproportionate rates. The SEA does provide a link to their website, but the data didn't really address the question of disproportionality and whether it exists.
<i>Strengths</i>	Detailed data/measures.  Clear definitions for how to calculate provided.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Only data provided was a link to their state website. Much data provided in the report on the link, but the data didn't really address the question of overall statewide disproportionality and whether it exists.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	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.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning to reduce incidences of bullying, harassment and overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.</p> <p>The plan provides details for LEA supports at p. 36. The description details trainings and state laws aimed at improving school conditions.</p> <p>This plan describes that the data components will be collected and that supports will be provided through instruction on identification of negative behaviors and strategies of how to reduce the negative behaviors through positive behavior intervention strategies. Physical restraints will be followed in accordance to AZ revised statutes regarding use of restraints.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Statutory revisions to further stress the necessity in appropriate behavior supports and disciplinary actions
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA states that LEAs will not use behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety; however, it does not provide any details.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

#### **A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 111(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>	The plan details several ways in which the state will assist LEAs by using MTSS framework incorporating UDL strategies. P. 36. Additionally, the plan states that LEAs will be encouraged to provide a range of researched-based trainings to support effective transitions. P. 32
<i>Strengths</i>	The plan provides lengthy description of how the state will support LEAs in transitions for elementary and middle school students.  School transition strategies mentioned in the plan are strong - specifically early childhood; MTSS; Universal Design for Learning; evidence-based instruction; the Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child Model; data-driven instruction; and comprehensive needs assessments.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Please clarify how the SEA will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions from MS to HS specifically, and work to decrease student dropouts.

## **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>	This state identifies how students will be identified as an English learner through their required enrollment practices. Identified students will then be assessed for proficiency. Students, regardless of receiving services will be tested yearly on their state ELL assessment to determine proficiency level and whether they qualify to exit.
<i>Strengths</i>	Clear and concise plan for identification.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA does not identify that students will be assessed upon enrollment, within the 1 <sup>st</sup> 30 days.

## 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 plan provides for how the SEA will assist LEAs by offering professional development and ensuring proper alignment of ELPS and academic content standards. P. 46
<i>Strengths</i>	Multiple ways identified in which assistance will be provided.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**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 plan provides details for how the SEA will offer TA to LEAs throughout the state at p. 46 and 47.  Eligible schools will be monitored on a rotating basis by the SEA Office of English Language Acquisition Services with select LEAs being monitored annually to confirm fiscal compliance. LEAs out of compliance are provided technical assistance, are required to make adjustments, and are monitored again the following year.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Few details about the actual technical assistance or development that will be provided.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	