

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Notes Template

STATE: Hawaii



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,¹ does the SEA describe, regarding the 8th 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: The state does not administer an advanced eighth grade mathematics assessment and as a result is not requesting an exemption.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet</i>	

¹ In order for an SEA to exempt an 8th grade student from the mathematics assessment typically administered in 8th 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 8th 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>	<p>The state provides the definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population as “a primary language used by a student group that exceeds 5 percent of the student population in the state” (p. 23). The state specified there were no languages that met that criterion, listing Ilokano as spoken by 2.2% of the population. The plan does not provide what percentage of students speaks Hawaiian. Whether the most populous group turns out to be Hawaiian or Ilokano speakers, the definition needs to include the most populous non-English language group.</p> <p>The definition does not include the most populous language other than English spoken by students, and its calculations appear to be done at the statewide level, so it is possible that there are particular complex areas or particular grade levels that have a significant portion of speakers of a non-English language. Furthermore, in section A.3.iii of its state plan, the SEA seems to state that Hawaiian is a populous enough non-English language to merit inclusion, even though it does not mention Hawaiian in its response to A.3.i: “Hawaii currently does not identify any language other than English and Hawaiian that is present to a significant extent in the participating student population” (p. 23).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The definition does not include the most populous language other than English spoken by students, and its calculations appear to be done at the statewide level, so it is possible that there are particular complex areas or particular grade levels that have a significant portion of speakers of a non-English language. Furthermore, in section A.3.iii of its state plan, the SEA seems to state that Hawaiian is a populous enough non-English language to merit inclusion, even though it does not mention Hawaiian in its response to A.3.i:</p>

	“Hawaii currently does not identify any language other than English and Hawaiian that is present to a significant extent in the participating student population” (p. 23).
<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 state’s definition needs to be revised to include the most populous language other than English spoken by students. Data should also be submitted to show the language breakdown by complex areas and grade levels.

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>	<p>The state plan indicates that there are no existing assessments “in languages other than English and Hawaiian” (p. 23). This is because no non-English language (even Hawaiian) meets their definition of being significant. A rationale for providing assessments in Hawaiian is needed. [Peers located information about grades 3 and 4 assessments in Hawaiian language and mathematics for students in the Hawaiian immersion program on p. 14-15 but the response to this element should be clear on these points as well. The state plan also mentions that it plans to offer assessments in grades 5-8 as well (p. 40).]</p> <p>That said, the plan did note that Smarter Balance for Mathematics does offer a supplementary glossary-based feature for translation in 11 languages. (p.23)</p> <p>The state secured stakeholder input concerning the translation of assessments indicating that stakeholders desired a larger focus on supporting students in attaining English Language Proficiency (p.23) as opposed to using the resources to develop assessments in other languages. Some peers commented that this demonstrates a good level of trust in the state system to support English learners (ELs).</p> <p>The state would do well to monitor the performance of EL students on performance assessments and use that data to continually evaluate the state definition of “significant” extent to which other languages are present, the need to consider strengthening EL support, and the potential need in the development of assessments in other languages.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state monitors requests for assessment in languages other than English and peers believe that this openness to stakeholder needs is commendable.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	As it is presented in this section of the plan, it is a bit unclear what assessments are available in Hawaiian and what the rationale for providing the assessments is (since Hawaiian is not listed as a language present to significant extent in the population).

<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.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>	<p>Peers find the state’s response to this section to be unclear. On p. 23 of the state plan, the state states, “Hawaii currently does not identify any language other than English and Hawaiian that is present to a significant extent in the participating student population for which yearly student academic assessments need to be administered. Hawaii will monitor the languages present in the student population annually to determine if academic assessments are needed in any language other than English.” The first sentence indicates that academic assessments need to be administered in Hawaiian whereas the second sentence indicates that such assessments are not necessary.</p> <p>It appears that the state offers Hawaiian language programs and assessments because of the bilingual/bicultural constitutional nature of Hawaiian, regardless of the number of speakers of Hawaiian. To the extent that students are instructed in Hawaiian, there is need for providing assessments in Hawaiian. This should be more clearly specified in the plan.</p> <p>The state has taken significant effort to develop Hawaiian language assessments for its students who are enrolled in Hawaiian immersion programs. Peers commend the state on assessing in the language of instruction and reducing the burden on testing (avoiding double-testing in English and Hawaiian for those students).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state has taken significant effort to develop Hawaiian language assessments for its students who are enrolled in Hawaiian immersion programs. Peers commend the state on assessing in the language of instruction and reducing the burden on testing (avoiding double-testing in English and Hawaiian for those students).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Peers find the state’s response to this section to be unclear.
<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</i>	

<i>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>	<p>The state continues to monitor requests for assessment in languages other than English but has not received any. The state response refers to surveys and community meetings where it involves various stakeholders (p. 24).</p> <p>Although it is positive that the state has stakeholder involvement, “Hawaii has not received a substantial number of requests via survey responses or community meetings for an assessment in a language other than English and Hawaiian” (p. 24). Some peers expressed concerns that it is unlikely that parents and EL advocates would request assessments in home languages. Parents may not even know this is a possibility and EL advocates often push students toward English use without consideration of their native language.</p> <p>The state has also demonstrated its willingness and ability to develop assessments in languages other than English (i.e., assessments in Hawaiian for the Hawaiian immersion program).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state has demonstrated its willingness and ability to develop assessments in languages other than English (i.e., assessments in Hawaiian for the Hawaiian immersion program).</p> <p>The state refers to surveys and community meetings where it involves various stakeholders.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Although it is positive that the state has stakeholder involvement (“Hawaii has not received a substantial number of requests via survey responses or community meetings for an assessment in a language other than English and Hawaiian” (p. 24)), some peers expressed concerns that it is unlikely that parents and EL advocates would request assessments in home languages.</p>

	<p>Parents may not even know this is a possibility and EL advocates often push students toward English use without consideration of their native language.</p> <p>The state will need to revise its definition to include the most populous language other than English present to a significant extent in its population. Once the definition is revised, the state may need to intensify its efforts to develop assessments.</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: 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>The State plan lists the following racial/ethnic subgroups to include in the statewide accountability system (p. 27): Native Hawaiian (26.0% of the student population); Filipino (22.1%); White (17.0%); Asian, not including Filipino (15.5%); Pacific Islander (9.4%); Hispanic (3.6%); and Black (2.8%).</p> <p>The state added Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian, and Filipino as subgroups to ensure they can be responsive to the multi-cultural student population (p. 27). In specific, the state distinguished Pacific Islander as a subgroup population as this population struggles the most in meeting academic expectations (p.27).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The list is tailored for Hawaii’s specific population rather than just being taken wholesale from federal guidelines. In particular it is notable that Hawaii has included a category for ‘Pacific Islander’ and that they explain that this is a group that has typically struggled, so it is important to be able to measure their progress rather than including them in a larger group where their struggles could be camouflaged (p. 27).</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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</i>	

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to 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>	N/A: The state did not include any other subgroup populations (p. 27)
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<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>	N/A: The state has elected exception i.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))

<i>all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<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>An N size of 20 is the minimum for accountability purposes for disaggregation and this is the same for all students and for all subgroups (p. 28).</p> <p>Table A.2 (p. 29) shows a breakdown of number and percent of schools excluded at different N sizes.</p> <p>The state articulated the desire to ensure validity to prevent any false positives resulting in the inclusion of more schools in need of comprehensive supports. The state indicated the desire to ensure that the resources and supports be targeted to the schools most in need (p.26).</p> <p>The state sought, was responsive to, and reported stakeholder feedback in determining minimum N size (Appendix D, p. 185).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Table A.2 (p. 29) shows a breakdown of number and percent of schools excluded at different N sizes.</p> <p>The state articulated the desire to ensure validity to prevent any false positives resulting in the inclusion of more schools in need of comprehensive supports. The state indicated the desire to ensure that the resources and supports be targeted to the schools most in need (p.26).</p> <p>The state sought, was responsive to, and reported stakeholder feedback in determining minimum N size (Appendix D, p. 185).</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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</i>	

<i>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?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state plan nicely lays out the explanation that establishing a minimum N size is a balancing act. The data provided on how many schools are excluded based on N sizes of 10, 20, 30 and 40 are illustrative and show that the State has put thought into the determination (p. 29). The state indicates that a minimum N size of 20 students provides a maximum margin of error of +11 percent at 1 standard error (p.26). Peers believe it meets a rigorous level of reliability.</p> <p>Some peers expressed concerns about the appropriateness of selecting an N size of 20. However, some larger populations are still being underreported with an N size of 20 (i.e., 36% of schools for English learners and 39% of schools for Pacific Islanders). In some peers’ estimation, the minimum n size of 20 allows too many students to be excluded, and a smaller minimum N size would be more appropriate for the subgroups in the state. Perhaps the state could examine data with a minimum N of 15.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state provides data to show clearly how many schools would be excluded from having to report on each subgroup at different minimum N sizes (Table A.2).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The impact of changing minimum N size from 10 to 20 is large, particularly for many of the subgroups. Additional information needs to be provided regarding the justification for excluding more than a third of the schools with English learners, White, Asian, Pacific Islanders, and Black students.
<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>	

² 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.

<i>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 state made use of “feedback received from the Accountability Design Workgroup, the workgroup of school administrators and public interest group representatives, principals, teachers, and community members...” (p.29) Based on this feedback, the state determined that an N size of 20 was appropriate because an N size of 30 was too large and an N size of 10 was too small (p. 30). It did not really explain how they reached this decision. More elaboration would be helpful, especially in light of the data presented in Table A.2 (p. 29).
<i>Strengths</i>	There was ample stakeholder involvement in the process.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The state should explain not only how the Accountability Design Workgroup came to the decision of an N-size of 20, but also on what basis it made that decision.
<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?³

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The state uses the minimum N of 20 for accountability and reporting purposes (p. 30) and will not publicly report data resulting in 0 percent, 100 percent if it reveals negative information about students, and a count of fewer than 20

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	students. The explicit mention of suppression rules is laudable.
<i>Strengths</i>	The explicit mention of suppression rules is laudable.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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: The state intends to use the minimum number of 20 for accountability and reporting purposes (p. 30).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
<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 plan seeks to reduce by half the percent of all students and students in each subgroup who are not proficient in reading/language arts and math. Its baseline data for all students and all subgroups comes from 2015-16 assessment data and it seeks to achieve this goal by 2025 (p. 31-32). That is, the same multi-year timeline for all students and subgroups, and these are certainly ambitious goals. It seems that in the subgroups that are struggling the most (special education [SPED], English learners [ELs], and Pacific Islanders) this will be a particularly large challenge. For instance, SPED children are 13% proficient in reading, and the goal is to bring the group to 57% proficient in nine years which is a 44% gain; approximately 5 percentage points per year.</p> <p>The long-term goal is set for ESSA academic achievement indicator by the year of 2025. This aligns with HI P-20’s campaign to achieve the goal of 55 percent of working age adults having a college degree by 2025. Closing the achievement gap and increasing the graduation rate will advance that goal.</p> <p>The state – through their Strive HI Performance System Measures – includes metrics beyond those required within ESSA. For example, inclusion rate, career and technical education concentrator rate, language arts and mathematics achievement gaps, etc. (p.26).</p> <p>The state has established rigorous long-term goals for all students – including the subgroups. While admirable, these goals may be difficult to achieve in the subgroups without ensuring the appropriate services are available to support all students learning. The application indicates as such, but does not include specific in how the schools will be supported to do so.</p> <p>The state demonstrates alignment with the state Board of Education strategic plan and connections within their ESSA Consolidated Plan. There is not an explicit need to connect but does demonstrate the desire to ensure coherence across the state.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The goal is ambitious over a 9 year period and same method applied to all subgroups.</p> <p>The goals and method for calculating total improvement are clear.</p> <p>The state demonstrates alignment with the state Board of Education strategic plan and connections within their ESSA Consolidated Plan. There is not an explicit need to connect but does demonstrate the desire to ensure coherence across the state.</p> <p>The state – through their Strive HI Performance System Measures— includes</p>

	metrics beyond those required within ESSA. For example, inclusion rate, career and technical education concentrator rate, language arts and mathematics achievement gaps, etc. (p.26).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The goals require substantial improvement by all students (and subgroups). It is unclear on what basis the performance of some subgroups can improve 3 times over the next 8 years. For example, ELs are moving from 21% to 61% in English language arts (ELA) in 9 years.</p> <p>The state has established rigorous long-term goals for all students – including the subgroups. While admirable, these goals may be difficult to achieve in the subgroups without ensuring the appropriate services are available to support all students learning. The application indicates as such, but does not include specific in how the schools will be supported to do so.</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.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 interim measurements of interim progress for statewide achievement and graduation rate are also aligned to the state/Board of Education strategic plan’s target for 2020 (p. 33). Interim goals were based on all students and subgroups of students.</p> <p>The state plan provides interim progress targets for all students and for each subgroup, as denoted in Appendix A and on page 33 (Table A.3.b). The interim progress is provided only for the SY2019-20, and not throughout the entire nine-year period. Thus, it is not clear if additional measurements of interim progress are calculated and will be used to monitor progress over the nine-year period.</p> <p>It is not clear if additional measurements of interim progress are planned to further monitor progress throughout the entire nine-year period. As such, it will be difficult to determine if progress toward the target will be regularly monitored.</p> <p>Linear growth, while transparent and ambitious is likely not feasible given there is no evidence to suggest that sustained linear improvement over 8 years is feasible.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Linear growth, while transparent and ambitious, is likely not feasible given there is no evidence to suggest that sustained linear improvement over 8 years is feasible.</p> <p>It is not clear if additional measurements of interim progress are planned to further monitor progress throughout the entire nine-year period. As such it will be difficult to determine if progress toward the target will be regularly monitored.</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.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>By establishing that all student groups should reduce their number of non-proficient students by half, there is a greater rate of improvement expected for lower performing groups than for higher performing ones (see long-term expected proficiency rates in the chart on p. 32.)</p> <p>The state states in its application a belief that all students can achieve excellence with the appropriate supports to meet or exceed the long-term goals and measurements of interim progress. The application further suggests that schools will need to ensure they are aggressively addressing the need of the lagging subgroups through interventions to accelerate their progress (p. 34).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Goals close gaps but expectations of progress are overly ambitious for some subgroups (i.e. students with disabilities (13% to 32%), EL (21% to 39%).
<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 state plan provides long-term (2024-25) graduation goals for all students and for each subgroup of students. The 2016 baseline data are provided in Table A.4.a., with the timeline being a nine-year span to 2025 graduation, which is the same for all students and for each subgroup of students. The 90% graduation rate target is ambitious for only a few subgroups of students, (i.e., children with disabilities, Pacific Islander) with those groups needing a growth rate of more than 2% a year. Many subgroups (e.g., Filipino) and the “all students” group do not need a growth rate more than 1% per year to reach the goal. The Asian subgroup is already above the 2025 goal. Thus, the long-term graduation rate goals are not ambitious overall or for many student subgroups. A 95% target would be more ambitious for all students and all subgroups of students.
<i>Strengths</i>	The baseline data and plan are clearly presented and high expectations for graduation are the same for all subgroups.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Because the state plan lists a set goal that is the same for all groups, it is less ambitious for some groups than for others. In fact, for the group with the highest current graduation rate (Asians, 91%) the goal is to stay the same, rather than to increase.
<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 state should set more ambitious goals for some subgroups (i.e. Asian, Filipino).

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. The state does not include an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<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>	<p>The State lists baseline and interim graduation goals for all students and all subgroups. It calculated interim rates by dividing the difference between the 90% goal and the current rate by 9, to allow for a gradual progression over time (Table 4.A.b, pg. 36). There is no extended-year adjusted cohort.</p> <p>The methodology used will not only increase the percentage of students graduating, but also close the gaps between all students and subgroups of students.</p> <p>It is not clear if additional measurements of interim progress are planned to further monitor progress throughout the entire nine-year period. As such it will be difficult to determine if progress toward the target will be regularly monitored.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodology used will not only increase the percentage of students graduating, but also close the gaps between all students and subgroups of students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It is not clear if additional measurements of interim progress are planned to further monitor progress throughout the entire nine-year period. As such it will be difficult to determine if progress toward the target will be regularly

	monitored.
<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.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>	Long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups that currently graduate at lower rates, as evidenced by the data in the charts on pg. 34 (long-term goals and baseline graduation rates by subgroup) and pg. 36 (interim goals and baseline data by subgroup).
<i>Strengths</i>	Long-term goals require greater rates of improvement for subgroups that currently graduate at lower rates, as evidenced by the data in the charts on pg. 34 (long-term goals and baseline graduation rates by subgroup) and pg. 36 (interim goals and baseline data by subgroup).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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>	<p>The state uses the WIDA English Language Development Standards and administers the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 as an annual measure of English language progress and proficiency for students identified as ELs. Students are deemed functionally English proficient when they achieve a composite score across the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing of 5. All tested English learners from K through grade 12 will be included. A growth-to-target methodology to measure students' progress and proficiency will determine individual student growth expectations. However, in general, an incremental growth expectation of one proficiency per grade level will be expected. Using this methodology, the state is projecting to move from 36% of ELs meeting that target to 75 percent by 2024-2025 (p. 38).</p> <p>While a long-term goal of 100% of students being on target to reach EL proficiency would be desirable, the state target of 75% is ambitious, given the heterogeneity of ELs and the different age ranges at which students begin to learn English; this is an ambitious goal.</p> <p>The state indicates that the long-term goal is 75%. It is not clear what the basis for this goal is. The state does not present a specific timeline for ELs to reach English language proficiency (ELP). Timelines appear to be based on initial ELP level in some manner, but this is not sufficiently explained (p. 37).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	While a long-term goal of 100% of students being on target to reach EL proficiency would be desirable, the state target of 75% is ambitious, given the heterogeneity of ELs and the different age ranges at which students begin to learn English; this is an ambitious goal.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The state indicates that the long-term goal is 75%. It is not clear what the basis for this goal is. The state does not present a specific timeline for ELs to reach English language proficiency. Timelines appear to be based on initial ELP level in some manner, but this is not sufficiently explained (p. 37).
<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 state must describe in further detail the state determined timeline for ELs to reach English language proficiency.

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>	Interim progress toward long-term goals for ELs making progress in achieving English language proficiency are based on the initial baseline and incremental increases needed to meet the long-term goal of 75 percent. The

	<p>measure of interim progress for SY 2019-20 for the state is 63 percent (pg. 39).</p> <p>The plan includes a table (A.5.b.) that provides a measurement of interim progress for 2020 of 63%. One reviewer felt it was not clear how this was calculated, because taking the target (75%), subtracting it from the baseline (36%), dividing that by 9, multiplying that number (4.33) times three for the number of years from 2017 to 2020 and adding that to 36 yields a SY2019-20 goal of 49%, not 63%. The plan does not provide measurements of interim progress for each year; thus, it is not known what the targets are for the years between 2020 and 2025. One reviewer therefore suggested that the rationale for why there is such a large gain in the first 3 years should be explained.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	It appears that the State is expecting a large increase early in the process and it is not clear to the peers how the interim goal of 63% was set. The rationale for why there is such a large gain in the first 3 years should be explained.
<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 state needs to provide the rationale for why there is such a large gain in the first 3 years.

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 state will use the following measures to fulfill the required indicators per ESSA; 1) academic achievement – the percentage of students who are proficient on the annual assessments for English Language Arts and Mathematics; 2) ELA and Mathematics Median Growth Percentile; 3) 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate; 4) percentage of English learners on-target to English language proficiency; and 5) percentage of students who are chronically absent (15 or more days per academic year) (p. 39).</p> <p>The Academic Achievement indicator is the percent of students proficient on the statewide language arts and mathematics assessments, administered in grades 3-8 and 11. Each content area is weighted equally. (pg. 39-40). The academic achievement indicators are based on the state long-term goals that prepare students to be successful in their post-high school goals (pg. 41).</p> <p>In the State plan, the state notes that not all students take the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA). Some students take the alternate assessment and students in grade 3 and 4 in the Hawaiian immersion program take the KAEO (the state content assessments in Hawaiian language) in language arts and mathematics. Academic achievement will be measured with either the SBA or the KAEO. The plan does not indicate if these two assessments have been aligned or are comparable to each other to enable results to be compared for students who take one but not both of these assessments. Since all students are not taking the same assessment, it seems that further documentation is needed to show the equivalency of scores on the various assessments, which are ultimately, used as academic achievement indicators.</p> <p>All students are included and counted based on the official enrollment count to participation rate count date – meeting the 95% student participation rate (p. 41). Data from each of the assessments will be able to be disaggregated for each subgroup of students, with the academic achievement indicators based fully on grade-level proficiency on math and ELA assessments.</p> <p>If the waiver is not approved and immersion students are required to take the English test in content areas in which instruction in English was not provided, construct irrelevant variance will lead to invalid conclusions about achievement.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The plan is transparent as it is based on percent proficient.</p> <p>The plan is linked to SEA long-term goals and tied to proficiency in language arts and math.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Since all students are not taking the same assessment, it seems that further documentation is needed to show the equivalency of scores on the various assessments, which are ultimately, used as academic achievement indicators.</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</i>	<p>The state should provide further documentation to demonstrate the</p>

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	equivalency of scores on the various assessments used as academic achievement indicators of ELA & math proficiency.
--	---

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>	<p>The Plan states that student growth as measured by the annual statewide assessments is the Other Academic (Academic Progress) indicator for the statewide accountability system. Growth is based on the school’s median growth percentile in ELA and Mathematics, as derived from the Hawaii Growth Model. Median growth percentiles will be calculated for elementary and middle schools, as it has been for a number of years already. Students who take the alternate assessment (HAS-Alt) and Kaiapuni students taking the KAEO are not included.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by all subgroups meeting the minimum N side of 20 students. P.41</p> <p>The state uses median student growth percentile (SGP). No analysis is presented regarding reliability of the indicator relative to the minimum N size.</p> <p>It is not clear how immersion students and students with significant cognitive disabilities are included due to taking different assessments (i.e. KAEO and the alternate assessment).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state has been using median student growth percentiles for a number of years.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Median student growth percentile (SGP) is not as reliable a measure as mean

	<p>SGP. No analysis is presented regarding reliability of the indicator relative to the minimum N size.</p> <p>It is not clear how immersion students and students with significant cognitive disabilities are included due to taking different assessments (i.e. KAEO and the alternate assessment).</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 state needs to provide an analysis regarding the reliability of the indicator relative to the minimum N size.</p> <p>The state needs to describe how immersion students and students with significant cognitive disabilities are included due to taking different assessments (i.e. KAEO and the alternate assessment).</p>

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 state Plan states that the Graduation Rate indicator includes all students, even those who receive a certificate or a Hawaii Adult Community School Diploma (pg.42). The information provided states the rate is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, with no mention of use of one or more extended-year adjusted rates. The state calculation uses a one-year lag to report the data, but the plan does not indicate if any averaging is used for low population schools. The graduation rate addresses long-term goals. High schools with a graduation rate of 67 percent or lower will be designated as schools for comprehensive support and improvement.</p> <p>The description indicates only that it will be calculated in all instances when</p>

	<p>the minimum N is reached, including students who are economically disadvantaged, were in English learner program, or received special education services at any time during the four-year cohort. Only students who receive a state high school diploma will be counted (p. 42).</p> <p>The State plan does not specifically and explicitly state that the SEA uses the same graduation rate indicator across all complex areas, although it could be inferred, given that all schools with a rate of lower than 67% are flagged as needing “comprehensive support and improvement” (pg. 42).</p> <p>The state proposes to include students in a high-needs subgroup at any time during their high school in their respective high needs subgroup for graduation rate determination – even though they have exited the subgroup. This is allowable in the case of the graduation rate indicator.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state plan clearly specified how students with the most significant cognitive impairments taking the alternate assessments and students in an alternative education program are counted.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The description needs to be more explicit that the SEA uses the same indicator across all schools/complex areas in the state and that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all schools/complex areas, across the State.</p> <p>The information provided states the rate is based on the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, with no mention of use of one or more extended-year adjusted rates. The state calculation uses a one-year lag to report the data, but the plan does not indicate if any averaging is used for low population schools.</p>
<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>	<p>The state needs to describe if it uses the same indicator across all schools/complex areas in the state and that the calculation is consistent for all high schools, in all schools/complex areas, across the State.</p> <p>The state needs to indicate if any averaging is used for low population schools in which the minimum N size is not met.</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>
--	----------------------

<p><i>Peer Analysis</i></p>	<p>The state has proposed a “growth to target” model to determine English language proficiency and the timeframe to exit the language instruction education program. This looks at: 1) the student’s initial proficiency level; 2) the timeframe, in annual increments; and 3) the English language proficiency level where services are no longer needed. The timeframe proposed is up to five years – which is also dependent on the level in which students enter the program taking into consideration that students are expected to advance on average one proficiency level per year (p 43).</p> <p>The state plan specifies that progress is measured through a growth-to-target model – at the same time students are expected to progress at a rate of one proficiency level per year on the ACCESS, and level 5 which is inconsistent (p.43). The state consulted the WIDA consortium to determine an appropriate measure for English proficiency. Individual growth to target model promotes regular monitoring of progress by both the teachers and student.</p> <p>It is unclear in the plan how the timelines are implemented given different initial English language proficiency levels.</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>If the state is using a Growth to target model it is a transparent system.</p> <p>The state consulted the WIDA consortium to determine an appropriate measure for English proficiency. Individual growth to target model promotes regular monitoring of progress by both the teachers and student.</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p>	<p>The state plan specifies that progress is measured through a growth-to-target model – at the same time students are expected to progress at a rate of one level per year on the ACCESS, which is inconsistent (p.43).</p> <p>It is unclear in the plan how the timelines are implemented, given different initial English language proficiency levels.</p>
<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s))</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewer(s))</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	<p>The state plan must clarify if it is using a growth-to-target model or whether its progress expectations are at a rate of one level per year.</p> <p>The state needs to clarify if the timelines are implemented consistently given different initial English language proficiency levels.</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 state proposes to use chronic absenteeism (15 days or more absent) as the indicator in all grades. It is calculated as the percent of students in a school who are chronically absent (for 15 days or more per year) – for students who are present for the full school year. Data in the state plan show that schools range from 2-54% absenteeism (pg. 45) with an average of 15% across the State and data can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students meeting the minimum n size. The State’s strategic plan intends for schools to average 9% absenteeism by 2020. Currently only 49 of the 290 schools have a chronic absenteeism rate at 9 percent or under.</p> <p>The business rules suggest that only students who are present the full school year are counted within the chronically absenteeism indicator. There is concern that the rule will not capture students who are not enrolled at the beginning of the school year to the participation rate count day (May 1st), therefore those students will not be counted in the chronic absenteeism calculation.</p> <p>The State plan makes a connection pointed to by research between absenteeism and poor achievement, and decreasing absenteeism is a worthy goal. State data demonstrates how this indicator differentiates by school to illustrate pockets and regions with concern. The state has experienced a decrease in chronic absenteeism in elementary schools.</p> <p>The state recognizes that students who are chronically absent miss a significant portion of the school year and are at additional risk due to a lack of engagement in educational opportunities.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state has used this metric for a number of years (for elementary schools) and has experienced a decrease in the chronic absenteeism rate since then. Therefore, it is a metric that has been effective.</p> <p>The State plan makes a connection pointed to by research between absenteeism and poor achievement, and decreasing absenteeism is a worthy goal. The State data demonstrates how this indicator differentiates by school to illustrate pockets and regions with concern. The state has experienced a decrease in chronic absenteeism in elementary schools.</p> <p>The state recognizes that students who are chronically absent miss a significant portion of the school year and are at additional risk due to a lack of engagement in educational opportunities.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The business rules suggest that only students who are present for the full school year are counted within the chronically absenteeism indicator. There is concern that the rule will not capture students who are not enrolled at the</p>

	beginning of the school year to the participation rate count day (May 1 st), therefore, those students will not be counted in the chronic absenteeism calculation.
<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 state should revise their business rules to ensure that students with high mobility are included in the calculation for the chronically absenteeism indicator in order to ensure that this indicator is valid and reliable.

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>	<p>Table A.9 (pg. 48) shows a clear breakdown of how the state meaningfully differentiates all public schools in the state, which includes all indicators in the accountability system. Performance is broken out for all students and for each subgroup where the minimum N size is met. The state plan also has a clear system for aggregating data across years for the smallest schools/subgroups (pg. 46).</p> <p>All schools receive a “unit” score that will be used to determine CSI and TSI, as well as schools (e.g. elementary, middle, and high school) that do not require additional Title I supports. A minimum of 5 percent of Title I schools will be identified. In addition to any schools with a graduation rate of less than 67% and all schools with low-performing or consistently underperforming subgroups.</p> <p>The state has proposed to use a multi-year pooling for up to 3 years for the schools in which the N size of students is less than 20. It is not clear, however, how the indicator will be reapportioned in schools not meeting the minimum N with the ELP indicator specifically.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The proposed system is transparent because it multiplies the percent that meets a given standard by the weight of that indicator.</p> <p>Examples provided in Table A.9 and the sample performance unit scores in Table A.7 and A.8 are clear and easy to follow.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The state has proposed to use a multi-year pooling for up to 3 years for the schools in which the N size of students is less than 20. It is not clear, however, how the indicator will be reapportioned in schools not meeting the minimum N with the ELP indicator specifically.</p>

	The plan using the graduation rate as a very high weight which may result in less incentive to improve student assessment performance (assuming Smarter Balanced does not contribute to graduating).
<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>	The state should clarify how the ELP indicator will be reapportioned in schools not meeting the minimum N for 3 consecutive years.

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>	<p>The State plan has a clear process in place for cases where an indicator cannot be calculated due to a violation of minimum n size (pg. 46). Each of the four indicators receives substantial weight individually, and in the aggregate they account for 90% of the score, with just 10% accounted for by the student success measure (p. 48).</p> <p>The Performance Unit Score will be weighted differently for elementary/middle school (ES/MS) than for high school (HS). For each school level, scores from 4 state indicators will be used. The ES/MS weighting structure places 40% emphasis on achievement (ELA and Math, 20% each), and 40% emphasis on academic progress/growth (ELA and Math, 20% each), which are a substantial emphasis individually. At the HS level, graduation rate is 50% and academic achievement is 30%, which are individually a substantial emphasis. At all levels, the Student Success indicator is equal to the Progress In Achieving English Language Proficiency, though in the aggregate Student Success is less weight that the other indicators combined.</p> <p>The Plan (pg. 46) describes a process for multi-year pooling for up to three years for schools or subgroups not meeting the minimum n-size (pg. 46). It is not clear how the state will address how the weighting would be adjusted for schools for which an indicator cannot be calculated – specifically the ELP indicator given that the minimum N may not be reached over the 3 years.</p>

	HS graduation receives a substantial amount of weight, which (1) likely results in systematically higher scores for HS than non-HS, and (2) provides less incentive for schools to improve assessment results. Weights determined based on overall goal of academic and post school success – college and career readiness. The state plan did not include academic progress with as much weight as the other metrics as the state hopes to identify these schools to receive comprehensive and targeted support. p.49
<i>Strengths</i>	Clear presentation of weighting and adjusted weighting in cases where minimum n size is not met – with the exception of the ELP indicator.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency weight at ES/MS and HS is not greater than (but equal to) the Student Success weight. It is not clear 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)?
<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 state should clarify how weighting is determined for the ELP indicator when the minimum N size is not met over a 3-year period.

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>	<p>The State plan clearly describes how multi-level schools are subdivided into K-5, 6-8, and 9-12 (pg. 49) for purposes of comparison with elementary, middle, and high schools. The methodology will be applied to all the state and public charter schools. In the case of multi-level schools, units will be divided into grade spans. If a grade-span qualifies as the lowest 5 percent, then the entire school is targeted for comprehensive support. New schools are reported in the 1st year and in the 2nd year reporting is used to determine lowest performing schools.</p> <p>The State plan mentions that there is one K-1 school that “does not currently participate in statewide assessments of language arts and mathematics” (pg. 50). It is unclear what would be done to remedy this situation, since it does not fall under the description for multi-level schools in this section. The plan states, “The state is exploring an alternate assessment for the academic achievement indicator for this school.” (pg. 50)</p>

	Giving a school multiple scores, it may be difficult to administer interventions or assign a grade span within a school to comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) (which to some extent seems incongruent with CSI).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Giving a school multiple scores, it may be difficult to administer interventions or assign a grade span within a school to CSI (which to some extent seems incongruent with CSI).</p> <p>The State plan mentions that there is one K-1 school that “does not currently participate in statewide assessments of language arts and mathematics” (pg. 50). It is unclear what would be done to remedy this situation, since it does not fall under the description for multi-level schools in this section. The plan states, “The state is exploring an alternate assessment for the academic achievement indicator for this school.” (pg. 50)</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 State should describe how they intend to remedy the situation in which one K-1 school that “does not currently participate in statewide assessments of language arts and mathematics” (pg. 50) can be included in annual meaningful differentiation.

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>	<p>The state proposes to identify all title I schools in the bottom 5 percent by school grade band (ES, MS, HS) and multiple grades bands within a school. The plan will also identify the schools with the lowest graduation rate (pg. 50) to target for support.</p> <p>The Plan indicates that school identification for comprehensive support and improvement will begin in Fall 2017 using SY 2016-17 data. It is not clear that the methodology described (pgs. 50-51) will identify the lowest 5% of all Title I schools statewide, as it appears that the lowest 5% of each school type (ES, MS, HS) will be identified. Thus, there may be, for example, an elementary</p>

	school that is not in the lowest 5% of ESs but would be in the lowest 5% of all schools based on their statewide accountability score.
<i>Strengths</i>	The state provided a nice and clear presentation of the methodology to identify CSI schools.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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 state plan indicates that all public high schools with graduation rates of 67% or less based on the four-year adjusted cohort rate will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Such identification will begin in Fall 2017, based on data from the class of 2016 (pg. 51). The methodology described should result is the identification of all HSs failing to graduate one-third or more of its students to receive comprehensive support and improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	The state provided a nice and clear presentation of the methodology to identify CSI schools via low graduation rate.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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>	Title I schools identified for additional targeted support due to at least one poor performing subgroup that does not meet the exit criteria within three years will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. The exit criteria for the schools identified for targeted support are that such schools would no longer require additional support to improve if the subgroups improved enough to exceed the threshold score set by the lowest-performing Title I school in its grade span in the year initially identified (p. 51). Schools are initially identified to receive targeted support in Fall 2017 and will be re-evaluated in Fall 2020 (pg. 52). Table A.10 on page 52 is very clear and provides nice illustration of the escalation from additional targeted support to CSI.
<i>Strengths</i>	Table A.10 on page 52 is very clear and provides nice illustration of the escalation from additional targeted support to CSI.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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 state will identify schools for comprehensive support and improvement based on low performance and low graduation rates once every 3 years beginning in Fall 2017, as well as the identification of schools for targeted support beginning in Fall 2020 (p. 31). The state meets the requirements of ESSA but more frequent checks (e.g.,

	each year) might help to ensure that schools are on track and identify areas in need of further assistance sooner.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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>	<p>The state defines “consistently underperforming” subgroup as a subgroup of students with a subgroup performance unit score that falls in the lowest 10% of all subgroups for at least 2 consecutive years. If at least one subgroup in a school has a subgroup performance unit score in the lowest 10% of all subgroups’ unite scores in both Year 1 and Year 2, the subgroup would be considered consistently underperforming and the school would be identified for targeted support and improvement (p.53). In Year 1, schools receive notification and they are identified in Year 2, beginning in Fall 2018. The state will identify schools annually.</p> <p>The methodology presented should identify schools with consistently underperforming subgroups, using all the statewide indicators as summarized in the performance unit score for schools and subgroups.</p> <p>Because the year to year probability of being in the bottom 10% is likely not independent, it is difficult to determine how many schools would enter targeted support and improvement (TSI). Also, there is no guarantee that any school would go into TSI under this system.</p> <p>No example was provided as it was for A.4.vi.c above to show how consistently underperforming subgroup identification would happen in practice. The wording is a little ambiguous, but the peers’ interpretation is that if, for instance, Pacific Islanders in School X are in the lowest performing 10% of Pacific Islanders in the State (based on their performance unit score) for two years in a row, Pacific Islanders in School X would be identified as “consistently underperforming”. Given the low rates of proficiency and</p>

	graduation by some Hawaii student subgroups (SPED, ELs, and Pacific Islanders in particular) peers question whether this ‘lowest 10%’ isn’t leaving out many students who are also consistently low-performing. This problem is exacerbated because of the conjunctive rule described in the analysis.
<i>Strengths</i>	Methodology is straight-forward as it is simply the bottom 10 percent two years in a row and unlikely to have false positives due to using a conjunctive model.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Because the year to year probability of being in the bottom 10% is likely not independent, it is difficult to determine how many schools would enter TSI. Also, there is no guarantee that any school would go into TSI under this system.</p> <p>No example was provided as it was for A.4.vi.c above to show how consistently underperforming subgroup identification would happen in practice. The wording is a little ambiguous, but the peers’ interpretation is that if, for instance, Pacific Islanders in School X are in the lowest performing 10% of Pacific Islanders in the State (based on their performance unit score) for two years in a row, Pacific Islanders in School X would be identified as “consistently underperforming”. Given the low rates of proficiency and graduation by some Hawaii student subgroups (SPED, ELs, and Pacific Islanders in particular) there is a concern that this ‘lowest 10%’ is leaving out many students who are also consistently low-performing. This problem is exacerbated because of the conjunctive rule described in the analysis.</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.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>	Additional schools will be identified if they are below the lowest unit score for

	<p>that type of school, or if they have at least one subgroup score that is lower than the lowest unit score for the type of school.</p> <p>The state will identify at least 1 under-performing subgroup of students for additional targeted support and has established specific criteria to do so. This will begin in Fall 2017, using SY 2016-17 data, and identify schools with low-performing subgroups of students for additional targeted support every 3 years.</p> <p>The methodology is straight-forward because it is easy to compare a subgroup score to the CSI all student threshold.</p> <p>This likely will result in many TSI schools being identified. It is not clear whether the state would have the capacity to address all such TSI schools.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodology is straight-forward because it is easy to compare a subgroup score to the CSI all student threshold.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	This likely will result in many TSI schools being identified. It is not clear whether the state would have the capacity to address all such TSI 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.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>	NA. The state has not included additional categories.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<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 State plan outlines a punitive approach to non-participation, whereby any subgroup that does not reach 95% participation must count non-participants as non-proficient up to the 95% threshold. The plan also specifies, “The state will require schools that do not meet the 95 percent participation requirement to create a plan for corrective action to increase student participation in statewide academic assessments.” (pg. 55). It is not clear what the requirements or ramifications of the corrective action plan are (e.g. if miss 95% again).
<i>Strengths</i>	The ratio is good because it addresses the severity of missing the 95% participation rate. For example, as demonstrated in the example on the bottom of p. 54.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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>	Exit criteria are clearly delineated on pg. 57-78, and schools must demonstrate that they meet the relevant exit criteria three years from the time they were identified. Some criteria appear to be more stringent than others. However,

	<p>schools identified for a graduation rate of 67% or less must demonstrate only a graduation rate of higher than 67% three years after identification. Theoretically, a school could exit with a graduation rate of 68% but this school would still be at risk and such an increase does not really indicate improved outcomes in any meaningful way. Along those same lines, “to exit in Fall 2023, the subgroups identified as persistently low-performing in Fall 2020 must have subgroup performance unit scores higher than the threshold score of their grade span that led to their identification for additional support the year they were initially identified (Fall 2017) and demonstrate significant improvement.” (pg. 58) It is not clear how a school would demonstrate <i>significant improvement</i> or whether <i>significant improvement</i> is entailed simply by having higher performance unit scores than the threshold that put them in the category.</p> <p>Schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement due to low performance for persistently low-performing subgroups will also be required to select additional measures from a state-created menu to demonstrated improvement and will be evaluated by a school review committee on an annual basis. CSI schools can exit if they are no longer in the bottom 5% after year three. If a CSI school is a CSI school due to consistently underperforming subgroups, the exit criteria will be to be above the threshold score that was used to enter into CSI. If it was identified as a CSI school due to subgroup performance, then the review committee examines evidence of progress. The state indicates it will use an exit committee to determine whether the school made sufficient progress based on submitted evidence. The state did not present what the evidence would be or how it would be evaluated.</p> <p>The state does a nice job of aligning the criteria with the priorities of the state strategic plan.</p> <p>The State does not present any linkage to long term goals (e.g. progress is on par with meeting measures of interim progress (MIPs) at the school level).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The state does a nice job of aligning the criteria with the priorities of the state strategic plan.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>State does not present any linkage to long term goals (e.g. progress is on par with meeting MIPs at the school level.</p> <p>The state indicates it will use an exit committee to determine whether the school made sufficient progress based on submitted evidence. The state did not present what the evidence would be or how it would be evaluated.</p> <p>It is unclear to the peers that the exit criteria are robust enough to “ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State”.</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</i>	The state should describe the criteria and evidence analyzed by the review committee to determine if schools can exit when identified as TSI for low performing subgroups.

<i>an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The state should clarify the exit criteria to demonstrate alignment to the state’s long term goals.</p> <p>The state should define how a school would demonstrate “significant improvement” (p. 58) or whether “significant improvement” is entailed simply by having higher performance unit scores than the threshold that put them in the category. Peers believe this is crucial in order to determine whether the exit criteria ensure schools are making continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.</p>
---	---

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>After three years, the subgroup that scored below the threshold to enter TSI must score above the threshold. Progress is assured given that the school must move beyond the threshold.</p> <p>From pg. 59 of the State plan: “... to exit in Fall 2020, the subgroups that led a school to be identified for additional targeted support in Fall 2017 must demonstrate significant improvement and must have a subgroup performance unit score higher than the threshold score that led to their identification.”</p> <p>For schools that are receiving additional targeted support as a result of low-performing subgroups, the subgroups that led to the identification must have performance greater than the threshold of the bottom 10%. Once that is accomplished, they can exit UNLESS another subgroup performance falls below the threshold. If another subgroup falls below the threshold, the school will be considered a newly identified school (p. 59).</p> <p>The criteria listed within this section appear to be identical. It is unclear how this plan specifically relates to closing the statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps. Also, while it is implied that schools have three years to exit, this section does not explicitly state the timeframe.</p> <p>The plan is not clear about whether a school could exit with no improvement if the CSI unit cut score decreased over the three year period. However the state</p>

	<p>indicates the school must make significant progress (undefined) which presumably precludes a school from exiting without improving. Hypothetically, a school could meet the threshold and actually demonstrate regression; however, the language “continued progress” may prevent this scenario. The state might consider the implications of the exiting criteria on ensuring continuous progress.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Gap should close as long as school progresses and meets threshold.</p> <p>Impressive that they are monitoring other subgroups as the school might work hard to get the initial subgroup over the threshold at the cost of other subgroups.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The exit criteria do not align with long term goals – i.e. if the threshold for CSI has not increased much in three years then subgroup performance may have improved but not in line with MIP.</p> <p>The plan is not clear about whether a school could exit with no improvement if the CSI unit cut score decreased over the three year period. However the state indicates the school must make significant progress (undefined) which presumably precludes a school from exiting without improving.</p> <p>It is unclear to peers that the exit criteria are robust enough to “ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State”.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (peer reviewer(s))</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>The state should clarify the exit criteria to demonstrate alignment to the state’s long term goals.</p> <p>The state should define how a school would demonstrate “significant improvement” (p. 58) or whether “significant improvement” is entailed simply by having higher performance unit scores than the threshold that put them in the category. Peers believe this is crucial in order to determine whether the exit criteria ensure schools are making continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State.</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>	<p>After three years plus a one-year grace period for improvement, schools that do not meet exit criteria must undergo a series of interventions involving the Complex Area Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent (pg. 60-61). More rigorous interventions are developed by the complex superintendent and support by the state deputy Secretary. The state proposes to use specific</p>

	<p>research-based interventions such as the six-part community approach.</p> <p>It is not clear how the more rigorous interventions differ from the original interventions that were applied in the first four years of TSI. Also, it is not clear to what extent complex leadership can initiate meaningful change if it has not already accomplished this in four years. State support may be insufficient to ensure that the complex has capacity to facilitate meaningful change.</p> <p>The peers would have liked to see a little more specificity in the plans, even though each school may have slightly different needs, as the State plan indicates. The peers questioned if the description of the more rigorous intervention plan would be strengthened if the state proactively used the six-part strategic approach in all of the schools identified, rather than just those that do not meet exit criteria. If the State wants to improve achievement and progress, a multi-faceted approach is most likely to succeed.</p> <p>Although interventions are listed, the peers were generally concerned about the selection of interventions aligned to schools needs and the level of implementation support. The peers would like to see more coordination and alignment with other Title programs. Complex Area Superintendent will oversee budget and personnel issues so that the principals can concentrate on supporting teachers in the classroom – general concern about sustainability.</p> <p>The application suggests that the “more rigorous interventions” will be identified per the schools’ needs and that stakeholders will develop a “menu” for selection. The school will receive additional oversight from the Complex Area Superintendent and the School Transformation Branch</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The six-part strategic approach, which focuses not just on in-school issues such as curricula, but also on community issues, such as health care, looks promising because it doesn’t see schools as isolated but rather as parts of communities with certain limitations and challenges.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is not clear how the more rigorous interventions differ from the original interventions that were applied in the first four years of TSI. Also, it is not clear to what extent complex leadership can initiate meaningful change if it has not already accomplished this in four years. State support may be insufficient to ensure that the complex has capacity to facilitate meaningful change.</p> <p>It was unclear how long the more rigorous interventions will be tried and what happens if these do not work.</p> <p>The peers would have liked to see a little more specificity in the plans, even though each school may have slightly different needs, as the State plan indicates. The peers questioned if the description of the more rigorous intervention plan would be strengthened if the state proactively used the six-part strategic approach in all of the schools identified, rather than just those that do not meet exit criteria. If the State wants to improve achievement and progress, a multi-faceted approach is most likely to succeed.</p>

	Although interventions are listed, the peers were generally concerned about the selection of interventions aligned to schools needs and the level of implementation support. The peers would like to see more coordination and alignment with other Title programs. Complex Area Superintendent will oversee budget and personnel issues so that the principals can concentrate on supporting teachers in the classroom – general concern about sustainability.
<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.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>	<p>The School Transformation Branch, the Complex Area Superintendent, and/or the Commissions of Federal Programs will conduct a resource allocation review for schools identified for comprehensive and targeted support to address any resource inequities that involves a number of stakeholders (state and local staff) during the year and annually thereafter (p. 61). The plan is not clear what each team is reviewing, or what criteria for review are.</p> <p>The frequency and regularity of the review allows for reallocation of resources as needed in a timely fashion that supports school improvement.</p> <p>Peer reviewers indicated that the plan was unclear and not connected to other Title plans. Peer reviewers suggest that the plan describe how it will leverage all Title resources to support all students. The resource allocation review criteria were not detailed in any way.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The frequency and regularity of the review allows for reallocation of resources as needed in a timely fashion that supports school improvement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Peer reviewers indicated that the plan was unclear and not connected to other Title plans. It would have been helpful if the state would describe how it will leverage all Title resources to support all students.</p> <p>The resource allocation review criteria were not detailed in anyway.</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</i>	

provide to fully meet this requirement

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 state functions as both the SEA and LEA. In the State plan, the state indicates that it will provide “a Complex Academic Officer (Educational Officer) and a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Resource Teacher or the monetary equivalent to support school improvement processes” for each complex area or public charter school commission with schools that have been identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement (pg. 62). These personnel will work jointly with the Academic Reflection Teams, which work to monitor and evaluate any school reform.</p> <p>The state Superintendent will oversee the schools in complex areas that have the most schools with struggling students and deploy the School Transformation Branch to provide personalized technical assistance (TA) support. An Academic Reflection Team will be used to monitor progress.</p> <p>The Plan describes a multi-faceted and multi-layered strategy to provide technical assistance to schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. Most support will be provided at the complex level, to provide more unique-to-school strategies and resources, with flexibility and focused needs at the school level a priority.</p> <p>Peers questioned whether a two person support team would be sufficient. In addition, the plan is unclear to what extent that the technical assistance will be differentiated.</p> <p>Although it seems that the state has met the requirements, it is unclear to what extent the technical assistance will be differentiated based on the individual school’s needs, given the description of what the State can provide: “...assisting schools in implementing the state-approved evidence-based interventions, which include induction and mentoring for probationary teachers and new school administrators; mentoring for less-than-satisfactory teachers; coaching for all teachers and school administrators; and strengthening core instruction.” (pg. 63)</p> <p>One peer commented on the use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and the potential need for additional professional learning support that is sustained and job embedded.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The peers commended the State for providing funding for staff to support

	technical assistance; however, it is unclear whether two people per complex area will be sufficient.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan is not clear whether an additional two staff can meaningfully address complex needs – if in fact the complex has several CSI and TSI schools.</p> <p>Although it seems that the state has met the requirements, it is unclear to what extent the technical assistance will be differentiated based on the individual school’s needs, given the description of what the State can provide: “...assisting schools in implementing the state-approved evidence-based interventions, which include induction and mentoring for probationary teachers and new school administrators; mentoring for less-than-satisfactory teachers; coaching for all teachers and school administrators; and strengthening core instruction.” (pg. 63)</p> <p>One peer commented on the use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and the potential need for additional professional learning support that is sustained and job embedded.</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.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. The plan did not include any additional optional action (p. 64).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# peer reviewer(s)) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewer(s)) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA (# 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?⁴

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State plan refers to a report titled ‘Equitable Access to Excellent Educators’ submitted to USED in November 2015. This report, according to the State plan, describes the disproportionality of teacher distribution across the state, identifies potential causes of this disproportionality, and defines the strategies the state plans to utilize to eliminate this disproportionality, but the state did not preset any data as to disproportionate access to effective teachers. The state indicated they learned only that “fewer than 1 percent” of Hawaii’s teachers were identified as ‘ineffective’ based on the state’s teacher performance evaluation, but there is no information about what that really entailed nor describe the definition of ‘ineffective’. However, it seems that ineffective is defined as out of field and inexperienced. There is some discussion in the State plan (pg. 64-65) about the reasons that teachers in rural areas and in areas with large minority populations tend to be less experienced or out-of-field but there are no data provided to show the extent to which this is an issue. The link to a state website depicting teacher quality data was under construction with little information currently. Presumably this is the public reporting portal, but it is not populated with enough information to judge at this time.</p> <p>The Plan provides an extensive explanation for the variety of reasons that may result in low-income and minority children being served at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers. The state description outlines several reasons for lack of egalitarian results, such as remoteness and turnover.</p> <p>While not mentioned within this section of the state’s plan, the state does</p>

⁴ 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.

	<p>include “staff success” as one of the goals within the state’s strategic plan. This recognizes the critical role that educators play and also signifies the need to provide the infrastructure and supports necessary to enable educator success.</p> <p>The application suggests that due to a small number of teachers rated as ineffective, the state is electing to use out of field and inexperienced teachers to determine the percentages but there are no data provided to show the extent to which this is an issue.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state description outlines several reasons for lack of egalitarian results, such as remoteness and turnover.</p> <p>While not mentioned within this section of the state’s plan, the state does include “staff success” as one of the goals within the state’s strategic plan. This recognizes the critical role that educators play and also signifies the need to provide the infrastructure and supports necessary to enable educator success.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Even if less than 1% of teachers are less than effective, the state still may have scenarios in which the “less effective” teachers are within one region.</p> <p>The application suggests that due to a small number of teachers rated as ineffective, the state is electing to use out of field and inexperienced teachers to determine the percentages but there are no data provided to show the extent to which this is an issue.</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 state should include more data illustrating the extent to which all students’ have equitable access to effective teachers.</p> <p>The state needs to maintain current data on the state teacher quality website for public reporting of equitable access data.</p>

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?
- 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>	The state focuses on the whole child within its applications and intends to leverage their Comprehensive Student Support System, their early warning system, and Response to Intervention to provide services to students to ensure their needs are met. Student bullying and harassment are addressed through

	<p>student mediation and counseling, in addition to a statewide anti-bullying effort. The plan also provides information about its initiatives to involve parents, teachers, and other students in preventing bullying and harassment (pg. 66).</p> <p>The state Plan describes general strategies that are provided in all schools, noting that some will be expanded (e.g. response to intervention [RTI] and early warning system). The Plan notes the State commitment to reduce bullying and the use of strategies to reduce the need to remove students from classrooms and maintain student health and safety.</p> <p>The descriptions do not provide much detail other than providing the types of services but these are not directly linked to any specifics or areas of need.</p> <p>One peer commented that the plan focused on school climate but did not make mention in the role of leadership support and educator quality in this section. There also did not seem to be a focus on collecting school climate and/or learning conditions data within this section.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Peers commended the state for the focus on the whole child within the plan and the recognition by the state that learning conditions have a significant impact on student academic and social success.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The descriptions do not provide much detail other than providing the types of services but these are not directly linked to any specifics or areas of need.</p> <p>One peer commented that the plan focused on school climate but did not make mention in the role of leadership support and educator quality in this section. There also did not seem to be a focus on collecting school climate and/or learning conditions data within this section.</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>	The state should add further clarity in how it will support schools to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom and the use of aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety.

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>	“The state schools have implemented the Response to Intervention (RTI) model, a comprehensive student support system, and the Early Warning System, which identifies students who are at risk of not being successful in school due to grades, attendance, or behavior.” (pg. 67-68) The State plan also

	<p>indicates that the state is exploring alternative educational programs for students who do not excel in traditional high school settings despite the aforementioned interventions. The State plan indicates that, although there is a particular focus on ninth-graders, there are plans throughout the grades, from early elementary school on, to help ensure school success.</p> <p>The application identifies the transitions that are a priority to support. The application focuses on the early learning transitions – in particular ensuring that more students have access to preschool (p. 66). Complex area supports are listed as a resource to support elementary to secondary transition. The state intends to leverage local Response to Intervention frameworks and early warning systems to identify students that are struggling with transition.</p> <p>The state response presents many programs and initiatives but little detail on how any of these support students and transition. For example, the state has an early warning system, but it is unclear exactly what it is warning of – what data are used, what is predicted, and what the responses are (other than evidence based).</p> <p>The plan mentions evidence-based strategies to support student transitions, but not specifically regarding what evidence-based practices (EBPs) will be used, the evidence base level, and how EBP implementation will be supported to ensure fidelity of implementation. For example, the application suggests that the state will implement innovative, evidence-based strategies in the k-12 setting to keep students in school; however, little mention of how those will be identified and supported. Unclear of the data collection mechanism.</p> <p>The state is aware of the need in diversity, specifically addressing transitions across the lifespan (i.e. secondary transition, early childhood, military transition centers).</p> <p>The alignment between this section and the overall strategic plan is strong in ensuring that students are prepared for careers and are able to be contributors to society. The state mentions the use of blended and braided funding to support early childhood/preschool education.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state is aware of the need in diversity, specifically addressing transitions across the lifespan (i.e. secondary transition, early childhood, military transition centers).</p> <p>The state focuses on ensuring students have a successful transition post-high school as a post-secondary transition and require a student personal transition plan that aligns with their future aspirations (p.66). The alignment between this section and the overall strategic plan is strong in ensuring that students are prepared for careers and are able to be contributors to society. The state mentions the use of blended and braided funding to support early childhood/preschool education.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The state response presents many programs and initiatives but little detail how any of these support students and transition. For example, the state has an early warning system, but it is unclear exactly what it is warning of – what data are used, what is predicted, and what the responses are (other than</p>

	<p>evidence based). For example, it would be helpful if the early warning system described or identified specific subgroups at risk of not graduating (e.g. Pacific Islanders).</p> <p>The plan mentions those evidence-based strategies to support student transitions, but not specific regarding what EBPs will be used, the evidence base level, and how EBP implementation will be supported to ensure fidelity of implementation. For example, the application suggests that the state will implement innovative, evidence-based strategies in the k-12 setting to keep students in school; however, little mention of how those will be identified and supported. Unclear of the data collection mechanism.</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>	

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>	<p>The state has uniform entrance and exit criteria for ELs. Since there are no LEAs in Hawaii, the SEA performs the functions of both the State and local educational agencies. Incoming students who report a home language other than English take the ACCESS placement test (kindergarten) or the WIDA Screener (grades 1-12) within 30 days of enrollment (pg. 97). Those who score less than a 5.0 are identified for further screening (an interview with a speaker of their home language) to assess whether SPED services are needed. ELs are assessed annually using the ACCESS and exit once they reach a level 5.0, after which time they are tracked for two years.</p> <p>Peers expressed a concern that a score of 5.0 may be difficult to attain under ACCESS 2.0 and delaying students’ exit too long may be detrimental as well. The state should monitor whether a score of 5.0 is necessary or whether it is</p>

	<p>substantially delaying exit unnecessarily.</p> <p>Peers commend the state for having a home language interview for ELs with a bilingual staff member. By the same token, bilingual staff may not always have the necessary training to determine whether students require SPED services.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Has a history of addressing student language needs as well as determining whether the student needs additional services at the time of screening.</p> <p>Use of standardized WIDA assessments to place ELs and to document their progress over time.</p> <p>The state assessed WIDA proficiency and academic achievement results to validate the decision to set the criteria to exit at the 5.0 proficiency level.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<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.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>	<p>The Plan narrative (pgs. 98-102) includes information on how the state processes and programs align and support the State’s academic standards, and how the EL classes and teachers address the teaching of the standards to English Learners, including computer aided instruction and collaboration with institutions of higher education. The state provides instructional services and acculturation activities to ELs. The state also conducts needs assessments, engages parents and extended day learning opportunities. The state provides support to both schools and complex areas. The WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment provides yearly interim progress towards the goal of reaching a 5.0 level in English proficiency.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The fact that reflection and assessment are built into the EL supports is noteworthy, and teachers are encouraged to find what works best for their students rather than being pushed into one support or method. The fact that Hawaii is a WIDA member also means it has access to WIDA professional development initiatives.</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Given the extended and multi-faceted support, it is surprising that the percentage of ELs making progress is around 36%. Additional detail to address what has not worked and will be changed would be useful.
<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 sub grant 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>	<p>On pg. 102 of its State plan, the state outlines the data it monitors for each entity receiving a Title III, part A sub grant for ELs, including schools' English language proficiency rates, annual statewide assessment proficiency rates, and other student data including, but not limited to, student grades, retention rates, graduation rates, and chronic absenteeism rates.</p> <p>In cases where further assistance is needed, "State (English language learner) ELL program staff and complex area ELL staff work collaboratively to identify and provide needed technical assistance and strategy modification to these schools." Supports include a number of technical assistance and support strategies, which range from securing training, onsite observations, and needs assessments for the complex area, school, and classroom. (pg. 102-103)</p> <p>The state ELL program staff meets monthly with staff in complex areas to monitor progress of students in ELL programs.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Indicates several strategies to provide TA, such as collaboration with external partners (e.g., WIDA and the University of Hawaii).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The plan indicates that the state does desk monitoring; however, peers are concerned that although this is necessary, it may not provide sufficient oversight and support.
<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>	