

# STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

---

STATE: Illinois



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>By checking ‘yes’ to the advanced math course work on page 56, it appears that Illinois intends to take advantage of the elimination of double testing in 8th grade. However, in the crosswalk to the new template Illinois indicates NA for 8th grade exemption.</p> <p>Illinois’s response to this section outlines the state’s efforts to support effective standards-based instruction and build the capacity of mathematics teachers. Illinois’ efforts are centered around ensuring every middle school student has access to qualified staff to pursue advanced coursework in middle school.</p>

---

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

	<p>However, there is some ambiguity in the response. Illinois notes the SAT is administered to grade 11 students (starting in 2017 per footnote 20 on page 25) and a high school science end-of-course exam (Biology I). Because the exception applies specifically to end-of-course mathematics assessments, it is unclear how Illinois meets the specific requirements based on the submitted information. Earlier responses mention the high school PARCC end-of-course exams are used to set long-term goals. It is unclear whether these EOC exams will be in addition to, or in place of, the SAT beginning in 2017. The SAT will be administered to every student in the 11<sup>th</sup> grade.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is not clear from the plan (pg.56) if an end-of-course math assessment is administered. The “yes” box is checked, and the narrative states the State is supporting implementation of their standards, but the text does not indicate an EOC test is given.</p> <p>While Illinois checked ‘yes’ to this requirement, it is unclear for which school years the state end-of-course assessments in mathematics that would be available to 8<sup>th</sup> graders taking advanced mathematics courses.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should clarify the contradictory information as it appears that Illinois intends to take advantage of the elimination of double testing in 8th grade by selecting ‘Yes’ to the advanced math coursework, but in the crosswalk to the new template Illinois indicates NA for 8th grade exemption (page 56).</p>

**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>On page 57, Illinois at the top of the page references a definition of “significant extent” as “any world language spoken by more than 60 percent of English Learners in the state.” Then, in the bottom paragraph. Illinois references having a goal of “translations for all languages where 30 percent or more of English Learner population speaks the same language.”</p> <p>The reference to Appendix E on page 57 should be Appendix C.</p> <p>Illinois defined languages present to a significant extent as ‘any world language spoken by more than 60 percent of ELs’. As defined, at most only one language could be present to a significant extent (e.g., once a language reaches the 60% threshold, all other language would represent a minority).</p> <p>Illinois commits, contingent upon funding, to develop translations for all languages where 30% or more of the EL population speaks the same language.</p> <p>Illinois response does not directly address whether languages are spoken by a significant proportion of students in one or more LEAs or across grade levels. However, the response reflects input from stakeholders including the Bilingual Advisory Council and Latino Policy Forum.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Clear, measurable definition of languages present to a significant extent.</p> <p>Commitment by the state, contingent on funding, to provide translations for any language spoken by 30% of the EL population.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The plan did not address how the state considered if a language other than English is spoken by a significant portion of students in one or more LEAs</p> <p>Illinois’ current definition of ‘languages spoken to a significant extent’ would allow only one language, at most, to meet these criteria.</p> <p>The most populous language is not identified in the narrative.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the</i>	Illinois should clarify the differing percentages (60% and 30%) and be more explicit in listing the languages that

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>meet the criteria described.</p> <p>Illinois should provide a specific description of 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.</p>
--	--

**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>Illinois states that the PARCC is trans-adapted in Spanish for mathematics (page 57).</p> <p>Illinois mentions that additional development and validation is necessary to offer trans-adapted versions in other languages.</p> <p>Illinois also it provides translation of directions on PARCC assessments. No additional information is provided on high school assessments or science assessments, so it is assumed assessments are only available in English.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois does not indicate the grade levels of the Spanish trans-adapted versions of the PARCC mathematics assessment in the narrative.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.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>Illinois offers a trans-adapted Spanish version of the PARCC assessment and commits to working to develop translations for all languages where 30% of more of the EL populations speaks the same language.</p> <p>Illinois provides a list of all languages and numbers of students in Appendix C. The plan notes that the PARCC math assessment is trans-adapted in Spanish, and that development is needed in “all other areas and for other languages” without specifying the other test areas or languages.</p> <p>Given this statement, it would appear Spanish versions (trans-adapted or translated) are not available in PARCC ELA, high school, or science (5, 8, and end-of-course Biology I) and are needed. Illinois’ plan would be strengthened by clarifying if this assumption is accurate and providing information on the number of languages meeting the 30% threshold current.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois acknowledges that translation is necessary in other languages and in other testing areas.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois’ plan would be strengthened by clarifying that assessments are needed but not yet available and providing information on the number of languages meeting the 30% threshold current.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should clarify in what test areas they will develop Spanish versions, and, if applicable, in what other languages.

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

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- 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>Illinois makes it clear (p.58) that funding is a barrier to developing native language content areas exams.</p> <p>The reference to Appendix D should be changed to Appendix B.</p> <p>The state plan addresses each of the requirements in a concise manner, providing information that confirms it is seeking to develop native language assessments. The plan describes several methods used to gather input and communicate with various stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Illinois commits to continuing to work with stakeholders to identify funding and technical resources to offer additional native language assessments. Stakeholder feedback included requests for Spanish version of the PARCC ELA assessment (78% of EIs).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois made commendable efforts to consult with stakeholders around the need for assessments in languages other than English that was rooted in a larger statewide strategy for meaningful stakeholder engagement. Appendix B shows evidence of stakeholder engagement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois did not provide a timeline for this work, or interim milestones.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should provide a timeline for work to develop additional assessments or interim milestones, such as convening stakeholders to identify possible funding streams and resources for assessment development.

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The list is provided on page 84, and includes all required subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois clearly includes 7 major racial/ethnic groups as subgroups for accountability.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

#### A.4.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>	Illinois also includes Former English Learners and Students Formerly with a Disability as additional subgroups.
<i>Strengths</i>	Having these additional subgroups is an interesting idea.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	Not applicable. Illinois selected the second option. (p.86)
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	On p. 86, Illinois gives several recommendations to n-sizes proposed by various groups, but does not explicitly state that 20 was the final decision until iii on page 87.
<i>Strengths</i>	References to stakeholder discussion of minimum n-size.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The response to section E could be strengthened by a concluding statement that affirms the final decision to proceed with an n-size of 20.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan provides information from several documents which support statistical soundness of a minimum n-size of 20 or 30.  Illinois cited the experience of the California CORE districts, a 2011 NCES report, Illinois' experience with a minimum n-size of 30, and feedback from various stakeholder groups. Illinois appears to have thoroughly weighed

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

	<p>the benefits of including more students in the accountability system by lowering the state n-size from 30 to 20 and the potential statistical consequences of making accountability determination based on a smaller subset of students.</p> <p>Illinois mentions convening multiple teams with ‘sufficient statistical and data expertise to lead the effort to establish a minimum group size’ (page 88). Illinois also notes that as baseline data becomes available on indicators, Illinois will work with its TAC to verify the statistical soundness of estimations.</p> <p>Illinois’ response also alludes to methods beyond a minimum n-size to protect the privacy of individual students.</p> <p>Background data provides information on statistically sound practices.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Good use of references</p> <p>Illinois plans to continuously evaluate the statistical soundness of its selected minimum n-size as data becomes available, and collaborate with the Illinois TAC on this work.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Illinois plan would be strengthened by including state-specific data to support the statistical soundness of a minimum n-size of 20.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	<p>Illinois received recommendations for n-size from several groups and stakeholders, which ranged from a low of 10 to a high of 30. ISBE decided on a subgroup n-size of 20 for accountability.</p> <p>Page 45 includes public comment received on the second draft of the plan regarding n-size (and page 46). Page 15</p>

	of the Appendix includes outreach to IPA (Illinois Principals Association) and IFT (Illinois Federation of Teachers). Illinois also repeatedly mentioned consultation with the Latino Policy Forum and review by the IBAMC which includes teacher, parent and district representatives.
<i>Strengths</i>	Good use of references.  Active engagement of and collaboration with diverse stakeholders to determine the state n-size.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan described the process used by Illinois state education agency and state board of education to ensure the minimum n-size ensured privacy, referring to several documents by NCES and other entities (pgs. 86-87, 90).  Illinois suppresses data for demographic groups that are below a minimum n-size of 10.
<i>Strengths</i>	Good use of references.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois plan would be strengthened by a clear articulation of the procedures, selected from the examples given, that will be implemented in the state.

---

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Illinois proposes a minimum n-size of 10 for reporting purposes. Illinois mentions the work of PTAC to identify best practices, including cell suppression. However, it is unclear whether Illinois uses complimentary cell suppression or removed totals from public reports to further protect individual student privacy, or the specific practices that would be implemented in the state.
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois, with the assistance of its TAC, will verify that results are statistically valid and reliable.  Illinois’ ongoing evaluation of its accountability system will ensure a review of the appropriateness of the n-size for new measures (e.g., school climate, etc.).
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iii: 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 plan provides a narrative and tables which detail the long-term academic achievement goals in ELA and Math. The long-term goals are ambitious, seeking a level of 90% proficiency. The baseline is provided for the total and for each subgroup, and the timeline is identical for all subgroups (that being 2032).</p> <p>Baseline data reveals significant progress must occur for LEP and IEP students to achieve 90% proficiency (currently at 9.7% and 7.9% respectively in grades 3-8 for ELA). At the high school level in mathematics, African American/Black students have a baseline of 8.7% which Illinois intends to raise to 90% in 15 years.</p> <p>Illinois intends to use a three-year average for interim goals, and notes the baseline data is not the result of a three-year composite average. A date/year is not provided for when three years of data will be available.</p> <p>Illinois should clarify if long-term goals will be based on end-of-course (EOC) assessments or revised for the 11<sup>th</sup> grade SAT.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity regarding why high school EOC data cannot be disaggregated.</p> <p>Every required subgroup for accountability is included in the goal tables, plus groups likely included for reporting purposes such as migrant, not-low income, etc. However, Illinois does not include baseline data for two groups proposed for inclusion in the accountability system – former EL and former SWD. It can be assumed the long-term goal is 90% proficient given the state’s commitment ‘to maintain the same ambitious goals for all students and student demographic groups.’</p>

	Illinois will collect and report data for former ELs and children formally identified with a disability.
<i>Strengths</i>	Consistent high expectations for all students & each subgroup.  Illinois' goals align with the vision, mission, and goals previously approved by the state board of education in 2015.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois does not provide baseline data for the two student groups that state has elected to add, beyond those required for inclusion in the accountability system – former EL and former SWD.  Illinois does not clearly specify at which high school grade level all students are expected to take the EOC assessments for ESSA purposes.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The tables in the plan (pgs. 26-30) delineate specific targets for interim progress, which are unique for each subgroup, in order to meet the long-term goal in 2032.  Illinois provided initial interim goals that will be adjusted once the state accumulates three years of data to average. Interim goals are provided for each required group of students. However, similar to the long-term goals, the two additional groups of former EL and former SWD appear to be missing. Illinois proposes to collect and report data for these groups but does not give a timeline for when data will be available, or whether the state intends to use a single year of data until 3 years are available.
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois even set goals for groups which are not in the accountability model (examples are Not LEP, Not IEP, Not Low Income and Migrant).

	Graph breaks out male and female students.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Interim goals for the two additional groups of former EL and former SWD appear to be missing. Illinois proposes to collect and report data for these groups but does not give a timeline for when data will be available, or whether the state intends to use a single year of data until 3 years are available.  It is unclear whether “not IEP” refers to children formally identified with a disability, and unclear if “Not LEP” refers to former ELs.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The long-term goals and interim targets for progress denote that subgroups of students who are behind the overall proficiency rate must make greater rates of improvement to achieve the long-term goal.
<i>Strengths</i>	The use of the ISBE goals is a good idea.  Illinois commits to conduct ongoing analysis of schools’ actual success to determine if interim goals are both ambitious and achievable.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The goal of 90% proficiency may be challenging for many subgroups as Illinois does not present historical data to demonstrate goals are both ambitious and achievable.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>It appears that Illinois will not be able to provide benchmark and interim progress measures until the conclusion of the 2017-18 school year (p.31) and will use a three-year average. Illinois notes that what is in the plan “does not include data from the college and career readiness indicator.”</p> <p>In narrative and chart form, the plan presents four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate baseline data and long-term goals for the total and subgroups of students. The long-term goal is ambitious, at 90% graduating ready for college and career.</p> <p>Illinois proposes a long-term goal of 90% of all students and demographic groups graduating from high school within four years. Illinois sets a 15-year timeline to achieve the goal, 2032, consistent with academic achievement long-term goals. Student groups furthest from the goal would have to increase graduation rates by slightly less than 20 percentage points.</p> <p>Baseline data reveals the statewide average for some student groups has achieved the long-term goal. In 2016, the average graduation rate for white students was 90.4 and the graduation rate for Asian students was 93.6. Given the variation of performance across the state, it can be assumed some schools have not yet achieved the 90% goal for these student groups. Illinois’ plan could be improved by providing additional data to justify the long-term goal is ambitious for all student groups. For example, the number or percentage of schools not yet achieving the 90% target for white or Asian students.</p>

	<p>Illinois also appears to not yet have baseline data for former EL and former SWD, additional subgroups the state has elected to add to the accountability system.</p> <p>Graduation goals are set for 4-, 5- and 6-year adjusted cohort rates.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois provided a timeline for the availability of three years of data for each student group.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Illinois' plan could be improved by providing additional data to justify the long-term goal is ambitious for all student groups.</p> <p>There is no clear rationale or justification for why Illinois does not have three years of graduation data to calculate a three-year average for the four-year rate.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The plan includes extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates for 5-year and 6-year cohorts. The interim goals are specific by subgroup in order to meet the 2032 target of 90% graduating ready for college and career.

	<p>Long-term goals for the extended-year graduation rate appear to be the same as long-term goals for the 4-year graduation rate. Given that the extended rate aims to capture more students, including those that take longer to graduate, the long-term goal of 90% for the extended rate appears less rigorous.</p> <p>However, measures of interim progress are higher for the extended year rates than they are for the four-year graduates.</p> <p>Illinois acknowledges that measures may need to be adjusted when 3-year averages are available.at the end of 2017-18 school year for 5- and 6-year graduation rates and 2020 for former EL and former SWD.</p> <p>Illinois does not provide baseline data for former EL and former SWD subgroups.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Given that the extended rate aims to capture more students, including those that take longer to graduate, the long-term goal of 90% for the extended rate appears less rigorous.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should set extended year graduation rate long-term goals that are more rigorous than 4-year graduation rate goals, or reconsider inclusion of extended year rates in the ESSA plan.

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 tables in the plan provide measures of interim progress in order to achieve the long-term goals, for the 4-year cohort, and for the 5- and 6-year cohorts.</p> <p>Interim progress is included but it appears that measures will change after the 2017-18 school year.</p>

	<p>Illinois provides measures of interim progress for the required subgroups, but does not provide data for the 2 additional subgroups the state has chosen to include in the accountability system (former EL and former SWD). Illinois also notes the state intends to reset baseline data once three years of data are available for averaging.</p> <p>Narrative references 3 year interim goals and conducting an analysis of the goals in order to improve progress</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The narrative does not describe what changes may be necessary to achieve progress measures.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Long-term goals require greater rates of progress for student groups further from the goal</p> <p>The long-term goals are set as 90% for all groups by 2032. However, the White and Asian subgroups already are surpassing the goal of 90% and Illinois still holds these subgroups to a 90% goal. To justify this goal is ambitious, the Illinois’ plan could be strengthened by providing data on the number or percentage of high schools that have not met the 90% goal for those subgroups.</p> <p>The interim subgroup goals for 4-, 5- , and 6-year cohorts, which lead to the 90% long-term graduation rate goal, take into account that subgroups that are behind the overall average graduation rate require greater rates of improvement to reach the 2032 goal.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The narrative indicates that an ongoing analysis will be conducted.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The narrative does not indicate who will be conducting the analysis.

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois proposes a maximum timeline of five years for English Learners to achieve ELP on the annual assessment (p.34). However, it will not be able to set student-level targets until after June 2017 because of the need to establish a revised cut score for reclassification on the new ACCESS 2.0 assessment (p.34).</p> <p>Illinois is in the process of establishing a baseline performance level, after which it will set three-year targets for readiness and achievement toward a 90% year 2032 target. The 2032 target of 90% attaining English proficiency within 5 years is ambitious.</p> <p>Illinois proposes a 90% goal for ELP by 2032, with baseline data provided in the table reporting 63.0 percent. Yet, it is unclear whether this is the percentage of students who reached proficiency or percentage of students that were on-track to reach proficiency within 5 years.</p> <p>Illinois proposes using a growth-to-target measure to ensure 90% of EL students are on-track to achieve English language proficiency within 5 years (or 12<sup>th</sup> grade).</p> <p>All ELs are screened upon first 30 days of student enrollment.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Students are not exited from the program if they do not reach the goal within the state-determined 5-year

	timeframe.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Baseline data has not yet been set.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should provide baseline data and interim targets as soon as data are available.  Illinois should provide the student-level targets as soon as they are established after June 2017.  Illinois should clarify the measurements used in the table on page 37, specifically if it is measuring growth-to-target or proficiency.  Illinois should clarify the role of the state content assessments, referenced on pages 35 and 36.

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>	<p>“Once the baseline for ACCESS of ELs within each school has been established, the 90 percent targets to 2032 will be back mapped with the timeline of interim goals determined by the State Board” (p.35). However, Illinois describes a growth to target methodology which will eventually be established and schools will be reported as: schools making below average progress with ELs, schools making average progress, and schools making above average progress with ELs, once data has been analyzed and targets have been established (p.36). This sounds like there will be two ways of data being reported for ELs making progress. Illinois also mentions using a three-year composite of data.</p> <p>Illinois provided initial measures of interim progress, but notes that the standards-setting for ACCESs 2.0 is ongoing and that the initial goals are not based on a 3-year average. Interim goals represent about a 5.1 percentage point increase every 3 years, and 1/3 of the progress for 2031-2032.</p> <p>Illinois should explain why there are two different school ratings on page 36 (progress categories vs. school growth categories).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The narrative does not indicate how families and communities will be engaged in the process.
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)

requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	Illinois should explain why there are two different school ratings on page 36 (progress categories vs. school growth categories).  Illinois must provide the interim progress data and clarify the measures used after they are established after June 2017.

**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>	The plan provides a narrative and a table which describes the components of the academic achievement indicators in the state accountability system. The indicator is measured by the annual ELA and Math PARCC assessments, and the SAT test at the HS level. The indicators are based on the long-term goals (% of students Proficient), and can be disaggregated for each subgroup of students. The calculations are consistent across grades and schools, with an equal weighting of ELA and Math (10% each, currently). A measure of student growth is included in the Academic Achievement Indicator, which is 50% of the total weight. This ELA and Math growth is calculated through a simple linear regression. This methodology is used based upon the recommendation of IBAMC. The ISBE will run additional statistical treatments to review the methodology for growth calculation at the end of the 2019-20 school

	<p>year. Each of the measures for Academic Achievement have documented high levels of reliability and validity. The indicators can measure the performance of at least 95% of all students and students in each subgroup.</p> <p>Illinois proposes to add science assessments in 2019-20.</p> <p>Illinois provides links to information on the validity and reliability of the assessments.</p> <p>Illinois consistently references a plan to average data across three years to increase statistical reliability. However, to ensure that schools receive recognition for recent achievement gains, Illinois will allow schools to use the better of 3-year averaged data or current year performance so long as the n-size is met.</p> <p>Illinois should confirm performance is based on the greater of 95% participation or enrollment.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Narrative indicates ELs are assessed in the first year – prior narrative section indicated students are assessed in the first 30 days of enrollment.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should confirm academic achievement is based on the greater of at least 95 percent of students enrolled or percent participating in the assessment.</p> <p>Illinois should confirm the inclusion of the two additional state-defined subgroups, former EL and former SWD, and the availability of data for these groups.</p>

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

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

- Does the SEA describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including that the SEA uses the same indicator and calculates it in the same way for all elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, in all LEAs, across the State, except that the indicator may vary by each grade span?
- Does the SEA describe, if applicable, how it averages data across years and/or grades (e.g., does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?
- If the SEA uses a different indicator for each grade span, does it describe each indicator, including the grade span to which it applies?

- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, is the indicator another valid and reliable statewide academic indicator?
- If the Other Academic indicator is not a measure of student growth, does the indicator allow for meaningful differentiation in school performance?
- Can the indicator be disaggregated for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Illinois proposes to use linear regression to measure student growth in grades 3-8. Illinois also notes the state will concurrently run simulations of additional growth models as additional data becomes available.
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The narrative does not clearly address disaggregation of data by subgroups.  Illinois should clarify how growth is being computed for grade 3, or correct the narrative
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.iv.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 graduation rate indicator is related to the long-term goal of 90% graduating ready for college and career. The plan indicates the data are stable, valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs.</p> <p>Illinois proposes to include a 4-year, 5-year, and 6-year adjusted cohort graduation rate. Illinois does not describe the relative weighting of the 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates. Illinois does not mention an alternate diploma for students with the most significant disabilities.</p> <p>Illinois baseline data suggests the indicator can be disaggregated by subgroup, and the state should confirm the availability of data for former EL and former SWD subgroups.</p> <p>The table on page 60 combines graduation with ELA and math growth. However, on page 66, the table just includes graduation rate with no reference to ELA and math growth.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Great use of references for research.</p> <p>As referenced in footnote 63 for graduation rate, measuring high school student growth is a goal based on stakeholder input. The Governor will commit to finding funding to include a second high-school assessment to support measuring high school academic growth— no time frame is indicated as when this will occur.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is not clear how the 4-, 5-, and 6-year cohort graduation rates are combined or used in calculating this component of the overall indicator. The plan does not specify the process used to calculate the rate for very small schools. The plan does not indicate how it includes students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the graduation rate.</p> <p>Illinois does not describe the relative weighting of the 4-, 5-, and 6-year graduation rates.</p> <p>3 years of graduation rate data are not addressed. Alternate assessments are not addressed in the narrative.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</i>	<p>Illinois should describe how the different graduation rates will be combined, including the relative weighting. This is noted in the section below about weighting.</p> <p>Illinois must clarify the discrepancy regarding the table on page 60 that combines graduation with ELA and math growth, and the table on page 66 that just includes graduation rate with no reference to ELA and math growth.</p>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois uses ACCESS across all LEAs to measure English Language Proficiency. Research from the developer and WIDA provide validity and reliability indices (though not provided in the plan). The plan is not clear on the precise measure of growth to target, but that the measure will be based on the recommendation of stakeholders (pg. 61).</p> <p>Illinois proposes to use ACCESS 2.0 as the ELP measure. Illinois’ description of the indicator in response to this section is brief. In the description of long-term goals, Illinois outlines its intent to measure growth-to-proficiency within 5 years or by 12<sup>th</sup> grade (page 36). Illinois also notes that baseline data will be necessary to set growth targets, once the revised proficiency definition is in place.</p> <p>Illinois should clarify when ACCESS 2.0 was administered and whether this occurred in in 2016-2017 (year 0), so that 2017-2018 (year 1) would provide the necessary second score for growth measures and allow for the inclusion of ELP in identification of CSI schools based on 2017-18 data (for planning/implementation in 2018-19).</p> <p>Illinois provides a definition of English language proficiency on page 150, Illinois describes its definition of English language proficiency, developed in 2013, as an overall composite score of 5.0, reading proficiency level of 4.2, and writing proficiency level of 4.2 on the annual English language proficiency assessment. Illinois is currently reviewing and revising the ELP definition in collaboration with stakeholders by June 30, 2017.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Illinois needs to develop the growth-to-target measure.</p> <p>Revised definition of English language proficiency is not available until June 30, 2017</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)

<i>requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should clarify when ACCESS 2.0 was administered and whether this occurred in 2017 (year 0), so that 2018 (year 1) would provide the necessary second score for growth measures and allow for the inclusion of ELP in identification of CSI schools based on 2017-18 data (for planning/implementation in 2018-19)  Illinois must provide the EL data when available.

**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 - Science</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Illinois proposes to include Science assessments in grades 3, 5, and once in high school (Biology I EOC). Illinois notes the science assessment is still under development. Therefore, the indicator will not be included until 2019-20. Illinois provides the anticipated weights for when science assessments will be included.
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois provides detailed references and evidence to support the inclusion of science assessments in an accountability system focused on college and career readiness.  While there is not sufficient evidence to determine whether science assessments meet requirements at this time, Illinois’ inclusion of future indicators, along with weighting adjustments, demonstrates the state’s efforts to continuously evaluate and refine the system in response to feedback from stakeholders.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois does not yet have state data available on the science assessments.
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)

<i>requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Once the science assessments are fully operational, Illinois should submit information for review.

	<i>Peer Response - Chronic Absenteeism</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Chronic Absenteeism, P-12, (p. 70). Illinois provides research and evidence to support the inclusion of chronic absenteeism in the accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

	<i>Peer Response - Climate Survey (5Essentials),</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois proposes to initially include the participation rate on the 5Essential Survey in grades 6-12 (pp. 74-75) as a measure of school quality or student success.</p> <p>Illinois acknowledges that the current measure of school climate does not meet technical criteria for inclusion as an indicator as it cannot be disaggregated by subgroup and is not required annually. However, the IBAMC and other stakeholders supported the inclusion of a school climate measure. Using the participation rate seems a reasonable compromise.</p> <p>However, for participation to be a viable indicator it must be measured annually and be disaggregated by subgroup. Illinois notes in footnote 86 (page 75), that work is ongoing to amend the School Code to require annual administration of the 5Essential survey. Illinois plan could be strengthened by including an anticipated completion date so that it is clear when the indicator will first be included in the accountability system, or a plan to adjust the</p>

	weighting. Illinois should also clarify whether it will only use the 5Essentials survey, or also include participation on alternate surveys selected from a state approved list.  School culture and climate indicator is not based on student-level data (page 90).
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should include an anticipated completion date to amend the school code to require annual administration of the 5Essential survey, so that it is clear when the indicator will first be included in the accountability system, or a plan to adjust the weighting of the indicators.

	<i>Peer Response - Fine Arts, P-8 and P-12</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Fine Arts, P-8 and P-12, Will not be part of the model until 2021-22 (p.75)
<i>Strengths</i>	While there is not sufficient evidence to determine whether the Fine Arts indicator meets requirements now, Illinois' inclusion of future indicators demonstrates the state's efforts to continuously evaluate and refine the system in response to feedback from stakeholders.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Once the Fine Arts Indicator is fully operational and will be weighted greater than zero, Illinois should submit information for review.

	<i>Peer Response - Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator (P-8)</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Elementary/Middle Grade Indicator (P-8) – “to be modeled after the idea of a college and career readiness indicator for high school” (p.77); no indication what it will be or when it'll be introduced into the model
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should submit details once they are finalized and indicate the school year when it will enter the accountability system.

	<i>Peer Response - P-2 Indicator</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	P-2 Indicator; details to come at some later date (p.77).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should submit details and when it will enter the accountability model.

	<i>Peer Response - 9<sup>th</sup> Grade On-Track</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	9 <sup>th</sup> Grade On-Track, (p.71) Table row for 9th grade on track refers to chronic absenteeism in the “Aids in Meaningful Differentiation” section.
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to</i>	

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

<i>Peer Response - College Career Ready Indicator</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	Illinois will provide data that the proposed indicator aids in meaningful differentiation of schools in the state once data are available and reviewed by the TAC. Illinois did provide supporting evidence through many research citations.
<i>Strengths</i>	Great use of references for research.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**A.4.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>Illinois will be using four tiers to meaningfully differentiate schools (p.78). The plan describes the complexities and complications in developing a system to meaningfully differentiate all public schools (pgs. 90-92) in the state. Ultimately, the state’s system will be based upon all indicators, but currently would exclude several climate indicators and others that lack the technical quality review from the Technical Advisory Council</p> <p>The details of the differentiation process remain unclear, specifically how the performance of all subgroups contributes to the overall rating. Illinois outlines a plan to standardize all indicators on a 100-point scale and set</p>

	<p>performance levels based on distance from interim targets (full points awarded to achieving long-term goals).</p> <p>Work will begin in April 2017, but no anticipated completion date is provided.</p> <p>Tier 3 school designation is the only designation that does not include a graduation rate. It is unclear if this omission is intended.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois has given thoughtful consideration on how to present the complex information in an intuitive manner on public report cards.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is not clear what indicators will be included in the 2018 reporting and how others will be added into the system, and how the variety of components will be communicated to the public to indicate an “apples to apples” comparison from one year to the next.</p> <p>Work will begin in April 2017 on the performance index, but no anticipated completion date is provided.</p> <p>Footnote 93 and 94 have been switched.</p> <p>The chart on page 81 lists “Student who is a parent in the armed forces” and should read “who <u>has</u> a parent in the armed forces”.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should provide a plan, timeline, and interim goals for designing the index system and setting performance levels. Including materials for the April 2017 work would also be beneficial to the extent materials frame the design of the index, and how individual subgroup performance contributes to each metric’s 100-point scale.

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 plan presents a weighting system of Core Academic Indicators and School Quality Indicators. The narrative does not describe how the weighting is adjusted for schools in which an indicator cannot be calculated. The School Quality Indicators constitute only 25% of the weight, while the Core Academic Indicators make up 75% of the index. ELA and Math Growth (ES) and Graduation/ELA and Math Growth (HS) make up 50% of the overall weight, with Math and ELA Proficiency each accounting for 10% (20% overall).</p> <p>Illinois mentions that schools with grade configurations spanning elementary, middle, and high school (e.g., 4-12) will use the indicators associated with the highest-grade (page 97). This ensures all schools with a graduating class will be evaluated on graduation rates.</p> <p>Illinois' plan could be strengthened with a description of how ELP is substantially weighted at 5%.</p> <p>The Governor is committed to securing funding to measure growth at the high school level. The narrative has indicated in multiple places the uncertainty of the state budget.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois should specify the specific weights for growth and graduation rates for K-12 schools.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should provide a description of what the weights will be respectively for the 4-year, 5-year and 6-year graduation rates.</p> <p>Page 60 (also repeated on page 93) provides a table of the indicators and the weights. However, the table has a footnote that indicates in parentheses when the indicators will be available but that is not done for all the SQ &amp; SS indicators. Illinois should complete the table to provide the timeline and all relevant information.</p> <p>Illinois should indicate how the weights are adjusted for schools in which one or more indicators cannot be calculated because of minimum N-size.</p> <p>Illinois should specify the specific weights for growth and graduation rates for K-12 schools.</p>

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>	Illinois includes information on its process to back-map results to feeder schools based on the same system of annual meaningful differentiation.  Descriptions of different methodologies are listed on pages 97 and 98.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should substantiate why a new school with sufficient n-sizes is not held to the accountability model until year 3. Two years of data should be sufficient to be included in the model.

**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>	Illinois proposes to identify the lowest-performing 5% of Title I schools, consistent with requirements.  Schools will begin developing and implementing improvement plans beginning in 2018-19. However, it is unclear

	whether this timeline aligns with the timeline of data to be available for the proposed 3-year average. Additionally, Illinois mentions engaging in a standard setting process to rate/rank schools that would require a review of data (page 91). If so, the state should clarify that it will have the necessary data for 2017-18 for identified schools to develop/implement plans in 2018-19.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois should clarify that it will have the necessary data available to identify schools based on 2017-18 data and for identified schools to develop/implement plans in 2018-19.  Illinois' definition of parent family and community engagement should be expanded.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should provide a timeline of data available for CSI implementation or plan development during the 2018-19 school year, specifically whether data would be available for a 3-year average and alternative plans if 3 years of data are not available.

**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>	Illinois uses 3-year averages for the 4-year, 5-year and 6-year graduation rates (pp.31 & 32), but will only use the 4-year rate for CSI low graduation rates (p. 99). This complies with requirements. However, in the text on page 99, Illinois states that "Schools in the first two categories will be first identified, using data from the full range of the accountability system..." which implies use of 5- and 6-year graduation rates.  Illinois will first identify schools for development/implementation of CSI plans in 2018-19. Schools will be

	identified in three-year cycles.  Illinois proposes to average data across three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Narrative does not indicate what will be made available to schools for support and learning opportunities.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should clarify the contradictions on page 99 of stating “full range of the accountability system” for low graduation rates.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois’s methodology is described at the top of page 102. Because Illinois will identify schools for TSI for the 2018-19 school year and allow schools to have three years to exit, it would be the 2021-22 school year when those schools could become CSI schools. However, Illinois will allow TSI schools to have a planning year and then three years to exit so schools taking the planning year would not become CSI until the 2022-23 school year.</p> <p>Illinois proposes to include schools with chronically low-performing subgroups that have implemented TSI plans for 3 years, and the same subgroups that resulted in identification remain at or below the all students subgroup for the lowest performing 5% of schools.</p> <p>Illinois notes that schools may have an initial year to develop an improvement plan, before implementing the plan. Illinois’ description at times refers to identifying TSI schools that have implemented plans for 3 or more years, which may or may not include the planning year. Footnote 91 on page 78 implies a four-year period before TSI</p>

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

A.4.vi.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>	<p>Illinois plans to identify schools on a 3- year basis, beginning with implementation/planning in 2018-19 for CSI-Lowest Performing &amp; Grad rates and 2021-22 (following 3-year cycle) for chronically low-performing subgroups.</p> <p>Illinois notes that schools may have an initial year to develop an improvement plan, before implementing the plan. Illinois’ description at times refers to identifying TSI schools that have implemented plans for 3 or more years, which may or may not include the planning year. Illinois should clarify that identification will occur at least once every three years, even if every TSI school uses the first year of identification as a planning year.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois does not clarify if this means that identification only happens every three years.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this</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 text contains some ambiguity which makes it difficult to determine compliance with requirements. For example, on page 101, Illinois appears to propose identifying schools with consistently underperforming subgroups for TSI where the former EL or former SWD group is on par with the ‘all students group’ in any school identified for CSI. Yet, the footnote implies these schools will be identified for comprehensive services. It is also unclear from the description how ‘consistently’ is measured, as the term implies more than one data point.</p> <p>Laudable focus on former EL and SWD students, given that EL and SWD students are among the lowest performing groups in the state. However, Illinois should consider if the focus on these groups comes at a cost of other student groups not receiving targeted interventions and services for consistent under-performance. Illinois may also consider identifying schools where the former EL and former SWD groups are on par with the ‘all students group’ in CSI as a state-defined additional category of schools.</p> <p>Illinois also includes in TSI-Consistently under-performing any school that has not met the 95% participation requirement for the all students group or any one subgroup for the past three consecutive years.</p> <p>Illinois states notification will begin in 2018-19 and annually thereafter.</p> <p>Illinois notes that schools identified under this definition will have an LEA-determined number of years to implement TSI plans.</p> <p>The first definition of underperforming subgroups as provided in the page on page 101 does not identify groups as underperforming. Rather, it addresses schools or subgroups within a school that failed to meet the 95% participation rate threshold for three years.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should ensure its methodology for “Targeted Support and Improvement - Consistently Underperforming” is based on all indicators and subgroups.</p> <p>Illinois should clarify the language that refers to comprehensive support and improvement when the requirement refers to targeted support for consistently underperforming subgroups. Illinois should review the text for consistency with its intended plan.</p> <p>Illinois should address for category 2, how it meets the requirement for consistency when it appears they only use one data point.</p> <p>Illinois should revise its first identification criteria to reflect a methodology based on performance on all indicators.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois proposes to identify schools that receive Title I funds that have student groups whose performance is on par with the performance of the ‘all students group’ of the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools.</p> <p>Identification will begin in 2018-19 and occur every three years thereafter. Illinois notes that schools may take one planning year and up to three years of full implementation before needing to meet exit criteria (potentially 4 years until CSI identification).</p> <p>Illinois proposes to use a three-year average of data.</p> <p>It is not clear if the term three-year cycle indicates that identification will only be every three years or that schools</p>

	will be reviewed every three years.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois needs to clarify what is meant by the three-year cycle.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois' current plan does not meet requirements, specifically Step 3 on 101, which refers only to Title I schools when it should refer to ALL schools in the state. Illinois should revise its plan to comply with requirements.

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>	Crosswalk indicates “N/A”, but Illinois also proposes to identify as chronically underperforming Title I schools in the lowest performing 10% of schools for three consecutive years (page 95).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

- Does the SEA describe how it factors the requirement for 95 percent participation of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students in statewide mathematics and reading/language arts assessments into the statewide accountability system?

- If applicable, does the SEA describe how the SEA differentiates its approach based on such factors as the number of subgroups in the school missing the participation rate requirement, the length of time over which the school has missed the requirement, or the degree to which the school missed the requirement (e.g., 92 percent participation rate vs. 70 percent participation)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Participation rate is addressed on page 96 of the plan. Illinois states that “If a school does not have 95% participation rate, it cannot score at the highest level of proficiency.” Illinois should clarify what this means operationally. Illinois also states that “Furthermore, ISBE will include failure to meet the 95 percent student participation rate in its methodology for identifying schools for targeted support and improvement and defined as a consistently underperforming school” (p.96). Illinois describes the process on page 96, but does not include the participation rate in its section of the plan on Identification of Schools.</p> <p>Illinois notes that a school not meeting the 95% participation requirement cannot score at the highest level of proficiency on the academic indicator.</p> <p>Illinois will also identify schools failing to meet the 95% participation requirement for consecutive years as TSI-Consistently Under-Performing.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear if science included in the 95% participation rate.</p> <p>If the 3 year cycle set the school as a Tier I school and the school misses the 2<sup>nd</sup> year – what are the consequences?</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should clarify “cannot score at the highest level of proficiency” and should repeat the language on failure to meet the 95% participation in the section on CSI and TSI for clarity.</p>

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>	<p>On page 100, Illinois includes the statement that a school “has established a growth trajectory for students.” Illinois needs to operationally define this, as a school that is declining has established a growth trajectory but a negative one.</p> <p>Given that Illinois allows one planning year and three full years of plan implementation, schools are not required to meet exit criteria for up to four years.</p> <p>Illinois outlines exit criteria on page 100, including that the school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for CSI and that the school has established growth trajectories for all students, and a strong plan for sustainability of the progress made.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Schools are given the option of a one year planning year before moving into three years of support.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should operationally define what is meant by “has established a growth trajectory for students.”

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>Illinois proposes uniform exit criteria that indicates when a school no longer meets the eligibility criteria for TSI, has established growth trajectory for student groups in alignment with state long-term goals, and has a strong plan for sustainability.</p> <p>Schools will have one optional planning year, and three-years of full implementation of targeted support before needing to meet exit criteria (up to 4 years).</p> <p>The uniform exit criteria for TSI does not ensure that schools identified for TSI-Consistently Underperforming have resolved the issues that led to the school’s identification (e.g. does not ensure that the school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the schools was identified).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should address the schools or subgroups that are receiving targeted support because they failed to meet the 95% participation outlined in the state-defined “TSI-Consistently Underperforming” criteria.</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>Illinois’ monitoring process for additional state interventions is ongoing. A strength of the Illinois plan is its commitment to monitor quarterly report submissions of identified schools that provide progress data to swiftly put in place additional interventions (page 103).</p> <p>Illinois is developing a list of resources to support the selection of evidence-based practices. Schools not meeting exit criteria will be supported in selecting the appropriate evidence-based practice, and the state will support the</p>

	<p>LEA in establishing a strong monitoring program to ensure evidence-based practices are implemented with a high degree of fidelity. Schools that fail to meet exit criteria (or identified for CSI) will be required to partner with an ISBE-approved provider and use 1003 funding for professional learning, technical assistance and coaching.</p> <p>Illinois may wish to consider specific interventions that will be put in place for schools failing to meet CSI exit criteria in the required number of years, including school staffing, governance, or budgeting operations. While Illinois lists an extensive support system for CSI schools framed around Illinois-EMPOWER, it is not clear what specific additional, more rigorous interventions will be implemented in CSI schools that fail to exit.</p> <p>Illinois-EMPOWER Provider Partner has been identified as the technical assistance support for schools unable to meet the exit criteria.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>While Illinois lists an extensive support system for CSI schools framed around Illinois-EMPOWER, it is not clear what specific additional, more rigorous interventions will be implemented in CSI schools that fail to exit.</p> <p>The narrative does not indicate that the community is involved in the interventions in any way.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should describe the additional, more rigorous interventions, for schools failing to meet CSI exit criteria.</p> <p>Illinois should specify in the narrative a timeline for interventions.</p>

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>Building off an internal infrastructure analysis completed in 2014, Illinois will update its analysis in 2018-19 and annually thereafter.</p> <p>Every three years, Illinois will review state, federal, and other programmatic resources for each LEA serving one or more schools identified for TSI or CSI.</p>

	<p>Following this review, the state will engage stakeholders to determine the most appropriate strategies to address any identified resource inequities.</p> <p>Illinois' earlier responses support the states focus on effective resource allocation to support closing of opportunity and achievement gaps, including school based expenditure reporting (page 84)</p> <p>Illinois will update a review that was completed in 2014.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Illinois presents an impressive plan to review resource allocations on a regular basis for any LEA serving one more schools identified for CSI or TSI.</p> <p>Review will be conducted every three years.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Reference to Equity Plan on page 108 should be changed from Appendix F to Appendix D</p> <p>LEAs will be on a three year review cycle.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	Illinois' technical assistance is framed around Illinois-EMPOWER, including supporting the school's needs assessment, selection of state-approved vendors and interventions best able to meet those needs, and establishing and monitoring measurable improvement targets. Illinois is also exploring using Illinois-EMPOWER to establish

	<p>partnerships between high-achieving schools and CSI schools to provide coaching and mentoring.</p> <p>Illinois-EMPOWER is centered around 3 drivers for improvement: Governance &amp; management, curriculum and instruction, and culture and climate.</p> <p>This section of the narrative calls for a four year cycle – one to plan and three to implement. Other sections of the narrative indicated that schools could choose a three or four year cycle.</p> <p>The narrative does not discuss what steps will be put into place to close proficiency gaps.</p> <p>Illinois should endeavor to work in partnership with families and community organizations in designing and implementing the interventions, and outline responsibilities for these groups.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Illinois’ technical assistance is framed around Illinois-EMPOWER, including supporting the school’s needs assessment, selection of state-approved vendors and interventions best able to meet those needs, and establishing and monitoring measurable improvement targets.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The audit does not indicate that the community has input in the needs assessment.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (1 peer reviewer)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should describe what steps will be put into place to close proficiency gaps.

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>	Illinois provides page numbers to address this requirement in the Crosswalk, but there is no specific text related to this section in the plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois will report by October 2017 statewide rates, using school level data, on the extent to which students are taught at disproportionate rates.</p> <p>Illinois also notes as part of the Title I district plan, LEAs must describe how they will identify and address any disparities in access to teachers.</p>

---

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

	Illinois provides data on the disproportionate access to teachers in Appendix D – Illinois Equity Plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should submit its report in October 2017 to the U.S. Department of Education.

**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>	<p>Described on pp. 126 &amp; 127. ISBE will review district Title I plans and offer technical assistance when applicable.</p> <p>Illinois notes that each district’s Title I plan must include a process to reduce the overuse of discipline practices and incidences of bullying and harassment. Illinois notes in other sections the use of a school climate and culture survey which could serve to support and promote student health and safety.</p> <p>On page 120, Illinois outlines plans to implement evidence-based behavior health awareness programs, expand access to school-based counseling, and improve outcomes for children living in distressed communities.</p> <p>On page 124-5, Illinois provides specific details on its framing for support of schools and districts.</p> <p>The plan only states that ISBE staff will review district responses, and provide assistance when applicable. The plan does not provide specific types of assistance or strategies the ISBE would suggest to an LEA to reduce</p>

	incidences of bullying, and how that would be different from strategies to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classrooms.
<i>Strengths</i>	District Title I plans must describe their process. Illinois will review and provide TA where necessary and ensure compliance.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The narrative does not indicate a timeline for correction, how often the plans are reviewed and who within ISBE provides assistance.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Illinois should provide the specific types of assistance or strategies the ISBE would suggest to an LEA to reduce incidences of bullying, and how that would be different from strategies to reduce the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classrooms.

**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>	Illinois provides very extensive list of actions and presents a coordinated system, designed to support student transitions from early childhood through high school.  Great narrative on the importance of family engagement. The narrative provides a general description of how the various state program work together to support LEAs to support the PK-12 continuum. The narrative does not describe the specific supports for schools receiving Title I, Part A funding. The narrative does not describe specific strategies to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of dropping out.
<i>Strengths</i>	Identified many areas where families are nurtured and engaged.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Very little in the narrative addressed transitions and how the SEA will work with LEAs
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)

<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should include ways that the SEA will work with LEAs to support transitions of older youth.</p> <p>Illinois should provide the specific supports for schools receiving Title I, Part A funding. The narrative does not describe specific strategies to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of dropping out.</p>
--	---

**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>For whatever reason, Illinois did not include Title III in its crosswalk document. Regardless, Illinois presented information on ELs on pages 34-37 and pages 139-141. Potential ELs are to be administered “an appropriate placement screening assessment within 30 days of enrollment” (p. 34). Illinois does not go into details in its plan about how the statewide entrance and exit procedures were initially established but Illinois is a member of WIDA and participating states work together on these issues. Illinois does make reference to stakeholders on page 140 who are “currently meeting to revise the state’s definition of English language proficiency.”</p> <p>Page 34 notes a uniform procedure is applied to all students in Illinois upon enrollment, including a screening assessment administered within 30 days to those students who have a language other than English documented in the Home Language Survey.</p> <p>In revising the state definition of ELP, Illinois is engaging diverse stakeholders – administrators, teachers, and parents.</p> <p>Illinois did not provide information on consultation with stakeholders for the current entrance and exit procedures, developed in 2013.</p> <p>Narrative clearly defines entrance procedures.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	In revising the state definition of ELP, Illinois is engaging diverse stakeholders – administrators, teachers, and

	parents.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Illinois did not provide information on consultation with stakeholders for the current entrance and exit procedures, developed in 2013.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

**E.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>Illinois’ prior responses suggest a plan to identify EL students as early as possible, beginning with the early childhood setting.</p> <p>Illinois proposes to provide cultural and linguistic strategies for EL students entering middle school, including professional learning for teachers in general education classrooms. Illinois’ targeted focus on EL students who newly enroll in an Illinois school later in their education (middle or secondary school) or persist in EL status through middle and high school is commendable.</p> <p>The SEA direct support to school districts for EL progress seems focused on long-term ELs, who have demonstrated significant lags in academic progress after participating in a Transitional Program for five years. Illinois also suggests a direct focus on instructional learning strategies for secondary students. However, it appears that the state support does not begin until students remain in the program for 5 years. Illinois should consider possible supports or interventions that could be applied earlier to support students before their 5<sup>th</sup> year in the program, including providing professional learning to general education and EL teachers sooner, sharing data trends that may signal students are not on track to exit the program within the requisite number of years, and encourage early school intervention and support.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Illinois proposes to provide cultural and linguistic strategies for EL students entering middle school, including professional learning for teachers in general education classrooms.</p> <p>Assistance is provided to instructors.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The assistance from ISBE appears too late, in that ISBE intervenes to “assist school districts in targeting English learners that have demonstrated significant lags in academic progress although having participated in a Transitional Bilingual Program or ... for five years or longer...</p> <p>It appears that the state support does not begin until students remain in the program for 5 years.</p> <p>There is no mention of working with families or communities.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should include support or interventions for school districts (for the EL students) sooner rather than waiting until five years of significant lags occur.</p>

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

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

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>Illinois does in this section (p.141) describe how it will use student data that crosswalks both ELs and former ELs performance on the ACCESS 2.0 and the PARCC. This should be very helpful for the school districts and students.</p> <p>Illinois proposes to analyze the scores of EL and former EL students on PARCC assessments, monitoring schools that consistently demonstrate a lag in EL progress to ensure native language programs adhere to research-based interventions. Illinois does not describe the steps it will take to ensure research-based interventions are implemented with fidelity or the extent of lagging performance that would trigger state monitoring &amp; intervention.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	

<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Illinois does not describe the steps it will take to ensure research-based interventions are implemented with fidelity or the extent of lagging performance that would trigger state monitoring and intervention.</p> <p>Illinois does not specify the timeline or basis for Monitoring, nor does it discuss if Professional Learning will be offered.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Illinois should describe the steps it will take to ensure research-based interventions are implemented with fidelity or the extent of lagging performance that would trigger state monitoring and intervention.</p>