

STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Louisiana



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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA did not meet the statutory and regulatory requirements for this category. The plan failed to explain strategies to provide ALL students in the State the opportunity to take advanced math courses in middle school. (Pages 33-34)</p> <p>The SEA provides training and guidance to districts around middle school accelerated plans and incorporates incentives in school accountability plans to accelerate students into Algebra I in middle school.</p> <p>The State encourages students to pursue more rigorous mathematics through the use of Middle School Accelerated Plans.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The number of 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra I grew by more than 500 in 2015-2016 from 2014-2015, and by more than 1000 in 2016-2017, as compared with the previous school year. This shows the State's commitment to increase the number of students taking advantage of opportunities for enrollment in advanced math classes.</p> <p>Alignment of incentives across accountability plan and state-level PD initiatives.</p>

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

	Combining STEM progressions as part of the series of advanced math courses to support student acceleration.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>From the explanation on p. 33, it is not clear if all students are provided the opportunity to take advanced math coursework in middle school. The Plan mentions that the State provides training and guidance to districts to accelerate students into Algebra, pilots various STEM programs, and provides incentives to middle schools for accelerating students into Algebra. However, there is no discussion of historically underperforming subgroups. No specific conversation about how to ensure access at the same rate as peers.</p> <p>The table on page 34 shows how many 8th graders were enrolled in Algebra I and Geometry for the past 3 years, without showing percentages or giving us totals for how many 8th graders (total) are in the State.</p> <p>It is unclear what mathematics accelerated students would take in 8th grade. Algebra I and Geometry were both indicated, although that would imply students may take Algebra I below 8th grade and this was not clearly identified. It was not identified if the Geometry students in Grade 8 would take a Geometry EOC assessment. It implied that students in 7th grade could possibly take the Algebra I EOC assessment, and this is not identified as an exception.</p> <p>A more rigorous mathematics assessment for high school was not identified.</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>Additional information about historically underperforming subgroups and data are necessary.</p> <p>Plan should identify MS math pathways with the percent of students currently enrolled in each pathway. Need additional information about how those not currently enrolled or those in underperforming groups will be supported to take higher level MS math.</p> <p>Need additional information about the assessments that will be used in the alternate pathways and specific HS assessments that will be used for accountability for students in each pathway. (e.g. what happens if a student takes Algebra in grade 8, which HS assessment will be used for accountability, etc.).</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>The SEA provides its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population”; identifies Spanish as being the language spoken by greater than 1% of all students statewide; and consults EL advocacy organizations, educators, and the public to determine the languages spoken by distinct populations and the additional supports needed. (Page 34)</p> <p>The SEA describes what native-language assessments are available within the state.</p> <p>While the plan mentions engagement with advocacy groups, it may require additional documentation or discussion about that engagement to fulfill the conditions in the final two bullets above.</p> <p>This State clearly defines how additional languages are identified as being significant among their student population for translated versions of the assessment; it also allows a translator for test administration for the seven most commonly spoken languages within the state.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The State extends its outreach by using sound practices to assist ELLs whose primary languages do not meet the state’s definition. Students may have the tests administered with a translator; standardized directions for all assessments are available in the seven most commonly spoken languages in the State, and a Limited English Proficiency Accommodation Form is available for providing accommodations to students with limited English proficiency in the classroom and on assessments.</p> <p>Standardized directions for the state mathematics assessment are provided in the seven most commonly spoken languages.</p> <p>State seems to already be offering numerous accommodations for LEP students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>No discussion of migratory, those not born in US, or Native American.</p> <p>The State does not describe the criteria for allowing a translator for the top 7 languages. Are these languages significantly more abundant than the other languages in the State?</p> <p>Reviewers agreed the plan met most requirements, but that plan could be strengthened by adding information about Native American, migratory, and those not born in U.S. Data and narrative could be updated to include specific information about <i>all</i> groups in the template.</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.3.ii: Existing Assessments in Languages other than English

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA identifies the math examination being available in Spanish – the only language meeting the State’s definition for languages other than English. The Louisiana Education Assessment Program (LEAP) for grades 3-8 and end-of-course (EOC) tests for high school have the mathematics sessions available in Spanish. (Page 34)
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The response to this section is clear and complete.</p> <p>The schools may also provide a translator for any other languages spoken by students, as needed.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.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>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

- Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State’s plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
- Does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
 - 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
 - 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
 - 3) consult with educators, parents and families of English learners, students, as appropriate, and other stakeholders?
- If applicable, does the SEA’s description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include an explanation of the reasons (*e.g.*, legal barriers) the State has not been able to complete the development of such assessments despite making every effort?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State provides translated exams in Spanish, and the State’s translation policy ensures all students’ language needs are met, even for languages that are not present to a significant extent. There are no other languages that are spoken to a significant extent for which assessments must be developed. (Page 34)</p> <p>The State has translation services for assessments, and works with English Language Development stakeholders to ensure it is serving its population of English learners appropriately. This State describes the many efforts made to ensure the needs of the ELL population are being met to the fullest extent possible.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The State describes how it will continue to monitor a) the frequency with which translators for various languages are used annually, and b) its population makeup. Once population changes are identified, the State will work with its assessment vendors to offer translations of assessments in languages other than Spanish, based on needs.</p> <p>The State is working with advocacy organizations and uses assessment hotlines and emails to ensure the needs of their ELL population are being met.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA lists each major student subgroup included in its accountability system: economically disadvantaged (71%), white (45%), black/African American (43%), students with disabilities (12%), Hispanic/Latino (6%), English Language Learners (3%), homeless students (2.3%), and a State new subgroup: military-affiliated (reporting to begin in 2017-2018). (Page 44)</p> <p>While the major racial and ethnic groups are identified, it is not clear if additional groups are part of the data collection.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The identification is precise, clear, supported by %, and justified.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>No additional sub-groups are mentioned, although other parts of the plan mention “at-risk” identifications are present to some extent in the State.</p> <p>Some racial groups present in the state appear to be missing from the response, even if not “major”. Plan could be strengthened by including “all” racial subgroups present within the state- (e.g. no data about Asian/Pacific Islander or Native American included). Similarly, including information about “at-risk” could strengthen the plan.</p> <p>State should also review narrative on p. 44 regarding the inclusion of ELL students in monitoring status - while allowed in accountability for 2 years, states need to report for 4 years. Comments in narrative were unclear.</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.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>	<p>The SEA describes the new subgroup: military-affiliated students (reporting to begin in 2017-2018).</p> <p>This State identified a change in procedure for identifying students with disabilities who have exited this subgroup. Beginning with 2017-2018, the State will include any student classified as having a disability and any student formerly classified as having a disability (in any of the prior two years) in the overall subgroup.(Page 44)</p> <p>The State will also include students who take advanced math EOC assessments prior to HS.</p> <p>The plan includes a subgroup for homeless families.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>This identification of new subgroups demonstrates the State is aware of changing patterns in its student demographics; is making decisions informed by data available; and is committed to disaggregating data in the most useful way.</p> <p>Updated to better track students with disabilities.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	No “at-risk” or other designations used in State are present in the accountability system, although mentioned elsewhere in the plan.
<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>	N/A
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides the minimum number of students requiring disaggregation of information by subgroup of students (minimum “n” of ten students for reporting subgroups of students). The minimum number of students for each subgroup is the same (10). (Page 45) This State uses the same n-size for reporting as it does for accountability.</p> <p>The n-size presented is small enough to hold the majority of schools accountable for performance within subgroups, and large enough to be statistically valid.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The State provides a thorough explanation for establishing the minimum “n” of ten students for reporting subgroups of students. This has been the practice in the State historically; has been approved per Louisiana’s accountability workbook and Louisiana’s ESEA waiver. Also, the State justifies that an n-size of 10 for subgroup protects the confidentiality of students while including a majority of the students in subgroup accountability.</p> <p>N-size is sufficient to ensure Personal Identification Information (PII) is secure and holds schools uniformly accountable.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Using a value less than 30 for accountability purposes raises potential reliability concerns when designating a school for sanctions. Also, there is only so much money to provide for resources. Lower n-sizes may cause less money to be available for those populations who need it most.</p>

	Plan could be strengthened to provide additional statistical data and clarification regarding reliability of using the n-size.
<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?²

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The use of an n-size of 10 assures that a greater percentage of students are included in accountability. This State identifies that the low n-size for accountability does run the risk of a higher standard of error, but argues that given the requirement of multiple years of low performance before consequences are applied, this risk is sufficiently lowered. (Page 46) The n-size presented is small enough to hold the majority of schools accountable for performance within subgroups, and large enough to be statistically valid. There is sufficient evidence that the n-size presented is statistically sound.
<i>Strengths</i>	The justification for selecting the minimum “n” number of students to form a subgroup is clear and thorough.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	With lower n-size, the State runs the risk of a higher standard of error and misidentifying schools for consequences. Plan could be strengthened by providing additional statistical data and clarification regarding reliability of using the n-size of 10.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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>The SEA described the rationale for determining the minimum number of students.</p> <p>The plan details the process the state underwent to determine a valid minimum n-size.</p> <p>Data was provided showing thoughtful analysis of determination in line with historical practice.</p> <p>The n-size being utilized is consistent with past practice for both accountability and reporting.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>N-size provides for meaningful differentiation while protecting PII.</p> <p>This n-size will not be a change to what schools already expect; concerns about over identification, and how to best address, are unlikely. This n-size has already been a part of the SEA’s accountability model and its communications plan.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA did not describe how the State collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such minimum number.</p> <p>LA relied on historical practices to determine n-size – it was not a collaborative process.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes (# 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>In order to meet the requirement for this indicator, the State must provide information about how the State collaborated with teachers, teachers, principals, and other stakeholders to determine the minimum number.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students: it uses “disclosure avoidance techniques”. This means that all subgroup data related to assessments and academic performance are suppressed. The SEA states that counts representing less</p>

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

	<p>than 10 students are identified by a <10 marking and subsequent cells of disaggregated data are being redacted. The SEA uses “complementary suppression” when the number that has been suppressed can be calculated using other information in the row or column.(Page 46)</p> <p>The State’s n-size provides for meaningful differentiation, while protecting PII.</p> <p>A process for ensuring privacy is identified, along with additional measures - should other information lead to student identifiable data.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The explanation is thorough and sound.</p> <p>Other measures are employed that look beyond just a minimum number of students to ensure privacy.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes, in a quantitative manner, the long term goals for academic achievement measured by grade-level proficiency on yearly statewide reading and math assessments. The Louisiana plan specifies that beginning in 2017-2018, the State’s expectations for students will be updated in alignment with Louisiana’s long-term goals (e.g., “Mastery” = 100 points, 90% graduation rate = 100 points, ACT of 21 = 100 points). The SEA also proposes annual improvement targets between 2018 and 2025 that will represent average improvement of 2.5 percentage points per year in student proficiency in reading and math on State assessments (p. 11)</p> <p>The SEA describes in detail the process used for setting baseline data and long term goals.</p> <p>Both current data and long-term goals are included in the plan.</p> <p>Long term goals for each subgroup are identified, and the supporting explanation appears to be based in research.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The table accompanying the narrative clearly illustrates % of students at ‘basic proficiency’ and ‘mastery’ for 2016, as well as the long term goal (2025), both for reading and math.</p> <p>Long term goals seem reasonable and ambitious.</p> <p>Thoughtful data analysis regarding current achievement and long-term goals that express expectations for all students to learn at the same rate.</p> <p>Research regarding performance in other states, as well as the most successful states, were used to set goals.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Annual improvement targets between 2018-2025 appear to be linear (2.5 points per year), but linear growth is not a realistic expectation). This could yield a higher than expected number of schools labeled “failing”, which will result in lower public investment in ratings and/or too few dollars going to most at-risk schools.</p> <p>Reviewers commented that linear growth, especially in historically</p>

	<p>underperforming groups, may be unrealistic and encourage state to monitor interim progress measures over the early years to evaluate what, if any, targets may need to be revised.</p> <p>Goals could be more rigorous- ELA is less than 70% and Math is less than 60% by 2025.</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.a.2: Measurements of interim progress

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes the measurements of interim progress for the ELL sub-category. Because the State recently finalized its English language proficiency standards, and because the aligned exam will be administered for the first time in 2017-2018, the SEA will begin reporting on the percentage of students making progress towards English language proficiency using the new standards beginning in 2018-2019. The SEA is also establishing a long-term goal of 63 percent of English learners demonstrating progress, a two percentage point average annual increase (p 19). The SEA describes (pg. 96) the measurements for migrant students. On page 117, the SEA included the measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency consistent with the long-term goals described in Section 1 for all students and separately for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The plan appears to contain interim progress measures for most, but not all accountability measures.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The explanation was clear and comprehensive for ELLs and migrant students.</p> <p>Inclusion of thoughtful analysis for EL progress.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The information on measurements of interim progress is not all in one place in the document.</p> <p>Little discussion of interim goals for mastery at subgroups in narrative - need to search appendix for data.</p> <p>Reviewers commented that linear growth, especially in historically underperforming groups, may be unrealistic and encourage state to monitor interim progress measures over the early years to evaluate what, if any, targets may need to be</p>

	revised. Also, reviewers commented that the MIP for math and ELA do not appear to be matched to Graduation goals and MIP. Additionally, plan should note where to find information in the plan to meet the requirement as the plan does not include all relevant information at the provided page numbers.
<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>	<p>The SEA describes its efforts to increase academic achievement in 2010 by adopting a plan to phase in more rigorous academic content standards and high-quality aligned assessments. In 2012, the state legislature mandated that, beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, standards-based assessments implemented by the State in English language arts and mathematics shall be based on nationally recognized content standards. In 2013, the SEA increased its expectations for teaching and learning again, setting a 10-year goal of Level 4 (“Mastery”) as the new standard for what it takes to be an “A” rated public school in Louisiana by 2025. The State began publicly reporting student achievement not only in terms of “Basic and above,” but also “Mastery and above.” In 2016-2017, the SEA adopted the new Louisiana State Standards, and the state made the corresponding adjustments to the LEAP to ensure full alignment and continued high quality. Pp. 8-9.</p> <p>The SEA shows the expectations for improvement for sub-groups of students traditionally behind in the table on page 11.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The expectations are ambitious and feasible.</p> <p>Plan holds schools accountable for performance and growth in historically measured subgroups and provides data for current performance and long-term goals. The plan also provides information about state-level efforts to increase rigor.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>There is little discussion about how historically underperforming subgroups will be supported to attain rate of growth necessary to meet long-term goals. Also, little conversation about interim goals that will be monitored to ensure appropriate intervention if schools/subgroups are not making adequate gains at only the subgroup level.</p> <p>Reviewers commented that linear growth, especially in historically underperforming</p>

	<p>groups, may be unrealistic and encourage the State to monitor interim progress measures over the early years to evaluate what, if any, targets may need to be revised.</p> <p>Reviewers commented that the MIP for math and ELA do not appear to be matched to Graduation goals and MIP. Additionally, plan should note where to find information in the plan to meet the requirement as the plan does not include all relevant information at the provided page numbers.</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: Graduation Rate (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(A)(i)(I)(bb))

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes the long term goals for the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students (90% by 2025 for all sub-groups); the table on page 13 includes the baseline data (2014-2015) for each subgroup; the timeline is the same for all students (2025) and the goals are ambitious (national average 83% v. SEA’s goal of 90%) P. 12-13</p> <p>Graduation rate goals were set based on the state’s current graduation rates for each student subgroup. Long term goals of 90% graduation rate are identified for each cohort of students.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Goals are clear, well stated, and ambitious.</p> <p>Integration of career standards.</p> <p>Extensive collaboration with stakeholders were a part of the process for setting the goals and providing supports.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Goals for some sub groups require extreme growth without details on support to get to goal.</p> <p>Reviewers commented that long-term goals, while based in data provided, did not</p>

	necessarily align with data provided regarding current Math and ELA performance (e.g. rigor of grad rate 90% does not align with only 60% proficient at ELA/math). Reviewers recognize that there isn't a requirement for alignment, but thought more explanation of how these align would strengthen the plan.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (# 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>	Not applicable. Louisiana does not include an extended year cohort graduation rate in its accountability system and long-term goals.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

adjusted cohort graduation rate and any extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for each subgroup of students?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes on page 117 the measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency consistent with the long-term goals described in Section 1 for all students and separately for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The SEA provides measurements of interim progress toward long-term goals for the four-year adjusted graduation rate for all students and each student subgroup (e.g. military).</p> <p>While goals are ambitious, there is little discussion about how underperforming subgroups will be monitored for progress and interventions to ensure all students meet goals.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The information on measurements of interim progress is not all in one place in the document.</p> <p>Data is in appendix and narrative does not sufficiently address how interim measures were set or how subgroups will obtain rates of growth.</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.4: Improvement necessary to close statewide graduation rate gaps

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA shows the expectations for improvement for sub-groups of students traditionally behind in the table on page 11.</p> <p>Goals are common, but there is little information about how underperforming groups will catch up at rates necessary to meet long-term goals.</p> <p>Information about measurements of interim progress were not identified.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Much more support will be necessary to move underperforming groups to 2025 goal.
<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>	The plan provides a rigorous goal in place for all students. However, 2 reviewers did not feel the State provided sufficient details to demonstrate how the plan addresses the significant progress necessary for closing the graduation rate gaps amongst subgroups.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA does 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. The plan also includes a timeline (7 years, adjusted by baseline) for English Learners to achieve English Language proficiency.</p> <p>The state has changed assessments and will update annual targets as needed after data is available from the first year of assessment.</p> <p>A student centered approach is used to determine goals for language proficiency.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Very detailed data provided to support the state’s plan for accelerating language acquisition for English Learners</p> <p>Information in plan is based on solid research and historical data (e.g. research re: 7 years to reach prof.)</p> <p>Approach is student centered allowing for additional time based on age of student entering the program.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Information in plan is likely to change with new assessment.</p> <p>The length of time allotted for language acquisition seems longer than identified elsewhere.</p> <p>Given the change in assessment, reviewers felt it may be necessary for the State to revisit data and targets when more information is available. Reviewers also discussed that growth, particularly for ELL students, is not linear and state may want to consider this when further examining goals and evaluating measures of interim</p>

	progress.
<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.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>Because the SEA recently finalized its English language proficiency standards, and because the aligned exam will be administered for the first time in 2017-2018, Louisiana will begin reporting on the percentage of students making progress towards English language proficiency using the new standards beginning in 2018-2019. The SEA stipulates that it will measure school success with English language learners in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progress towards English language proficiency, as measured by the LEAP ELP Connect, will be included in the school accountability formula. 2. School performance on the English language proficiency indicator and English learner subgroup results on all other school performance indicators will be publicly reported on school report cards, and used as one of the subgroups leading to potential school identification (i.e. targeted schools or Urgent Intervention Required). <p>The SEA provides measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency.</p> <p>Chart includes interim progress expected based on historical data. May need updated after current year admin of new assessment.</p> <p>Interim goals based on trends identified in other states.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Louisiana is establishing a long-term goal of 63 percent of English learners demonstrating progress, a two percentage point average annual increase. This goal is ambitious but necessary in a state that has seen a nearly 80 percent increase in the number and proportion of students who are English learners over the last eight years.</p> <p>Long-term and interim goals in this area are ambitious, but attainable.</p> <p>A lot of information about student level growth, little discussion about school/state level proficiency target development.</p> <p>Research based goals.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	No information about interventions or how dual-identified students may need

	<p>assistance to meet growth demands in later years.</p> <p>Not confident a goal of 2% increase per year is rigorous enough.</p> <p>The narrative and table on p. 19 do not match. Reviewers commented that the table should be updated to correct 67% at 2022 Interim. Based on narrative of 2% growth, the reviewers assumed a typo in the table. State should clarify this is a typo as understood by reviewers. Also, state should continue to discuss and evaluate measures once new assessment data is available, as discussed in the narrative.</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.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 SEA describes the Academic Achievement indicator used in its statewide accountability system. The SEA uses the same indicator for all schools in all of its schools across the State: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Index, high school end-of- course (EOC) Index, and ACT/WorkKeys Index (Pages 36-37)).The calculation is consistent for all schools; it includes a measure of student growth (Page 37): This indicator captures student growth on ELA and math grade 3-10

	<p>state assessments as measured by growth towards proficiency OR student growth percentile using the state’s value-added model; the indicator is reliable and valid, and is based on the State’s long term goals. The indicator can be disaggregated by the State’s major student subgroups: economically disadvantaged (71%); white (45%); African American (43%); students with disabilities (12%); Hispanic/Latino (6%); English learners (3%); homeless (2.3%), and military-affiliated.</p> <p>The plan outlines the process by which Academic Achievement indicators were determined and how they are calculated.</p> <p>Plan presents a statewide system that uses the same indicators for all schools in all LEAs across the state- the only exception being the school quality measures at ES/MS v. HS. The table at pages 36-40 is a helpful tool in understanding each measure.</p> <p>The Academic Achievement includes assessments in Grades 3-8 and ACT/WorkKeys, with growth calculated using a VAM in grades 3-10.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA Performance Framework is very rigorous, ambitious, comprehensive, and achievable.</p> <p>Very detailed descriptions.</p> <p>Ability to get growth in the high school level.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Too few details about Strength of Diploma indicator- too many variables with little information about weights, etc</p> <p>The weighting of the academic achievement indicator was not identified, nor was how the 95% participation requirement was factored into the model.</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>Based on information provided, reviewers were unable to determine if the system measures the performance of at least 95% of students in each subgroup. State should explain better the rationale for system used and logic for using the 3 year aggregate (p. 58). More information also needed for how SEA will ensure participation rates are met other than applying a zero for any non-participant (foot note at p. 48),</p> <p>The plan does not specify a single academic indicator based only on statutory requirements found in section 1111(c)(4)(B)(i)(I) & (II). State needs to show how the single academic indicator is based only on long term goals and performance on math/ELA assessments. The state will also need to update weighting to show how other indicators included in the plan will be used, if they are used, and how moving the indicators to other portions of the plan will impact overall ratings.</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>	<p>Reviewers commented that it was difficult to complete review due to organization of plan and clarity of weighting for each proposed indicator.</p> <p>Growth Index (academic progress) is measured for all schools.</p> <p>Student Growth Percentiles along with a Growth Index used for assigning points is based on growth to proficiency.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Very comprehensive and detailed description.</p> <p>This measure captures all student growth & measures progress towards mastery and student performance against a comparison group.</p> <p>Innovative use of Dropout Credit Accumulation Index.</p> <p>More points awarded for meeting targets to gain mastery by 8th grade.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>A variety of business rules that must be developed could impact the rigor of the non-academic indicators as described.</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>Reviewers felt that many of the indicators included (but not allowed) above under Academic Achievement could be re-assigned to “other” indicators and weights adjusted accordingly. Similar to the notes above, as the State revisits weighting of each indicator (see p. 55), it should clarify the precise weighting for each indicator found in the tables at p. 36-40. Clarity or redefinition is also necessary for those considered Academic Indicator, Other Academic Indicators, and Success indicators.</p> <p>Reviewers also commented that the calculation for growth indicators was imprecise in its inclusion of language at p. 37 noting that it captures “growth on ELA and math grades 3-10.” Further clarity is necessary in the table at p. 37 and in more detail at 41-42 regarding how growth will be calculated at different grade levels and HS.</p>

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The plan outlines the formula used to calculate graduation rate (4-year cohort)</p> <p>The SEA describes the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State. The cohort graduation rate index measures the percentage of the cohort graduating in four years, per federal rule and consistent across all schools. It is included as 25 percent of the score for high schools. The points awarded based on cohort graduation rates are such that schools must be on track to the SEA’s long-term goal in order to earn an “A”. The cohort graduation rate index can be disaggregated by subgroup. Page 52</p> <p>Graduation rate calculation includes additional points for students receiving more rigorous diplomas as well as an option for students with the most significant disabilities.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Very comprehensive and rigorous system.</p> <p>Graduation rate calculation includes additional points for students receiving more rigorous diplomas.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Reviewers expressed concern about ambitious goals for subgroup achievement.</p> <p>Information regarding how to calculate for very small schools was not included.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (1 peer reviewer)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (3 peer reviewers)</p>
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i>	<p>Peer reviewers commented that additional details about the weighting included in table at p. 52 were necessary for the panel to determine if the description met requirements. Specifically, how does the weighting impact the reporting and</p>

<i>SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	validity of the ACGR- does the weighting artificially increase or decrease value of the rate? Additionally, use of 1.1 weighting starting at 76% does not appear to align with long term goals of reaching 90% by 2025.
--	---

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>The SEA explains in detail the English Language Proficiency Indicator. This indicator awards points for all English learners making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency as defined by meeting exit criteria and/or meeting or exceeding annual targets based on a student’s baseline proficiency level. This indicator will be included in the assessment index of every school beginning in 2018- 2019 after implementation of the State’s new ELP assessment in 2017-2018. The progress to English language proficiency indicator used by the SEA allows for objective, valid, reliable, and comparable results across LEAs in the state.</p> <p>Switch to new assessment in 17-18 may cause State to revisit some targets, but plan sufficiently addresses this issue.</p> <p>This state uses a state developed assessment for determining English Language Proficiency and allows for tracking growth towards language acquisition.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Convincing and comprehensive description of indicator.</p> <p>Well detailed outline of development and expected targets to proficiency.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	ELP indicator not separated from Assessment Index.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The narrative and explanation of the indicator do not fully meet the requirement because the ELP indicator is included within the “Assessment Index” and the weighting is not provided for ELP as a stand-alone indicator p.49. Therefore, the reviewers could not determine the validity of the element.

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

Note: Peer reviewers must separately review each School Quality or Student Success indicator that an SEA submits. For example, if an SEA submits one School Quality or Student Success indicator for high schools and a different School Quality or Student Success indicator for elementary and middle schools, then peer reviewers will provide feedback, using the criteria below, separately for each indicator. For any School Quality or Student Success indicator that does not apply to all grade spans, the SEA’s description must include the grade spans to which it does apply. (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B)(v))

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes 3 School Quality/ indicators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The School Quality or Student Success for all grade levels – uses an Interests and Opportunities indicator. This indicator will weight five percent of each school’s score. This specific measurement has not yet been defined; it will be fully developed by the 2019-2020 school year, based on stakeholder input. This School Quality indicator can be measured consistently across all schools and allows for disaggregation by subgroup. Page 54 2. The School Quality or Student Success for middle schools – uses the Dropout Credit Accumulation Index. This indicator measures credit accumulation through the end of 9th grade year, used to measure 8th grade schools. This School Quality indicator can be measured consistently across all schools and allows for disaggregation by subgroup. Page 39 3. The School Quality or Student Success for high schools – uses the Strength of Diploma as indicator. This indicator awards points based on the attainment of a high school diploma as well as post-secondary credit or credentials (i.e., more credits = higher points). It awards points for graduates who earn associate's degrees, passed AP/IB/CLEP exams, earned credit in AP/IB/dual enrollment courses, earned industry credentials, graduated in 5 or 6 years, and completed a HiSET equivalency diploma. This School Quality indicator can be measured consistently across all schools and allows for disaggregation by subgroup. Pages 39-40 <p>The plan describes an Interests and Opportunities measure to incentivize improvement on other measures of school health. A workgroup will determine how this will be measured and set 2025 goals.</p>

	<p>Each indicator has a strong correlation to school quality and student success.</p> <p>Elementary School Quality and Student Success indicator currently does not exist, only a timeline for development.</p> <p>Middle School “School Quality or Student Success” indicator that looks at student performance at the end of Grade 9 as an indication of appropriate student preparation in MS is a strength.</p> <p>Gr 9-12 School Quality or Student Success indicator focuses on quality graduates.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Comprehensive, rigorous, very strong</p> <p>Dropout Accumulation Index seems particularly well thought out and innovative.</p> <p>Research based approach for getting to successful preparation of students.</p> <p>Schools earn more points for students earning higher quality diplomas</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The Interest and Opportunities indicator seems promising, but is short on details.</p> <p>Only looks at students in Grade 9, which ignores other indicators of potential success.</p> <p>Could be biased against schools with greater numbers of economically challenged students.</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>The plan did not define what the state will use for the Interest and Opportunity measure. P. 54. However, reviewers felt that there were sufficient details regarding Strength of Diploma and Dropout Credit Accumulation Index.</p> <p>Because there was insufficient data and information about the Interest and Opportunity measure at elementary grades, the reviewers were unable to determine if the plan met requirements. The State must provide details about the measure to fully meet the requirements for school quality/success at elementary grades. Specifically, the plan must show how the measure meaningfully differentiates school performance and the overall validity and reliability of the measure.</p>

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes its system of meaningfully differentiating, on an annual basis, all public schools in the State. The State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation is based on all indicators in the State’s accountability system. The SEA’s framework explains three critical shifts in the design of the accountability system:</p> <p>a). Ensuring an “A” in the State’s letter grade system means mastery of fundamental skills.</p> <p>b). Adjusting school rating calculations to value more the progress of every individual child, including (a) measuring whether students are on a path to master fundamental skills; and (b) measuring how effectively students are advancing relative to their peers. This growth index will replace the current progress point system.</p> <p>c). Adding an Interests and Opportunities measure the extent to which each school is supporting a well-rounded education (five percent of score). Page 47</p> <p>In addition, the state will continue to weight English language arts and math assessments twice, and weighting science and social students once in grades 3-8 for all students. The Assessment Index comprises 70 percent of elementary school scores, 65 percent of middle school scores, and 12.5 percent of high school scores. The Assessment Index awards points a graduated scale of points, beginning at level 3 (Basic), such that an “A” school is one that is on track to meet Louisiana’s long-term goal of students scoring level 4 (“Mastery” or above).</p> <p>The State’s system of annual meaningful differentiation includes the performance of all students and each subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the SEA’s accountability system.</p> <p>The state has a plan to meaningfully differentiate all public schools using an “A-F” annual rating. This A-F system incorporates each weighted indicator. Additionally, the rating system takes subgroup performance into account by not allowing any school to obtain an “A” if any subgroup is performing at the “F” level.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Each indicator is supported by a comprehensive and sound description.</p> <p>There is a shift in this plan to ensure that a high score denotes mastery, all student progress is accounted for, and the existence of a non-academic measure.</p> <p>Attention to subgroup performance in schools that may otherwise be identified at high-performing.</p> <p>An A-F system is used that incorporates each weighted indicator</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Distribution curve is heavily weighted at the level of A/B and F. See tables at p 55-56.</p> <p>It is not clear how all of the different pieces come together.</p> <p>The description of the A-F system that is applicable to all schools is a strong point in the plan. However, reviewers commented that the plan could be strengthened by adding details regarding modeling or other data discussing how the proposal would meaningfully differentiate amongst schools.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers)

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

A.4.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 SEA describes the weighting of each indicator in its system of annual meaningful differentiation. The state will continue to weight English language arts and math assessments twice, and weighting science and social students once in grades 3-8 for all students.</p> <p>For Elementary Schools, the Assessment Index (including the Progress to English Proficiency) is 70%; the Growth Index 25%; and the Interests and Opportunities 5%</p> <p>For Middle Schools, the Assessment Index (including the Progress to English Proficiency) is 65%; the Growth Index 25%; the Interests and Opportunities 5%; and the Dropout Credit Accumulation Index 5%</p> <p>For High Schools, the Assessment Index (including the EOC Status and Growth and Progress to English Proficiency) is 25%; the ACT/WorkKeys 25%; the Strength of Diploma 25%; the Cohort Graduation Rate 25%; and the Interest and Opportunities Index 5% (Page 55)</p> <p>The interests and opportunities measure will not be included within annual results until 2019-2020.</p> <p>Until the interest and opportunities measure is added, the assessment index will be worth 75 percent for elementary schools, and 70 percent for schools with an eighth grade.</p> <p>Weighting appears in charts on p. 55, but specific weights for ELP are not clear.</p> <p>Detail regarding the inclusion of each indicator is provided.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Academic Achievement, Other Academic, Graduation Rate, and Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency indicators receive, in the aggregate, much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success indicator(s), in the aggregate</p> <p>Detailed descriptions</p>

<i>Weaknesses</i>	Heavy weights on assessments at all grade levels. The weight of English Language Proficiency is not separately broken out, but is a part of the aggregate for the overall achievement score.
<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>	Plan addresses weighting at p. 55, but as noted several times above, the weighting for ELP is not clear. Additionally, given required changes noted above, weighting of final plan is unclear. State should update the graphic on p. 55 with final weighting.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A
<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.vi: Identification of Schools (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D), 1111(d)(2)(C)-(D))

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA classifies Title I schools rated “D” or “F” in the state accountability system for three consecutive years or with an adjusted cohort graduation rate less than 67% in the most recent year as “comprehensive support” schools, requiring comprehensive intervention. This identification will begin in 2017-2018. (Page 57) In addition, schools demonstrating subgroup performance (for N=10 or higher) for that subgroup population, equivalent to what would be a “D” or “F” rating for an entire school population, is identified as “Urgent Intervention Needed”. Schools having subgroup performance at the equivalent of an “F” rating for two consecutive years are identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Required”. These schools are eligible for school improvement (targeted) funds and required to submit a plan outlining improvement outcomes for the struggling subgroup(s) of students.</p> <p>Schools showing persistent excessive out of school discipline (twice the national average) are considered for identification as targeted support and improvement. Schools that do not exit targeted support for a period of three years are identified as requiring Comprehensive Intervention.</p> <p>The SEA’s plan includes the year in which it will first identify these schools for comprehensive support and improvement. This timeline complies with the Department’s guidance. (Pages 56-58)</p> <p>Benchmarks become more rigorous from 2017 through 2025. Schools and districts have an idea of where they are headed, which will bring some clarity to long term planning and goal setting.</p> <p>The plan fully discusses how the state will identify at least the lowest-performing 5 percent of schools starting at p. 60. The plan identifies a process for ID of both schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement as well as targeted support and improvement.</p> <p>This state will identify all schools receiving a D or an F as needing Comprehensive Intervention</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The identification of, and support given to schools demonstrating subgroup performance – although no interventions are legally required in the district’s consolidated plan, this system allows for both public and in-school awareness of needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Use of subgroup data to identify schools for targeted supports regardless of legal bearing on the LEA’s consolidated plan- plus for transparency.</p> <p>The plan is projecting to flag more than 3 times the minimum 5% of schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Identification of up to 17 percent of schools may dilute message (p. 60). Unclear research backing for use of discipline data in determinations for interventions (p. 62).</p> <p>Additional clarity needed - does the total # of Title schools with a grade of “D” or “F” cover at least the lowest 5% of Title schools? Nothing in the plan guarantees</p>

	flagging lowest 5% should the schools excel and all score A-C, plan should clarify that at least the lowest 5% will be identified regardless of A-F rating.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes its method for identifying high schools failing to graduate at least 1/3rd of their students. The cohort graduation rate index measures the percentage of the cohort graduating in four years, per federal rule and consistent across all schools. It is included as 25 percent of the score for high schools. The points awarded based on cohort graduation rates are such that schools must be on track to the State’s long-term goal in order to earn an “A”. The cohort graduation rate index is disaggregated by subgroup. Students with disabilities pursuing a diploma are included into the accountability system based on the same criteria and with the same weights as their non-disabled peers. Students assessed using the LEAP Alternate Assessment, Level 1 are included in the graduation index for the year in which they graduated or the year in which they exited, whichever is first. The SEA describes how any Title I school with an adjusted cohort graduation rate less than 67% in the most recent year will be classified as requiring Comprehensive Intervention, making it a comprehensive support school in a given year.</p> <p>Schools will be added to the list on an annual basis. They will first be identified in 2017-2018. Schools that do not exit the Urgent Intervention Required category for a period of three years will be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention. Based on 2014, 2015, and 2016 school accountability results and draft simulations of the 2018 accountability model, an estimated 17% of schools could be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention. (Page 60)</p> <p>Process for identification using graduation rate data is outlined at p. 60</p> <p>This state’s methodology meets all of the identified criteria.</p>

<i>Strengths</i>	Appropriate and rigorous methodology.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Information regarding out of cohort graduates was not found.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The State plan describes the methodology that would be used to add schools to the Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools list on an annual basis. Schools will first be identified as Urgent Intervention Required for the 2018-2019 school year. Schools that do not exit this identification status for a period of three years will be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention. Consequences attached to subgroup performance require two or more years of low performance, which prevents over-identification or under-identification of subgroups.</p> <p>Schools with low-performing subgroups of students will be identified annually using the methodology described for “consistently underperforming” subgroups. (Pages 61-62)</p> <p>LA will start identifying schools in the 2017-2018 school year.</p> <p>The state outlines the process at page 61 and the state modelling suggests that a sufficient number of schools would be identified using the methodology.</p>
<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</i>	

<i>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>The SEA includes the frequency with which the State will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification. The SEA’s timeline results in identification of these schools at least once every three years.</p> <p>The State plan describes the methodology that would be used to add schools to the Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools list on an annual basis. Schools will first be identified as Urgent Intervention Required for the 2018-2019 school year. Schools that do not exit this identification status for a period of three years will be identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention. Consequences attached to subgroup performance require two or more years of low performance, which prevents over-identification or under-identification of subgroups.</p> <p>Schools with low-performing subgroups of students will be identified annually using the methodology described for “consistently underperforming” subgroups. (Pages 61-62)</p> <p>Schools will be identified on an annual basis, but will result in Comprehensive if not exited after 3 years.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Thorough and convincing explanation.</p> <p>Annual evaluations with continuous monitoring of those on the list.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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 SEA describes its methodology to identify consistently underperforming schools and subgroups. All schools having subgroup performance (those with subgroup N=10 or higher) at the equivalent of a “D” or “F” rating will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Needed”. All schools having subgroup performance at the equivalent of an “F” rating for two consecutive years will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Required”. These schools will be eligible for school improvement (targeted) funds, through a competitive process, and will be required to submit a plan outlining how it intends to improve outcomes for the struggling subgroup(s) of students.</p> <p>Based on 2015 and 2016 school accountability results and draft simulations of the 2018 school accountability model, 7% to 43% of schools meeting the minimum N size of 10 would be identified as needing Targeted Support and Improvement. (Page 61). This methodology is based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p> <p>LA defines ‘consistently underperforming’ as a school with a subgroup that earns the equivalent of an “F” rating for two years in a row. Schools will be identified as needing comprehensive support after 3 years of poor performance.</p> <p>The state has a plan for identifying schools with consistently underperforming subgroups. The accountability system also does not allow for schools with consistently underperforming subgroups to score in the A category- increasing public accountability.</p> <p>Subgroup performance will only be evaluated for D and F schools.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Comprehensive explanation.</p> <p>Additional flags are part of the plan that have schools identified as “urgent intervention needed” schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Does not appear to look at subgroup information for all indicators, only for those with a D or an F in the overall grade.</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.vi.f: Targeted Support and Improvement Schools—Additional Targeted Support

- Does the SEA describe its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students, on its own, would lead to identification under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the

State’s methodology under ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(D) (*i.e.*, the methodology described above in A.4.vi.a), including: 1) whether the methodology identifies these schools from among all public schools in the State or from among only the schools identified as schools with one or more consistently underperforming subgroups and 2) if applicable, how the SEA averages data (*e.g.*, does the State use a uniform averaging procedure across all schools)?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes its methodology to identify consistently underperforming schools and subgroups. All schools having subgroup performance (those with subgroup N=10 or higher) at the equivalent of a “D” or “F” rating will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Needed”. All schools having subgroup performance at the equivalent of an “F” rating for two consecutive years will be identified and reported as “Urgent Intervention Required”. These schools will be eligible for school improvement (targeted) funds, through a competitive process, and will be required to submit a plan outlining how it intends to improve outcomes for the struggling subgroup(s) of students.</p> <p>Based on 2015 and 2016 school accountability results and draft simulations of the 2018 school accountability model, 7% to 43% of schools meeting the minimum N size of 10 would be identified as needing Targeted Support and Improvement. (Page 61). This methodology is based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p> <p>Information about the methodology for identifying targeted assistance schools begins at p. 61. While the number of potential schools identified is high, the methodology is sound.</p> <p>The state identifies that this will occur on an annual basis starting in 2018-19. It also includes additional flags for identifying schools such that additional resources are provided as quickly as possible.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Comprehensive explanation.</p> <p>Commitment to urgent intervention due to subgroup performance.</p> <p>Additional flags for identifying schools and using projection data to get an idea of how many schools may be flagged.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Potential number of schools identified may weaken public message about performance.</p> <p>Start date is 2018-19, with projection data it appears clear this state could start in 2017-18</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</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	A category of “urgent intervention needed” is included in the plan in order to more quickly identify struggling schools
<i>Strengths</i>	Will allow for resources to more quickly be provided.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Plan mentions, but provides few details about the relationship of the “urgent intervention” category to the comprehensive and targeted support categories. Again, a table or graphic explaining the different levels of interventions and how schools move through each level would be a helpful addition to 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.vii: Annual Measure of Achievement (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(iii))

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes how it maintains student enrollment in a statewide student information system. All students who are enrolled in grades 3-8 by the first week of testing are required to participate in testing. For high school, all students who complete a class for which there is an end-of-course (EOC) test must take that EOC test. All high school students must take the English II (shifted to the English I test for students entering high school in 2017-2018) and Algebra I tests by the third year of high school enrollment. For the calculation of the school and district performance scores, when students who are required to participate in state testing fail to do so, the school receives scores of 0 on the status and growth indices. The 0 is factored into the calculation of the school performance score.

	<p>This State does not use averaging to calculate or report subgroup performance. Averaging is only used in the calculation of the participation rate. To determine if a subgroup meets the 95 percent participation rate test, the SEA calculates the participation rate of students within the subgroup during the current year, during the current and previous year (a two-year aggregate), and during the current year and two previous years (a three-year aggregate). The highest of the three rates is used to determine if the subgroup has met the participation criteria.</p> <p>The SEA states that a student that does not participate in testing will receive a score of zero that will be factored into the school's annual score on the corresponding indices. There is no mention of what happens to a school overall if participation falls below 95 percent.</p> <p>The state discusses participation expectations at p. 58. Here the state explains that all students enrolled in grades 3-8 are required to test. Also, those that "complete" in a class with a EOC assessment must be assessed. (Note: the Plan indicates requirement is for those that "complete" a class. State may want to review and change to students "enrolled" in class.) The state also has procedures for measuring participation rate at the subgroup level at p 58.</p> <p>The state attempts to identify which students are required to participate and the impact of their non-participation will have on the performance indicator.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The school assumes 100% participation and students who do not participate are counted as a 0 for both growth and performance.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Pairing of schools explained at p. 59 needs additional explanation in the plan. Seems like it could create an unfair outcome for some schools.</p> <p>Subgroups are not expressly identified, however, the method used should still address each of the subgroups.</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>	Based on information provided, reviewers were unable to determine if the system measures the performance of at least 95% of students in each subgroup. State should better explain rationale for system used and logic for using 3 year aggregate (p. 58). More information also needed for how SEA will ensure participation rates are met other than applying a zero for any non-participant (foot note at p. 48).

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>The SEA describes that its uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support is done by schools having to achieve a C-rating for two consecutive years. To exit the Urgent Intervention Required category, schools must not have any subgroup scores that are performing at the equivalent of an “F” rating and must have an out-of-school suspension rate above the relevant standard for identification as needing Targeted Support and Improvement for two consecutive years. (Page 62)</p> <p>A school will have to achieve a C-rating for two consecutive years to be exited from comprehensive support and improvement.</p> <p>The state has clear exit criteria at p. 61 that meet or exceed the standards in law.</p> <p>The criteria are aligned with the long-term goals, but pertain to the new category of “urgent intervention required”. If a school doesn’t exit this category after 3 years, they move to Comprehensive, but it does not identify how many years are required for exiting Comprehensive.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The 2 consecutive year bar will help ensure school level improvements are sustainable prior to exiting comprehensive support.</p> <p>Use of Urgent Intervention Required for earlier identification. Also, requirement of 2 years in poor category along with 2 years out allows for fewer misidentified schools.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Lack of clarification on length of time in Comprehensive.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The plan did not provide sufficient details about each category (Comprehensive, Targeted (Urgent) and those eligible for more Rigorous Intervention). It should be clear exactly how many years a school/LEA may be in Comprehensive Support before being identified for more Rigorous Intervention. Also, additional clarity is needed for the relationship and differences of Targeted and Urgent classifications and how one exits from each category. A flow chart would be very helpful to understand the different categories and how a school/LEA moves between them.</p> <p>Additionally, peer reviewers discussed the correlation of different parts of the plan and the fact that use of a low n-size for identification and identification on subgroup participation alone may cause over identification and languishing in tiers of intervention. Thought should be given to how schools enter the status, what resources they expend to manage that status/relationship with SEA monitoring, how to exit the status while still improving.</p>

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

- Does the SEA describe its statewide exit criteria for schools receiving additional targeted support under ESEA section 1111(d)(2)(C), which may include how the exit criteria align with the State’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress and the requirement that the goals and measurements of interim progress take into account the improvement necessary to close statewide proficiency and graduation rate gaps?
- Does the SEA’s description include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet such criteria?
- Do the exit criteria ensure continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State (e.g., do the exit criteria improve student outcomes for the subgroup or subgroups that led to the school’s identification and ensure that a school that exits no longer meets the criteria under which the school was identified)?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA explains that the exit criteria for the schools receiving additional targeted support is to not have any subgroup scores that are performing at the equivalent of an “F” rating. These schools must have an out-of-school suspension rate above the relevant standard for identification as needing Targeted Support and Improvement for two consecutive years. This exit criteria ensures continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success. (Page 62) This state uses a different category of “Urgent Intervention Required” and schools must exit this within 3 years.
<i>Strengths</i>	Getting flagged for this designation requires not only attaining an F in a subgroup, but also excessive out of school discipline. For a school to be removed the school must meet all necessary criteria for subgroup and suspension rates for 2 consecutive years.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The plan did not provide sufficient details about each category (Comprehensive, Targeted (Urgent) and those eligible for more Rigorous Intervention). It must be clear exactly how many years a school/LEA may be in Comprehensive Support before being identified for more Rigorous Intervention. Also, additional clarity is needed for the relationship and differences of Targeted and Urgent classifications and how one exits from each category. A flow chart would be very helpful to understand the different categories and how a school/LEA moves between them.

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>The SEA states that a school that is F-rated (“academically unacceptable”) for four consecutive years is eligible for placement in the state’s Recovery School District (RSD). This allows the LDE and BESE to enact a diverse set of strategies for radical school improvement in the schools where conventional improvement strategies have not generated needed gains.</p> <p>The State then gives examples from various school districts related to the radical school improvements or reorganization of historically struggling traditional schools.</p> <p>This state will place schools who have not exited Comprehensive after 4 years in their Recovery School District (RSD) “which allows the policy making bodies to enact a diverse set of strategies for radical school improvement”. Examples include turning the school into a charter school.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Examples of strategies for various school districts are relevant.</p> <p>The initial interventions listed (comprehensive needs assessment, advising on system-wide resource allocation, identifying effective support partners, and improvement planning) are responsive to individual school needs.</p> <p>A comprehensive support school that does not show progress over 4 years is eligible for membership in LA’s Recovery School District – a program that has shown success in school turnaround efforts</p> <p>Use of aggressive intervention after short period of underperformance.</p> <p>Much flexibility on research based radical intervention if necessary.</p>
<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>Rigorous interventions presented are researched based and plan provides sufficient details. However, reviewers noted that schools can be put in comprehensive status with a D or F, but are only put into Rigorous Intervention with a grade of F for 4 or more years. State should provide details on what happens to school (those at both D and F) after a number of years in Comprehensive status.</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>The SEA describes how it will review resource allocation to support school improvement in each LEA serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. The SEA will award a significant portion of the state’s 7% set-aside to make competitive grants to LEAs</p>

	<p>with the strongest plans for school redesign according to the research standards entailed in ESSA. Each LEA with a school identified as needing Comprehensive Intervention will submit one plan describing the goals, strategies and monitoring processes it will use to address the challenges at all of its schools identified as needing such support.</p> <p>In reviewing LEA plans in order to award school improvement funds, the LDE will prioritize those that propose to partner with a proven provider that is capable of supporting improvement in the areas identified through a comprehensive needs assessment. Each school identified as being in need of comprehensive support and improvement will have a point of contact at the LDE—the Regional Turnaround Support Manager (RTSM). The RTSM will manage a portfolio of LEAs to monitor for effectiveness of implementation. The RTSM will be responsible for ongoing site visits, will receive ongoing reports from the school and the LEA and will monitor the improvement of students within each school designated as in need of comprehensive support. (Page 63)</p> <p>The frequency is not fully defined, although reviewers assumed it will be included in the risk-based model outlined earlier in the plan.</p> <p>Inclusion of PK in evaluation</p> <p>This State indicates that reviews of equitable per pupil expenditures will occur and “to the extent practicable” will address inequities. Most focus is currently on funding for early intervention strategies, though the State indicated tracking access to enriching experiences and rigorous course work going forward.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	No details about actual frequency. It is not clear how often reviews will occur. It is not clear how the State defines “significant”. The SEA also needs to better define what is meant by “to the extent practicable”.
<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>	Not clear how review will occur. Also lacking any discussion about supports or review of financial elements. Plan needs to define the frequency of review and define “significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement”.

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>
--	----------------------

<p><i>Peer Analysis</i></p>	<p>The SEA describes the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA serving a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. The technical assistance is likely to improve student outcomes.</p> <p>In school systems with a significant number of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, the LDE will support school leaders in building a plan for improvement based on unique needs. That support could include: completing a comprehensive needs assessment, advising on system-wide resource allocation, identifying effective support partners, and building a plan for system-wide management of the improvement plan. The needs assessment will be based on unique school system and school profiles that will disaggregate each subgroup’s performance in key academic areas. The LDE will then run a competitive grant each year to support the most promising plans. The LDE will also provide focused resources for each subgroup.</p> <p>This will include a framework of support for each unique subgroup, a definition of excellence within that framework, key resources to support improvements in that subgroup, and recommended high quality support providers who can help districts improve that sub-group’s performance.(Pages 63-64)</p> <p>The initial interventions listed (comprehensive needs assessment, advising on system-wide resource allocation, identifying effective support partners, and improvement planning) are responsive to individual school needs.</p> <p>This State will provide a wide array of supports for the schools that could include needs assessments and advising on resource allocations. Also, they will provide supports for schools and school systems as they compete for grants to further address their needs.</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>Explanation of differentiated technical assistance is comprehensive.</p> <p>Competitive grant will encourage unique and new ideas for better addressing the needs of struggling schools</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p>	<p>Plan for technical assistance begins at p. 63. While the steps outlined are appropriate, they are lacking in two areas: 1) the discussion about how both fiscal and programmatic TA will be offered to impact performance; and 2) the large gap between TA offerings and more rigorous interventions outlined later in the plan (e.g. RSD takeover).</p> <p>Lack of discussion of fiscal TA to improve flexibility of spending, etc. No discussion of actual researched based interventions that may be most likely in state based on historically underperforming subgroups, only generalized “plans based on unique needs”. Are there any strategies the State is implementing for all LEAs to address areas of need?</p>
<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an</i></p>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A
<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?⁴

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA explains that the rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by ineffective teachers are lower than the rates at which non-low-income/non-minority students are taught by ineffective teachers. The rates at which low-income and minority students are taught by out-of-field and less experienced teachers are attributed to recruitment and retention challenges disproportionately faced by school systems and schools that serve high

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

	<p>percentages of these student populations. Many of these schools are in rural communities, which face significant recruitment and retention challenges. These school systems and schools are less geographically proximate to teacher preparation programs and offer less competitive compensation packages than nearby, urban LEAs.</p> <p>The rates and differences in rates are calculated at student level and are shown in Appendix B. (Page 78)</p> <p>State details the extent to which students (minority and those served under Title I) are taught at disproportionate rates by ineffective, out-of-field or inexperienced teachers starting at p. 77.</p> <p>Minority and low income students are more likely to be taught by inexperienced and out-of-field teachers than non-minority and non-low income students.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Sufficient explanation.</p> <p>The rate at which minority students are taught by ineffective teachers is 9.44 percentage points lower than non-minority students. Information about why this is occurring is provided.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Information about how the state is working to address this deficiency is not provided.</p> <p>Plan hyperlinks to the Educator Equity Plan, but a summary of activities would be helpful and bolster an otherwise strong section.</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.6: School Conditions (ESEA Section 1111(g)(1)(C))

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning and for reducing incidences of bullying and harassment; overuse of discipline practices that remove

	<p>students from the classroom; and using aversive behavioral interventions that compromise student health and safety. The LDE also provides resources, tools and professional development to LEAs, principals and teachers throughout the school year through regular meetings, phone calls, webinars, collaboration events and the Teacher Leader Summit. In addition, the LDE provides differentiated, one-on-one support to districts based on their individual goals and needs via the network teams. Through regional and one-on-one support meetings, LDE staff will support LEAs in addressing their greatest needs, as revealed by the results of needs assessments, analyses of data, and monitoring reports, and targeting funds toward those needs. This work will include addressing chronic absenteeism, excessive out-of-school discipline, and other behavior and discipline related needs for all students and for student subgroups. (Page 32)</p> <p>State addresses school conditions in various points in the plan. The state response on p. 90 (cited as primary on p. 4 of plan) does not provide sufficient information. Additional information as noted on p. 4 is not sufficient to provide a cohesive description of how funds will be used to specifically improve conditions for student learning. Specifically, there is little discussion of reducing incidences of bullying and harassment.</p> <p>This state plan focuses on the reduction of disproportionality in suspended students and the pathways that lead to this disproportionality.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The state has a clear understanding of how school conditions for learning differ between schools has included an exhaustive list of supports that are currently available for schools in this area (page 86).</p> <p>At various points in the plan it is clear that the state has a strong commitment to holding schools accountable for out-of-school and exclusionary discipline.</p> <p>Focus on reduction of out of school suspension and appropriate behavior interventions</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Little to no discussion of bullying and harassment.</p> <p>Information regarding interventions that compromise a student’s health and safety was not found.</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>There is no specific mention or discussion of how the SEA will provide supports to reduce incidents of bullying or harassment. The plan should also provide details about how the SEA will address these requirements if Title IV funds are not appropriated to states.</p>

A.7: School Transitions (ESEA 111(g)(1)(D))

- Does the SEA describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling (particularly students in the middle grades and high school)?

- Does the SEA’s description include how it will work with LEAs to provide effective transitions of students to middle grades and high school to decrease the risk of students dropping out?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes its strategies and how it will support LEAs to support the continuum of a student’s education from preschool through grade 12, including transitions from early childhood education to elementary school, elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post-secondary education and careers, in order to support appropriate promotion practices and decrease the risk of students dropping out (Page 83)</p> <p>The plan includes a specific measure in the accountability plan (Dropout Credit Index) to encourage LEAs to support students through the middle grades and high school transition. This accountability tool will encourage schools to track data that research suggests are predictive of dropping out. Further discussion at p. 83 also details State supports.</p> <p>This state identifies clear progression pathways for providing struggling students the supports necessary to become successful when transitioning into higher grades.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>Innovative measure to encourage schools to track students through transitions.</p> <p>Clearly articulated plans regarding promotion and placement that better meet the needs of students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Narrative could be strengthened by a more thorough conversation about the supports it will use to encourage strong transitions.</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>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The LDE will administer a new English language proficiency assessment in 2017-2018 based on the state’s English proficiency standards (the Louisiana Connectors for English language learners). A Home Language Use Survey is the first step in the entrance procedure; it is used to identify potential ELs at the time of their initial enrollment in school. The second step is to administer the English Language Proficiency Screener to determine an initial English proficiency level, confirm eligibility for enrollment in a specialized language program, and inform initial placement. The screening assessment developed from the same item bank as the summative assessment for each of the six grade bands helps schools assess the baseline English language proficiency of incoming ELs and inform placement and instructional decisions.(Page 102)</p> <p>Although processes outlined in the plan appear to be researched based and aligned with best practices, there is no information at p,102 or section 1.C. that details timely and meaningful consultation.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>Exit criteria have not been established yet because the State will be administering a new English Language Proficiency assessment. The SEA states that the exit criteria will be standardized, be the same criteria used to exit students from the English learner subgroup for Title I reporting and accountability purposes, and will not include performance on an academic content assessment. (Page 102)</p> <p>Test will not be in place until 2017-18 and timeliness of initial testing is not identified.</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Plan does not detail the exit criteria; nor does it address meaningful consultation with stakeholders, as specifically required in Title III.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describe how it will assist eligible entities in meeting the State-designed long-term goals for English language proficiency and how it will ensure that English learners meet challenging State academic standards.</p> <p>The Louisiana Connectors for English Learners are the English proficiency</p>

	<p>standards (ELP) that address the language needs of English Learners (ELs) for academic success. The ELP Connectors clarify and amplify the language demands of the Louisiana State Standards. The LDE is assisting local schools in meeting long-term goals for their English learners by providing training, developing resources, and supporting an ELL coaching model.</p> <p>The LEAP English Language Proficiency (ELP) Connect will be administered in the spring every year beginning in 2017-2018 and it measures listening, speaking, reading, and writing, in addition to the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the Louisiana Student Standards. The LEAP ELP Connect assessment provides two sets of outcomes. The first set of outcomes are intended to be used for score reporting and include a summary of performance on the four domains and a proficiency determination of Emerging, Progressing, and Proficient that is based on the pattern of performance across the four domains.</p> <p>These scores are provided for use by students, educators, and parents and meet the objectives of measuring progress and determining program eligibility. The second set of outcomes includes two growth indicators: an overall score and a comprehension score. Overall proficiency is determined through the pattern and level of performance across the four domains. Scale scores are provided for each domain, overall performance and comprehension. These scores meet the objectives for accountability.(Page 15)</p> <p>Interim measures are detailed in the plan, but may need to be revised after initial year of new assessment in 17-18.</p> <p>This State will establish student level targets for gaining language proficiency and will hold LEAs accountable for meeting those targets through inclusion in the accountability system.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	Research based approach to setting meaningful and appropriate targets.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Little information about how the SEA will actually assist LEAs is provided.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>The ELP interim measures are detailed, but reviewers noted that most will need to be revised once data is available from 17-18 assessment and the plan could be strengthened by more details about this review and revision.</p> <p>This portion of the plan did not supply the same amount of details regarding supports as we found in other parts of the plan and should be updated to provide these details. (see p. 15)</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>
--	----------------------

<p><i>Peer Analysis</i></p>	<p>The SEA explains that in order to monitor both compliance and effective program implementation, the LDE will engage in regular, targeted reviews of data and differentiate supports and interventions based on identified needs. The SEA’s new monitoring system allows for an evaluation of every LEA every year for all federal programs vs. a set of pre-determined risk indicators. The monitoring process addresses compliance, academic performance growth (overall and by subgroup), and fiscal risks over a two-year period. Quartiles are used for ranking and assigning points in order to distribute a set of data into four equal groups. Risk indicators are weighted, assigned points, and ranked on a rubric. The application of this rubric yields a monitoring report card for each LEA that displays data and other relevant information used to make monitoring determinations.</p> <p>The SEA describes 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.</p> <p>Monitoring is conducted and differentiated according to the level of risk, ranging from low intensity to high intensity. Monitoring experiences range from on-site monitoring at the most intensive level to self-assessments at the least intensive level. Comprehensive desk reviews are conducted at the moderate ranking level. LEAs must immediately develop and submit for LDE approval a corrective action plan for any findings of noncompliance. During the period in which the LEA is implementing the corrective action plan, the plan remains under the supervision of the LDE monitoring team, which regularly engages in conversations and collection of evidence to validate progress toward resolution.(Pages 29-30)</p> <p>The plan clearly articulates a process for monitoring all LEAs every year for all federal programs, not just Title III.</p>
<p><i>Strengths</i></p>	<p>The SEA’s new method of monitoring has eliminated a one-size-fits-all approach and provides all LEAs with more timely opportunities to address non-compliance, improve program management, and increase student outcomes based on factors that have the greatest impact.</p> <p>Yearly monitoring with a required clear corrective action plan that is goals oriented and includes technical assistance and supervision from the SEA.</p>
<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p>	
<p><i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)</p>
<p><i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i></p>	