

STATE PLAN PEER REVIEW CRITERIA Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Massachusetts



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>	N/A The SEA does not provide 8 th grade math exception.
<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)

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).

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

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

A.3.i: Definition

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides its definition of “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population” as first language of 10% or more of students eligible, and this includes only Spanish. But the SEA does not describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population in one or more LEAs, as well as languages spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population across grade levels.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does include the number of students enrolled in assessed grades and the percentage of students in the accountability system in individual subgroups on page 47; however, it is still not clear how the SEA considered languages other than English that are spoken by a significant portion of the participating student population.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the</i>	The SEA should describe how it considered languages other than English that are spoken by distinct populations of

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA identified one assessment that is made available in a language other than English. That assessment is the Grade 10 Mathematics test and retest and it is available in Spanish and English.</p> <p>It should be noted that state law restricts the development of further assessments in languages other than English. The Spanish grade 10 math test and retest were grandfathered because of the HS graduation requirement.</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 fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.3.iii: Assessments not Available and Needed

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates only one assessment in Spanish is available in one grade level for one subject. The state law restricts the development of further assessments in languages other than English. The Spanish grade 10 math test and retest were grandfathered because of the HS graduation requirement.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is exploring the feasibility of developing Spanish-language assessments and will pursue the development of test translations of HS Biology and Introductory Physics tests with the next generation MCAS assessments in 2019.
<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.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>	While the SEA is prohibited from developing or administering assessments in languages other than English, except for the grade 10 math test and retest due to the competency determination and HS diploma requirement, the SEA is exploring the feasibility of developing Spanish-language assessments and will pursue the development of test

	translations of HS Biology and Introductory Physics tests with the next generation MCAS assessments in 2019. The SEA also describes how it will gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English, collect and respond to public comment or consult with various stakeholders.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA lists each racial and ethnic group (African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Multi-race/non-Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and White) that it includes as a subgroup of students in its accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.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>	The SEA includes a High Needs group of students (<i>i.e.</i> , an unduplicated count of students that appear in any one of its three selected population subgroups--economically disadvantaged, EL, students with disabilities) as an additional subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA justified their use of another subgroup by noting that an additional 150 schools will be held accountable by adding this subgroup.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
--	----------------------

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A Currently, the SEA provides an exception for first-year ELL students from taking the ELA test. The SEA intends to explore applying the exception under ESEA section 111(b)(3)(A)(ii).
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA provides the minimum number of students necessary to disaggregate data by subgroup. This number is the same for all subgroups of students. The minimum n-size for all subgroups for accountability purposes is 20. The SEA will not report enrollment data for a group of less than 6 students. The SEA will not report assessment results for a group of less than 10 students.
<i>Strengths</i>	The methodology proposed by the SEA accounts for 99.8 % of students and includes multiple years of data to increase the confidence interval of reliability and accuracy. The SEA's n-size promotes privacy and transparency.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The requirement might exclude more schools and subgroup classifications for accountability, but SEA also explained that the loss is outweighed by the need to make valid and reliable determinations. The state plan indicates that the SEA would like to retain the flexibility of including former students with

	disabilities in the students with disabilities subgroup for up to two years; however, the SEA should be aware that including former students with disabilities within the students with disabilities subgroup is not allowable under ESSA.
<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 SEA’s n-size promotes privacy and transparency and is aligned to generally acceptable analysis. The described process for accountability purposes is statistically sound.
<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</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.

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes how it determined the minimum number. The SEA describes that the requirement would include 99.8% of all students from assessed grades and provides a table of subgroup percentages of students included in the accountability system with n-size of 20. The 2 main subgroups that would be significantly excluded are Native American and Native Hawaiian.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA includes a table of each subgroup and the percentage of students included in the accountability system.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA has not described the methodology, consultation, or analysis used to determine the minimum number. The SEA did not explicitly state how it collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining such number, other than referencing continuing is practice from recent years.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (2 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (2 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>Two Peer Reviewers concluded that the SEA met all the requirements based on their evidence on page 23 under “Ongoing Review and Refinement”.</p> <p>Two Peer Reviewers concluded that the SEA should provide additional information regarding how it determined the minimum number of students. The SEA should also describe how it collaborated with teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, and other stakeholders when determining the minimum number of students.</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 a set of strategies that, when used together, protect the privacy of individual students.</p> <p>The SEA does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • report enrollment, dropout, and graduation data for a group with less than 6 students • report assessment results for any group with less than 10 students • include any group with less than 20 students in its accountability system.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s disaggregated data reporting strategies balance transparency and student privacy.</p> <p>The SEA has a long history of reporting data to the general public while at the same time protecting the identity and privacy of its students.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA’s plan is lacking a detailed explanation on how the privacy of students will be protected given the minimum number of students necessary to make a subgroup.</p> <p>The SEA does not describe the rationale behind why they set these minimum n-sizes for different purposes and how they will protect the privacy of individual students.</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</i>	

³ See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

<i>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>	The SEA has an established accountability and reporting privacy policy. The minimum number of students for purposes of reporting is lower than the minimum number of students for accountability purposes and the SEA does provide that number. The SEA reporting for accountability purposes is set at 20 students, and the SEA’s minimum number for reporting is set at 6 students. The SEA has a long history of reporting data to the general public while at the same time protecting the identity and privacy of its students.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s disaggregated data reporting strategies balance transparency and student privacy.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

- Does the SEA identify (*i.e.*, by providing a numeric measure) and describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (which must apply the same academic achievement standards to all public school students in the State, except those with the most significant cognitive disabilities)?

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA does identify and describe the long-term goals for all students (and all subgroups) for improved academic achievement, as measured by grade-level proficiency on the annual statewide reading/language arts and mathematics assessments. The SEA has baseline data from SY 2015-2016.</p> <p>The SEA has ambitious goals and a specific timeline for meeting the long-term goals which includes all students and subgroups.</p> <p>The SEA is administering the next generation MCAS for the first time in SY16-17 so the state plan states that it is not possible for MA to determine final long-term goals for the state at this time, but the SEA did provide their long-term goals using the assessment results from SY15-16 and plans to apply the same methodology once the new assessment results are available.</p> <p>Their long-term goal is to reduce the proficiency gap by 1/3 over the next 6 years. The SEA also provides a table for ELA, Math, and Science with each subgroup’s baseline and the target proficiency rate for the next 6 years (2017-2022), and describes that each subgroup is to cut their proficiency gap by 1/3 against the baseline data for all students.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The long-term goals are both ambitious and reasonable. The SEA has a comprehensive plan that focuses on equity and narrowing the achievement gap as shown in their long-term goals.</p> <p>The SEA set interim targets from 2017 to 2022 so that they can progress monitor each subgroup’s performance over the years. The SEA also set differentiated final targets for each subgroup considering starting point to accurately measure and report growth.</p> <p>The SEA’s focus on equity and narrowing the achievement gap is shown in their long-term goals. The SEA set interim targets from 2017 to 2022 so that they can track each subgroup’s progress over the years. They also set differentiated final targets for each subgroup to take into account where they are starting from.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>While the differentiated targets make the goals reasonable, the subgroups with very low starting points will still remain low at the end of SY21-22. For example, students with disabilities will still be at 58% for ELA, 53% for Math, and 51% for Science even if they meet their target.</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>	The SEA’s measurements of interim progress toward meeting the long-term goals for all students and subgroups is provided, including a table with interim progress points for all students and each subgroup.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s interim progress goals are ambitious and reasonable. The SEA interim goals are differentiated by subgroup based on their baseline and the SEA’s long-term goal of reducing the achievement gap by 1/3 in 6 years.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While reasonable, subgroups with low proficiency baseline are still low even if they reach their targets at the end of SY21-22. For example, students with disabilities will still be at 58% for ELA, 53% for Math, and 51% for Science even if they meet their target.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s long-term goals and measurements of interim progress consider required improvement for low performing students and addresses 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>Strengths</i>	The SEA requires reasonable and greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that are lower achieving.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	While reasonable, subgroups with low proficiency baseline are still low even if they reach their targets at the end of SY21-22. For example, students with disabilities will still be at 58% for ELA, 53% for Math, and 51% for Science even if they meet their target.
<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 identifies and describes the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and for each subgroup of students. The SEA’s description includes baseline data for all students and subgroups as well as a timeline for meeting the long-term goals.</p> <p>The SEA has set long-term goals based on strong improvement in increasing their graduation rate in recent years. Since 2010, the average high school in MA has improved its 4-yr rate by 5 percentage points and the state cut its “graduation gap” for all students subgroup by 29 percent. The SEA’s long-term goal is to achieve the same level of improvements for all students and all subgroups over the next 5 years. The SEA includes table of baseline (2015)</p>

	and long-term target (2020) for all students and each subgroup, and the interim targets are included in Appendix A. The targets were determined based on the “graduation gap” or the distance from a 100% 4-yr rate and their historical trend of improvement.
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s long-term goals are both ambitious and reasonable. The SEA’s clear rationale supports its long-term goals which are comprehensive.</p> <p>The SEA also includes in the state plan that school districts have implemented a number of programmatic initiatives to increase their 4-yr rate since ACGR was first calculated in 2006, and that they have identified that the most significant reason behind the increase in their 4-yr rate has been a reduction in the number of dropouts in grades 9-12.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Because the targets are differentiated by each subgroup’s baseline, the subgroups with low rates still remain low even if they reach their target at the end of SY19-20. For example, the EL subgroup will still be at 74% in 2020 but the 4-yr rate will be 91% if they reach their targets.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA outlines the short/long term goals for graduation rates. The SEA identifies and describes the long-term

	<p>goals for each extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students.</p> <p>The SEA’s description includes baseline data for all students and for each subgroup of students and a timeline for meeting the long-term goals is included and it is the same multi-year length of time for all students and for each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The SEA states that they will use a modified version of 5-yr rate in its district and school accountability system, which is described as the sum of the percentage of students that have graduated within 5 years, plus the percentage of students that are still enrolled in school after years. The SEA describes their goal is to continue with the improvements made since 2010 and reduce its 5-yr rate plus gap by 33.3%, and includes a table of baseline and long-term goal targets for all students and each subgroup (interim targets are included in Appendix A).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has a justified proposal to use a modified version of the five year graduation rate.</p> <p>The SEA describes the rationale behind including the 5-yr rate plus as incentivizing schools to welcome students back into the school environment regardless of whether they are on track to graduate in 4 or 5 years. It also states that many schools now have alternative programming designed for off-track students and an accountability system should reward these types of programs.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>The SEA targets are differentiated by baseline for each subgroup and subgroups with low baseline is still low even if they reach their target at the end of SY19-20. For example, ELs are at 82% as opposed to 94% for all students even if they meet their targets in 2020.</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 SEA should specify the number of years used for the “percentage of students that are still enrolled in school” (on page 28).</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA provides measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and a modified five-year cohort graduation rate for all students and each subgroup of students.</p> <p>The SEA includes interim progress toward the long-term goals for all students and each subgroup for 4-yr and 5-yr rate plus in Appendix A.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s clear rationale supports its long-term goals. The SEA’s goals are reasonable using a modified five-year cohort graduation rate.</p> <p>The SEA’s target for each subgroup is differentiated based on their baseline data from 2015 and subgroups with lower rates need to make greater rates of improvement.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Low subgroups are still low even if they meet their targets in 2020.
<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>	The SEA’s target outcomes are based on goals and previous student achievement data. The SEA’s long term goals for the four-year adjusted and modified five-year graduation rate require greater rates of improvement so that the achievement gap will be reduced. For example, the target for 4-yr ACGR for the economically disadvantaged students is 84.5% in 2020, versus 88.5% for 5-yr ACGR plus.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA requires ambitious but reasonable performance with greater rates of improvement for subgroups of students that graduate from high school at lower rates.

	The differentiated targets for different subgroups make the long-term goals reasonable.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Low subgroups are still low even if they meet their targets in 2020.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes its long-term goal for increasing the percentage of ELs making progress in achieving English language proficiency as reducing the percentage of students that are not making sufficient progress towards English language proficiency by 50% over the next 6 years. The SEA provides a table for baseline data in 2016 and interim and final goal targets from 2017-2022. The state plan also notes that the WIDA ACCES for ELs test is in the midst of transitioning from paper and pencil to online testing so the SEA will determine the best approach to measuring progress after the transition is complete.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA has an ambitious 3.2% per year increase in ELs progress towards proficiency is noted. The SEA’s growth-to-proficiency targets are individualized based on students’ starting point and their progress is measured using student growth percentile. The SEA also has differentiated timeline for EL students reaching English language proficiency—students who grow up in the US and enroll in MA school by Kindergarten should attain proficiency by grade 2, students who enter school in upper grades will attain proficiency within 3 years, and secondary grade students will need a specialized program to accelerate English acquisition.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	

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

A.4.iii.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>The SEA’s interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency is noted.</p> <p>The SEA includes a table for measurements of interim progress toward the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of ELs making progress in achieving English language proficiency.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The interim targets reflect SEA’s goal of reducing the percentage of students that are not making sufficient progress towards English language proficiency by 50% over the next 6 years.
<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.iv: Indicators (ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(B), 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii))

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

A.4.iv.a: Academic Achievement

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The SEA describes the Academic Achievement indicators used in its statewide accountability system—ELA, math, and science average scale scores. While the state plan explains that the average scale score will replace the use of proficiency index because the average scale score better represents the range of scores at the district and school level, it does not explain how the use of scale score will show the proficiency level of students in each grade. The SEA also includes the weighting for each indicator, but they do not provide detailed information on how each measure within an indicator, if there are multiple measures, will make up the total weight for the indicator. For example, Academic Achievement indicator is measured by ELA, math, and science MCAS scores but the state plan does not indicate how much weight each measure will have to total up to 50% for the indicator.</p> <p>Additionally, the SEA should note that science should not be included in the Academic Achievement indicator.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>It is unclear where the SEA described the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement. The SEA’s use of the average scale score appears incompatible with the requirement that the indicator be measured by grade-level proficiency.</p> <p>Additionally, the SEA should note that science should not be included in the Academic Achievement indicator.</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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On page 51 and 52, the SEA should describe the weighting of reading/language arts achievement relative to mathematics achievement. • The SEA should explain how the average scale score is used to measure grade level proficiency. • The SEA should remove science assessment from the Academic Achievement indicator.
--	---

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA describes that the mean student growth percentile (SGP) will be used for the Academic Progress indicator. They will also pursue the possibility of using a growth to standard measure to be incorporated in the future.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA plans to improve its measurement of growth by using the mean SGP as opposed to the median SGP, which they are currently using, to better reflect the full range of growth percentiles at the direction of their Technical Advisory Committee.
<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</i>	

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

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will include 4-yr ACGR and 5-yr ACGR plus, as well as the dropout rate in its accountability system for all students and gap closing for high needs students. The SEA does not describe how it will include students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are awarded an alternate diploma in its 4-yr and extended-year ACGR.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA includes 5-yr ACGR plus to incentivize schools who are taking in students who are off-track. It also includes the dropout rate because reducing the number of dropouts was attributed to having the biggest impact on increasing the 4-yr graduation rate in MA.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	For 5-yr ACGR plus measure, the SEA indicates that students that are still enrolled in school “after years” but does not indicate how many years.
<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</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Page 42, specify the number of years used for the “percentage of students that are still enrolled in school

<i>specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	<p>after years”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA should describe how it will include students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are awarded an alternate diploma.
--	--

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 separately measures the student attainment of the English language proficiency and the progress made by students towards attaining the English language proficiency (for grades K-12).</p> <p>The SEA takes into consideration a variety of student characteristics when placing students in language instruction programs and making determinations about level and types of service. For example, this also includes students with limited or interrupted formal education.</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 fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA indicates that they will use chronic absenteeism, success in grade 9 courses (high school), and successful completion of broad and challenging coursework (high school) measures for its School Quality or Student Success indicator.
<i>Strengths</i>	The focus on equity is still demonstrated in these indicators by incorporating the improvements made in each indicator to address the gap between high needs students and their counterparts. The inclusion of broad and challenging coursework motivates the schools to provide expanded opportunities for their students to participate in advanced courses.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Grade 9 course passing is a leading indicator of how the students will perform in high school and beyond. The SEA should consider some sort of standardization of grading policy across districts or at least a cross-walk of differences in grading policy so that this indicator measure the same thing across districts. The SEA should consider providing a clearer guideline around which courses are considered broad and challenging across districts, and that there is no drastic difference between one district’s course rigor and another district’s course rigor. It is also unclear what “successful completion” of broad and challenging coursework means.
<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</i>	Two Peer Reviewers concluded that the SEA should provide more details on these measures and define “successful completion of broad and challenging coursework” (i.e., pass or fail, receiving a certain letter grade, etc.).

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Additionally, if the SEA chooses to use the successful completion of broad and challenging coursework and success in Grade 9 courses as their measures, the SEA should ensure statewide indicators are measured comparably across LEAs and schools.
--	---

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 indicates that the final summative determinations will be calculated annually, and the system of annual meaningful differentiation is based on all indicators in the accountability system. The SEA’s system of annual meaningful differentiation includes the performance of all students and the High Needs subgroup of students on each of the indicators in the State’s accountability system.</p> <p>Since science should not be included in the Academic Achievement indicator, the SEA will need to determine if and how science will be included in the system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA’s description is supported by a clear theory of action and rationale for the design of its accountability system. The SEA’s comprehensive description is supported by explicit design principles and is clearly based on the SEA’s goals and values.</p> <p>The placement into one of the six performance levels will utilize 2 different ways—falling within the range of cut ranges - for the accountability index or meeting the annual targets that are set and therefore moving up a performance level.</p>
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>While the SEA states that it will calculate the interim goals for each subgroup and provides the data in the state plan, it is not clear how each subgroup’s performance will be incorporated in the overall accountability index outlined on page 49 (other than the High Needs subgroup).</p>
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or</i>	<p>Since science should not be included in the Academic Achievement indicator, the SEA should determine if and how science will be included in the system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p>

<i>clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	Additionally, the SEA should specify how it will incorporate each subgroup’s performance in the overall accountability index outlined on page 49 (other than the High Needs subgroup).
--	--

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 identifies and explains how the new statewide accountability system will be used in comparison to the previous system and based on the pending summer 2017 data.</p> <p>Since science should not be included in the Academic Achievement indicator, the SEA will need to determine if and how science will be included and weighted in the system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<p>When an indicator includes more than one measure, the SEA does not describe the weighting of individual measures within an indicator.</p> <p>The SEA might consider equal distribution among different indicators of the 5% for schools that do not have an EL subgroup for the ELP indicator. And how the weight of an indicator will be re-distributed if a school does not have the minimum number of students for an indicator.</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>Since science should not be included in the Academic Achievement indicator, the SEA should determine if and how science will be included and weighted in the system of annual meaningful differentiation.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A The SEA does not have protocol for accountability determination for schools that do not administer the statewide assessment to any students in the school or do not have the requisite number of assessed students in the school.
<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>	The SEA outlines and addresses how it identifies schools in the lowest-performing and highest performing schools based on the priorities and outcomes for all students. The SEA indicates that the lowest 5% of schools will be identified according to the index methodology so any school with an overall accountability index from 1-5 will be identified as comprehensive support schools. The SEA will first identify these schools in the fall of 2018.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s review of newly developed comprehensive report based on stakeholder survey information. The identification methodology is supported by the accountability index.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA could clarify the accountability index is based on percentiles.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s plan to identify high schools with a 2017 4-yr ACGR lower than 67% will be identified as comprehensive support schools in the fall of 2018.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)

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

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

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

<i>Peer Response</i>	
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that any school identified as having the same chronically low-performing subgroup for 3 consecutive years will be identified as a comprehensive support school.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA has a tiered plan of support for qualifying schools for comprehensive support and improvement.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

A.4.vi.d: Frequency of Identification

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA does not include the frequency or the timeline with which they will identify each type of school for comprehensive support after the first year of identification in the fall of 2018.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA’s response does not include the frequency of identification for comprehensive support and improvement after the first year of identification.
<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>	Two Peer Reviewers concluded that although the SEA states that the schools could be exited after three years, the SEA should specify the frequency and the timeline with which the state will identify each type of school for comprehensive support and improvement.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA notes how it will identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups. It is not clear if the methodology is based on all indicators in the statewide system of annual meaningful differentiation. The SEA is not clear on whether schools will be identified annually.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA’s response states it will identify a school “if it has one more of the lowest performing subgroups in the

	state over multiple years.” It is unclear how many years “multiple” constitutes and under what frequency this identification will occur.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should describe its methodology to identify schools with one or more “consistently underperforming” subgroups of students including the timeline used by the state defining “multiple years.”

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>	The SEA does include the year in which the state will first identify such schools. The SEA does not indicate the frequency with which the state will identify such schools after the first year.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should describe its methodology to identify schools for additional targeted support including the frequency by which the state identifies schools for additional targeted support.

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A The SEA does not include any additional statewide categories of schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that a school’s summative performance level will be lowered if that school assesses less than 95% of students in the aggregate or for any subgroup that meets a minimum n-size of 20.
<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</i>	

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

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

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s response met all of the requirements in this section. Exit criteria are described and include the number of years (3 years) in which schools are expected to meet such criteria. In order for a school to exit, it must meet student performance, growth, and gap closing targets.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s requirement for schools to submit “exit assurances” help sustain continued progress to improve student academic achievement and school success in the State. The SEA also provides annual interim targets for each classified school for each indicator.
<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.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 number of years within which schools are expected to meet the criteria is not explicitly noted.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA holds a high threshold for exiting the targeted support classification—identification threshold is bottom 10 percentile but the exit criteria is being above the 20 th percentile within a group, as well as meeting their goal targets.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not indicate the number of years within which schools are expected to meet the exit criteria.
<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>	<p>Based on page 56, iii, one Peer Reviewer concluded that the exit criteria for Additional Targeted support schools “will be similar to the exit criteria for Focus schools within our current accountability system” and use this information to identify a potential annual exit timeline.</p> <p>Three Peer Reviewers concluded that the SEA should include the number of years within which schools are expected to meet the criteria.</p>

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA has developed several approaches to intervening in persistently low-performing schools and districts—full state take-over through receivership, vetted educational management organizations to fully manage a school on behalf of districts or the SEA, and support to districts in establishing alternative governance structures for specific schools or clusters of schools.

<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA's plan for more rigorous interventions is exemplary.
<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.viii.d: Resource Allocation Review (ESEA section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii))

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA states that before the first identification of schools in SY18-19, they will add a process for resource review to its array of supports for LEAs serving low-performing schools. Access to resources for students will be a component of a turnaround plan and the review will inform the strategies included in the plan.
<i>Strengths</i>	MA already publicly reports school budget allocations and they will expect the school plans to address this component. SEA also provides support around budget allocation as part of their technical assistance to the districts.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA does not describe the process for resource review they will be adding.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (0 peer reviewers) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (4 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	The SEA should describe the process of how it will periodically review resource allocation.

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

- Does the SEA describe the technical assistance that it will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement?

- Is the technical assistance likely to improve student outcomes by, for example, 1) identifying State-approved evidence-based interventions; 2) supporting LEAs and schools in the development and implementation of support and improvement plans; and 3) differentiating the technical assistance?

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA’s response met all of the requirements in this section. The SEA prioritizes resources and intervention to districts with comprehensive and targeted support schools by providing direct expert assistance and accountability from the SEA staff and its approved partners through coaching, PD, planning and program implementation support and data analysis assistance. They also provide funding and research based resources and preferred access to PD. The targeted assistance for turnaround is overseen through the Statewide System of Support in the District Support Center and is multi-pronged and is a customized approach based on district size, capacity, and accountability status. Some of these methods are Commissioner’s Districts, the state’s 10 largest, highest poverty school districts, supported through full time liaisons, program specialists, and partners with expertise; District and School Assistance Centers to support small and medium-sized districts and these centers are organized into 6 regions across state with former superintendents/principals, specialists in math, literacy, data use, and career vocational technical education; Additional Targeted Assistance Supports employed with 3 additional office that provide a variety of supports to comprehensive and targeted schools—Systems for Student Success Office, Office of Effective Practices in Turnaround, and Office of Strategic Transformation; Evidence-based criteria, or the 4 key turnaround practices, are used to turnaround schools; Priority Partner Initiative for the SEA to vet vendors interested in supporting comprehensive and targeted support schools.
<i>Strengths</i>	The Commissioner’s Districts and District and School Assistance Centers (DSACs) strengthen the technical assistance provided by the SEA. The SEA has a robust system of support for comprehensive and targeted support schools to utilize.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	The SEA may want to consider communicating and implementing plans for students who are not traditionally ‘college bound’ following an innovative CTE/apprentice track.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	N/A The SEA does not describe the action that it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA.
<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>	<p>The SEA has data that shows that more economically disadvantaged and minority students are served by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers than non-economically disadvantaged and white students. The SEA includes graphs of baseline data of percentage of “students’ learning experience with teachers with less than 3 years of experience” and the percentage of “students’ learning experience with non-highly qualified teachers for economically disadvantaged and minority students”. The data show that more students who are economically disadvantaged and minority (as well as students with disabilities and ELs) are taught by inexperienced and ineffective teachers than their counterparts. The SEA also includes the strategies it will employ to address this issue, as well as the metrics and timeline for these strategies.</p> <p>The SEA should note that ESSA no longer uses the term, “non-highly qualified” teachers.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	<p>The SEA has an ambitious plan to remedy teacher and instructional leader ineffectiveness including the development of a newly created teacher evaluation department. The SEA also includes a thorough root cause analysis for experience gap, preparation gap, and effectiveness gap, and identified main causes for these gaps. Additionally, the SEA also includes tables that show the sizes of gaps between comparison groups and the interim targets for eliminating the gaps.</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</i>	

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.

fully meet this requirement

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state plan indicates that the SEA will improve school conditions using the following efforts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collaborating States Initiative to help the state promote social and emotional learning ○ Collaborating with Safe and Supportive Schools Commission to update and refine a safe and supportive schools framework and self-assessment tool ○ Rethinking Discipline initiative to reduce the inappropriate or excessive use of long-term suspensions and expulsions ○ Guidance around substance use and effective substance use prevention education ○ Bullying prevention and intervention plans as required by the state law ○ Urban Leaders Network for School Climate and Student support to develop and pilot a series of metrics to assess the conditions for learning
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is collaborating with other states and different stakeholders to be able to provide support for the districts on improving school conditions for learning, as well as resources to assess their conditions.
<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</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	<p>The state plan describes multiple initiatives for supporting successful transitions from PK through grade 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birth to Grade 3 Advisory Group to address children’s development across all domains, including social and emotional development, through the provision of high quality early learning opportunities • Dropout Prevention and Re-Engagement Work Group to develop/refine action plans to help students transition in and through high school • Early Warning Indicator System to improve response time to students at risk • Partnerships to support students with disabilities and students whose first language is not English • Educational Stability team to ensure that students who are homeless, in foster care, migratory and/or active military duty families have full access to a consistent education • Guidance to support children and adolescents who are absent from school on a regular basis due to chronic and life threatening illness, family illness/death, truancy, etc. • Family literacy programs to help families boost their knowledge in foundational skills so that they can support the educational development of their children. <p>While the state plan describes the Dropout Prevention and Re-Engagement Work Group that supports students transitioning into high school, it includes few details on how the SEA is supporting the transition from middle school to high school and how it is supporting the districts in vertical articulation (e.g., vertical alignment of curriculum, opportunities for LEAs and schools to discuss individual students who are transitioning, short- and long-term goal setting, socio-emotional supports, etc.).</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA provides many initiatives of which the district may take advantage.
<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</i>	

clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement

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 SEA’s entrance procedures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Language Survey • Screening for English proficiency using the WIDA W-APT or MODEL (LAS Links or Pre-IPT for Pre-K students). Districts will submit an assurance when filing grant applications that students are screened within 30 days of enrollment <p>The SEA’s exit criteria is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composite ACCESS score of 5.9 and literacy score of 4.5
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA is a member of the WIDA consortium and follows the normed standards and assessments for ELs.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

E.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 state plan indicates that the SEA will review Title III grant application reporting elements to ensure that all elements, including progress in English language proficiency and academic content standards, are present, and ask the districts to use the data to evaluate their programs and consider making changes if necessary to ensure that their programs effectively meets the needs of the students they serve.</p> <p>The SEA will provide technical assistance through one-on-one calls or visits, periodic meetings or conferences, and/or webinars to assist districts in ensuring that ELs are making progress in English language proficiency. If districts demonstrate a need for assistance in ensuring the number and percent of their ELs are making progress, PD will be offered if funding is available.</p>
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA plans to check in with districts to monitor their progress and provide assistance when needed.
<i>Weaknesses</i>	
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (4 peer reviewers) <input type="checkbox"/> No (0 peer reviewers)
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

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

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

	<i>Peer Response</i>

<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The SEA will review Title III grant application reporting elements to ensure that all elements, including progress in English language proficiency and academic content standards, are present, and ask the districts to use the data to evaluate their programs and consider making changes if necessary to ensure that their programs effectively meet the needs of the students they serve. The SEA will provide technical assistance through one-on-one calls or visits, periodic meetings or conferences, and/or webinars to assist districts in ensuring ELs are making progress in English language proficiency. If needed, the SEA will consult with Title III eligible entities regarding strategies or program models that may yield more effective program results.
<i>Strengths</i>	The SEA’s technical support for ELs is embedded in its differentiated technical assistance plan, as part of the District and School Assistance Centers (DSAC). Each DSAC serves as a forum for regional networks of schools and district teams on various topics, especially the education of ELs and students with disabilities, and for developing strong instructional leaders.
<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>	