STATE PLAN
PEER REVIEW CRITERIA
Peer Review Panel Notes Template

STATE: Maine

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	N/A
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the	

---

[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).

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

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The state designates the most populous language other than English, but the definition excludes it. The state's definition of "present to a significant extent" does not explicitly capture Somali. The state does not address distinct populations of English learners. It is not clear why the state chose 3% as the threshold.
Strengths	Definition includes a threshold.
Weaknesses	A description of the process used to identify languages other than English being spoken to a significant extent is not evident. The language designated as "present to a significant extent" (i.e., Somali) is misaligned with its definition of "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population."-State does not meet the regulatory requirements related to populations in one or more LEA, grade level(s), and distinct student populations.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or	The state must provide a more detailed, definitive process for the identification of languages other than English that are spoken to a significant extent. The state must describe the process it used to include English learners not

clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	born in the U.S., and others as indicated above. The state must also 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. The state must revise its "definition of languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population" to include at least the state's most populous language other than English spoken by the participating student population by adjusting its threshold for identification.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The State currently has no assessments in languages other than English. There is a plan for development for students who speak a language other than English that is present to a significant extent.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	SEA uses assessments that are not available in languages other than English.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. SEA identifies the need for Somali exams in math and science, though it is unclear whether the cost (both fiscal and otherwise) is worth the benefit of providing these assessments for approximately 1% of the tested population.
Strengths	SEA notes the needed assessments apply only to the content areas of mathematics and science.
Weaknesses	No tests are currently available. The label of "present to a significant extent" is not correctly applied to Somali according to the SEA definition of "languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population."
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

A.3.iv: Efforts to Develop Assessments

➢ Does the SEA describe how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population, as defined by the SEA and identified under A.3.i of the consolidated State plan template?
➢ Does the SEA's description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include the State's plan and timeline for developing such assessments?
➢ Does the SEA's description of how it will make every effort to develop assessments in, at a minimum, languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population include a description of the process the State used to:
   o 1) gather meaningful input on the need for assessments in languages other than English;
   o 2) collect and respond to public comment; and
   o 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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	There is not consensus on whether this response was complete. SEA has begun to plan for the development of Somali trans-adaptations science and math assessment. The state has engaged with its testing vendors and its TAC. The DOE is working with families to determine if this is necessary. The DOE will rely on families, community, and technical advisory for this process. The state just changed assessments so it has been unable to develop Somali versions.
Strengths	Plan references initial research and planning by SEA. Plan references timeline by year for the State's timeline for developing such assessments in mathematics for grades 3 through 8 and high school. The SEA has begun the process of exploring the development of these exams.
Weaknesses	It is not clear that consultation with all required constituencies occurred, as required. Plan references this topic in the present tense as an item on the Spring 2016 TAC agenda but does not include any outcomes of the meeting. It is unclear whether the item was addressed at a meeting in Spring 2016, or if the item will be addressed at a meeting in Spring 2017. Plan references first-year challenges associated with the English versions of tests and associated processes but does not delineate or detail those challenges.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs a more detailed timeline for 2017/18, other than the general statement "2017/18 school year." The state must also include opportunities for public comment.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete.
	The state plan includes a list of each racial and ethnic student group it will include in its accountability system. The State does not include White students in its list. However, it does include White students in other parts of the plan, such as in the exhibits.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	In another area of the plan, the state indicates its intention to use another subgroup not listed in this section [i.e. Current and Former English Learners]. This section is inconsistent with other sections of the plan for which subgroup data is reported for major racial and ethnic groups (i.e. White subgroup not presented in this section).
	The State needs to check its plan for consistency.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	On page 34, the state notes that it is exploring combining the former students with disabilities with the students with disabilities group or potentially reporting out these students as a separate group, but has not committed to doing this, hence the N/A vote. The N/A vote also reflects that the lack of compliance related to the inclusion of former students with disabilities, although legally impermissible, is not relevant to this question. The State is prohibited from including former students with disabilities in the students with disabilities subgroup.
Strengths	Two additional subgroups included in plan: "Current and Former Students with Disabilities" and "Current and Former English Learners."

Weaknesses	The State is considering using former students with disabilities in the student with disability subgroup, which is not allowable.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers) 1 N/A vote
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state cannot include former students with disabilities in the student with disability subgroup data. The option to explore other combining the former students with disabilities with the students with disabilities group is not permissible. The section about this on page 34 needs to be revised.

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The State indicated in the plan that they were selecting the third option. However, the text provided was incongruent with this option. The state needs to either check a different option or provide how it will choose which exception applies to a recently arrived EL.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the	To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must provide specific information or clarification about how it will

specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	choose which exception applies to a recently arrived English learner or the state must select another exemption.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. This item was met as the 'n' is the same for all students and subgroups. SEA will use a minimum n size of 10 for all students and student groups.
Strengths	Plan references research-based approach to establishing N-size criteria.
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an	

SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	A detailed description of how the state determined if an 'n' size of 10 was a statistically sound number for this item was not met. While it is clear, the State serves many small, rural schools, the state plan did not include enough evidence to support its selection of an n-size of 10. The State needs to include more details on its perspective (population or sample) so that a determination can be made to support the selection of this n count. Furthermore, the State needs to provide more details on how it calculates the indicators used in its system and whether the margin of error that comes with an n count of 10 meets their criteria for statistical conclusion validity.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The information regarding why the state uses an 'n' size of 10 is insufficient.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (2 peer reviewers) ☒ No (2 peer reviewers)

---

[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.

If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must provide a more detailed description regarding the statistical soundness of an 'n' size of 10. The description must provide how the State calculates each indicator, whether the margin of error that comes with an n count of 10 meets their criteria for statistical conclusion validity, and what perspective the state takes.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The State chose 10 to include as many students as possible in its system. Given the size of the states' schools an n size of 10 appears reasonable. The SEA made this decision based off an ESSA Advisory workgroup recommendation. The workgroup included the type of stakeholders listed above.
Strengths	A broad variety of constituents was included in this decision. Plan promotes equity by including as many students as possible.
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this	

	requirement

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]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. More detail is needed to meet this area. FERPA and HIPPA guidelines alone do not assure students cannot be individually identified.
Strengths	Plan identifies how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students based on FERPA and HIPPA guidelines.
Weaknesses	Plan does not describe how it ensures that the minimum number of students will protect the privacy of individual students beyond the n count guidance found in FERPA and HIPPA. For example, how will the State ensure student privacy in instances when all students are non-proficient on a measure?
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (2 peer reviewers) ☒ No (2 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to provide more assurances beyond FERPA and HIPPA to ensure student privacy. The state needs to provide more detailed information about its efforts to ensure student privacy.

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?

---

[3] See footnote 5 above for further guidance.

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

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The long term goals are not considered to be ambitious (maximum percent proficient in ELA in 2030 is 75.81% and does not match the state goal of graduating 90% of all students college and career ready). The state may consider discussing how high school diplomas correlate to college- and career-readiness in establishing its long term ambitious goal. The state may also consider clarifying the composition of the baseline data (i.e. how are 3-8 tests and/or SAT factored in)?

	The state may consider using its online platform to set meaningful indicators and goals for lower-performing groups. Although the state discusses the use of Dirigo, it should describe how it will set indicators and goals in order to monitor progress in a meaningful way. Without further description, there is the assumption of lower expectations for certain subgroups.
Strengths	Strategic framework – page 8; use of Dirigo Star
Weaknesses	The long-term goals may not be ambitious for all students and subgroups. The plan does not describe the long-term goals for all students for improved academic achievement. The interim goals are misaligned with the long-term goals. This warrants more information on how the state plans to achieve the long-term goals (p. 101). The timeline does not have sufficient detail in the interim years.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (1 peer reviewer) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to provide more information on the ambitiousness of their goals. The state needs to provide more information on how it plans to achieve the long-term goals.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. State may consider providing annual interim measures to schools and districts in order to monitor progress and potentially use in the accountability system.
Strengths	Interim goals require under-performing groups to grow at faster rates to narrow achievement gaps.
Weaknesses	Interim goals require over-performing groups to regress to narrow achievement gaps.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The State's plan includes goals and measurements of interim progress that lead to the narrowing of achievement gaps. The goals provided require student groups that are further behind to grow more rapidly than their peers. By the State's long-term timeline, the achievement gaps present in the goals will be narrower than they are at present.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	Plan provides for sufficient, but not significant, progress in closing statewide proficiency gaps for all students and all subgroups to achieve 90% proficiency by 2030, as indicated by Appendix A. Though the plan provides for a narrowing of the achievement gap by the end of 2030, an achievement gap will still exist for under-performing subgroups.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. It is not clear that the state goals are ambitious for all students and subgroups, given the information provided (i.e. accelerated graduation rate in previous years). There are subgroups already near, at, or above a 90% graduation rate.
Strengths	Table included.
Weaknesses	This goal does not require growth for groups that are already at or above a graduation rate of 90%.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (1 peer reviewer) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The plan needs to provide specific information or clarification regarding the ambitiousness of the goal, ensuring its appropriateness for all students and subgroups.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The state goals may be insufficiently ambitious, given the information provided (i.e. accelerated graduation rate in previous years). There are subgroups already near, at, or above a 90% graduation rate.
Strengths	Table included exhibit 4.
Weaknesses	For some subgroups, the baseline graduation rate with interim progress measures are near the goal of 90% for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students. For the (2) subgroups already exceeding the goal of

	90% for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students, no growth is expected or required.
	The extended adjusted cohort graduation long term goals are not more rigorous that the 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rate.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The plan needs to provide specific information or clarification regarding the ambitiousness of the goal, ensuring its appropriateness for all students and subgroups. The extended year adjusted cohort graduation rate goal needs to be more rigorous than the 4-year rate adjusted cohort graduation rate.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete.
	SEA provides measures of interim progress for all students and subgroups for every 3 years until 2030 for both four-year adjusted cohort and extended-year cohort rates.
	Since the State plan only includes measures of interim progress every three years, the state may consider applying its methodology to each school and set individual school baselines, and provide these annual targets to schools and districts for planning purposes for ongoing improvement support.
Strengths	Interim goals lead to closure of gaps.
Weaknesses	Measures are the same for 4 year AGR and extended year AGR.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an	

SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The state establishes a uniform goal for all students and subgroups so that gaps will close completely by 2030. The goal the state establishes for both four-year adjusted cohort and extended-year cohort graduation rates is 90% by 2030 for all subgroups of students.
Strengths	Progressions are ambitious for each subgroup.
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response

Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The state sets a goal for 90% of students to demonstrate proficiency (i.e. proficiency rate), not progress towards proficiency.
Strengths	Timeline aligns with the state's long-term goal for Academic Achievement.
Weaknesses	The plan does not describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency. Plan uses simulated data not representative of actual student performance to identify and describe the long-term goal for increases in the percentage of English learners making progress in achieving English language proficiency.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	In the absence of actual data, a more detailed description of the methodology is needed, including ambitious progress goals. The state must provide appropriate data – simulated or otherwise – for the percent of students making progress in EL proficiency. The state must also explain how it derives that data for purposes of meeting this requirement. The state needs to align the text on page 16 with Exhibit 5, and must meet the requirement of the statute, which requires SEAs to set long-term goals for the percent of students making progress towards EL proficiency. This plan includes a goal for proficiency, not progress towards proficiency, which is insufficient to meet the statute

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. These goals are for the percent of ELs achieving proficiency, rather than making progress towards EL proficiency.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The goals provided were not aligned with the goals of this requirement.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to set interim goals for EL students demonstrating progress towards proficiency, rather than proficiency alone.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	Plan lacks clarity on weighting of the various indicators, the validity and reliability for the indicators, and the ability to disaggregate data for subgroups.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to provide a description of this indicator that addresses • how it will be used for all schools, • how it weights ELA relative to math, • how it reflects the long-term goals, • how it factors in 95% of students and subgroups, and • clarification that this is valid and reliable. The state must describe how participation rate will be part of this 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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. SEA describes an academic progress measure for grades 4-8. This indicator can be disaggregated. A table is provided for an example and is subject to adjustments. Application of the indicator across the different schools is unclear. The application of the weighting scheme across different schools is also unclear. It is unclear whether this weighting scheme is adjusted based on student group or just by school. Based on the reasoning, it seems like it should differentiate by subgroup. The assignment of schools to quartiles is unclear.
Strengths	Plan includes consideration for possibility of including science assessment and social emotional measures in future years to increase robustness of the Academic Progress indicator.
Weaknesses	Plan provides a limited description of the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools. There is not enough information in the narrative to understand the use of the quartiles. It is not clear that the indicator is valid and reliable.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers)
	☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this	The SEA needs to describe the Other Academic indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public elementary and secondary schools that are not high schools, including how 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 where the indicator may vary by each grade span. The state needs to provide more detail on the use of the quartiles, and on the application of the indicator to the subgroups. The indicator needs to be

requirement	disaggregated for each subgroup of students.

A.4.iv.c: Graduation Rate

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

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	Plan provides a limited description of the Graduation Rate indicator used in its statewide accountability system for public high schools in the State.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must provide a description of how the graduation rate goal relates to the State's long term graduation goal, how four year rates are weighted relative to five- and six-year rates, and how the calculation of this indicator is uniform for all schools.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. There is a proficiency timeline (Exhibit 5) but not a progress timeline; the latter is needed. The plan does not make the distinction between definitions and measures, which leads to confusion.
Strengths	Definition of "English Learner" classification is extensive. The State uses a 6.0 on the WIDA ACCESS as its criteria for EL proficiency. This is the highest possible score on the WIDA ACCESS and much higher than the WIDA recommended level. The State tests all students in grades K-12, which is beyond the scope of the statute.
Weaknesses	The State does not supply a description of what a 6.0 on WIDA ACCESS means. It is possible the use of a 6.0 for exit is higher than necessary. Depending on the ESL service delivery model, the state should consider whether retaining students in ESL services beyond the time when a student meets WIDA recommended composite scores is advisable since students may miss opportunities to receive instruction on the State academic standards and English.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must include the description of what a 6.0 on WIDA ACCESS means, provide a progress timeline, and also measure progress rates.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The limited description and generality of response lack clarity. The state does not describe this indicator beyond the table provided on page 31.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to describe this indicator with greater clarity, including how it differentiates schools, how it is a valid, reliable, and comparable measure, and is used consistently statewide in all schools. The state also needs to describe that this indicator can be disaggregated by subgroup. The state needs to provide greater specificity beyond "consistent" and "regular." See Exhibit 10.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The State will differentiate all public schools in the state each year based on all indicators. Schools will receive one of four determination codes. The performance of all students and all subgroups is included. The plan could be strengthened if it included how the State will calculate the four determination codes since information on how the State calculates the final determination code is important to evaluate the soundness of the State's system of annual meaningful differentiation. The system could be further strengthened if the State annually differentiated subgroup performance in schools. This type of information would highlight equity challenges in schools where specific student subgroups are underperforming or in need of support.
Strengths	Clear determination codes
Weaknesses	It is unclear how much weight subgroups receive.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete.
Strengths	Academic achievement, graduation rate and academic progress received substantial weighting.
Weaknesses	ELP progress did not receive substantial weight.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must clarify that its weighting for ELP progress receives substantial weight individually. The state must also provide a description of how ELP is weighted for schools without ELP students.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The State plan includes a description of how accountability determinations will be made in P-2 schools. This description is based on a methodology that is different from the one described in section 4.v.a of the State's plan. The State will provide P-2 schools the determination of the schools that they feed into. The state may consider including P-2 data and indicators to the extent possible, beyond achievement data.
Strengths	All schools are included.
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)

If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The State will identify schools for comprehensive support in summer of 2018 based on their accountability system. They will choose the lowest performing schools, which will be the bottom 5% of Title I schools.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	State only uses one year of data for a very high-stakes decision. It is recommended that the State explore using multiple years of data or model this identification to establish the stability of this approach.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. SEA will identify schools with low graduation rates in summer 2018. However, state does not define low graduation rate. Statute requires that the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement where one third or more of students fail to graduate.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	No responses in this area were found on the state plan..
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must explicitly describe how it will identify schools failing to graduate one third or more of their students. It must also describe which graduation rate it will use, the extended cohort graduation rate or the four year cohort rate.

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response complete. The SEA states it will identify schools with chronically low-performing subgroups but it does not describe the details of this. It will first identify these schools in 2018.In targeted support section it states schools that do not meet the exit targets for TSI-1 schools will be identified for comprehensive support.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	It is recommended that the State provide more details on this identification.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	SEA identifies these schools every three years, which is compliant with statute.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an	

SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete.
Strengths	Clearly defined threshold.
Weaknesses	'Annual identification' was not included in the response. Though the progress is monitored annually, the SEA identifies these schools every three years. The text of the State plan does not include a clear definition of "consistently underperforming".
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	State must specify that this identification is based on all indicators in their system and that these schools are identified annually. The state must provide a clearer definition of "underperforming."

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Brevity of the response created challenges for the reviewers.
Strengths	State provides a clear plan of action for schools identified by this methodology.
Weaknesses	The SEA does not provide sufficient information describing its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students that, on its own, would lead to the identification. Identification in Nov. 2018 (p. 43) does not comply with the Department's guidance of identification by the start of the 2018-2019 school year.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (1 peer reviewer) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must describe that its methodology to identify schools in which the performance of any subgroup of students that, on its own, would lead to the identification of such schools results in the identification of such schools. The state's timeline must comply with the Department's guidance for targeted support and improvement. (see "Dear Colleague" letter dated April 10, 2017). The state must revise Exhibit 12 on p. 41 to represent data consistent with this section.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	N/A
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this	

requirement	

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The participation rate is reported, but it is not part of the ranking portion of the state's accountability system. The state describes that participation rate is not a factor in its accountability system. However, the state will provide supports to schools that miss the 95%.
Strengths	The state provides a clear plan of action for schools missing this rate.
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The participation rate must factor into the accountability system in the summative score for each school per statute. The state must include in the denominator the greater of 95% of all such students, or 95% of all students in the subgroup, or the number of students participating in the assessments for the purpose of measuring, calculating, and reporting on the academic achievement indicator.

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Overall, the exit criteria for comprehensive support schools does not clearly identify how the state ensures it is making progress toward its long-term goals since the exit criteria is based on a relative approach. The State will exit schools that are above the identification criteria for two consecutive years. Schools have four years to exit. The plan discusses ongoing monitoring and support, which would enable evaluation. The plan assumes the state will make progress in the coming years but does not provide evidence of how it will ensure continued progress is made by all students.
Strengths	Requires sustained improvement in terms of relative ranking. Use of Dirigo Star.
Weaknesses	Plan does not include alignment with the State's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to explain how the exit criteria will ensure continued progress to improve student outcomes. The plan in this area must align with the state's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.

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)?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The relative nature of this exit criteria makes the assumption that the state as a whole will improve over time. This means that if State performance regresses over time, it will be possible for schools to exit this criteria by regressing at a slower rate than other schools rather than progressing. Given evidence that performance on state

	education assessments improve over time, it is likely reasonable to assume that state will improve. However, it is not a given that statewide improvement will occur.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	Statements on p. 43 lack clarity.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (3 peer reviewers) ☒ No (1 peer reviewer)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state needs to explain how the exit criteria will ensure continued progress to improve student outcomes. The plan in this area must align with the state's long-term goals and measurements of interim progress.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State will increase supports to schools identified for comprehensive support that do not meet exit criteria within three years. The State included a number of supports it will provide to these schools. The supports include in person coaching, help determining PD opportunities, and increased financial support for these schools.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	Although the state identifies the supports it will provide, the state's response lacks the detail necessary to capture how the state truly intends to support those schools most in need of support. As the state's description does not include external accountability pressures for these schools, the state may consider the development of a differentiated typology that would allow for the development of stronger internal accountability mechanisms in these schools.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to	

fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete.
Strengths	State has a clear vision for facilitating collaboration and streamlining communication between districts and states.
Weaknesses	The state does not address a periodic review
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must describe how it will periodically review resource allocation for LEAS with these schools. The state must provide the frequency with which resource support is evaluated.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State will provide a 12 month PD training for school and district leaders on comprehensive needs assessment. They will use many delivery methods to conduct these trainings. The state plans to build leader capacity through PD and networks. State provides tiered supports that are differentiated for schools based on their needs.

	It is unclear whether Tier III schools receive only the supports listed for Tier III schools or if they also receive Tier I and II supports as well.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	The plan does not delineate the specific strategies is will use for each of the supports it lists.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	The State addresses the action it will take to initiate additional improvement in any LEA with a significant number or percentage of schools implementing targeted support and improvement plans. In the these LEAs the State will provide an improvement coach. The use of a school improvement coach to provide ongoing onsite support will help focus school improvement efforts and add consistency to the process. The response does not indicate that the SEA will address LEAs with consistently underperforming schools that are not meeting the State's exit criteria. The response does not focus on actions to initiate additional improvements. Therefore, that part of this question is not applicable. The response does not indicate that SEA will address LEAs with consistently underperforming schools. The response does not focus on actions to initiate additional improvements. The actions listed focus on inputs, not outputs. The state may consider progress monitoring measures to determine the effectiveness of the supports provided.

Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (4 peer reviewers) ☐ No (0 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	

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]

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The state provides data about equity gaps between schools but does not describe the extent of equity gaps within schools.
Strengths	The state includes characteristics in its analysis that are important to its context, like isolated schools.
Weaknesses	Plan does not describe the extent, if any, that low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under

---

[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.

	Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective teachers.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The plan must describe the extent, if any, that low-income and minority children enrolled in schools assisted under Title I, Part A are served at disproportionate rates by ineffective teachers. The state must report the data on ineffective teachers in Exhibit 19. To fully meet this requirement, the SEA must provide specific information or clarification describing the measures (e.g., raw 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.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. In the section addressing Title IV dollars, the state plan indicates the SEA will review current priorities to determine funding, such as bullying and school climate.
Strengths	State plans to align funding with priorities. The plan has some reference to school culture and climate.
Weaknesses	No data was indicated in determining the need. The state does not address how it will reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions, such as seclusion and restraint.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must provide a detailed plan, to include a timeline, for how the indicated review of current priorities will occur to ensure this area is addressed in a timely fashion. The state must describe how it will support LEAs receiving assistance under Title I, Part A to improve school conditions for student learning such as schoolwide, positive support. The state must address how it will reduce the use of aversive behavioral interventions such as seclusion and restraint. The state must include a description of how it will support LEAs in reducing incidences of bullying and harassment as well as the overuse of discipline practices that remove students from the classroom.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	SEA will provide data on academic and attendance trends at educational transition points. The Office of Truancy, Dropout Prevention, and Alternative Education will provide technical assistance to address issues that contribute to dropping out. LEAs have dropout prevention committees. SEA does not explicitly state which data it provides to LEAs or how it uses this data to support LEAs.
Strengths	Many professional development activities across content areas are in process.
Weaknesses	There is no indication of how the professional development impacts classrooms. There are no progress monitoring measures.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☒ Yes (1 peer reviewer) ☒ No (3 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The SEA must state how its interventions will result in a decreased dropout rate. The plan must include more detail about transition points other than middle to high school in order to show the extent to which it meets the requirements. The State must describe how it will support LEAs in meeting the needs of students at all levels of schooling, including elementary to middle. The State must include more detail about transition activities and the grade levels at which these activities occur.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. It is not clear that the ACCESS data is the only measure used (i.e. Is local input used?).
Strengths	Clear description of exit criteria.
Weaknesses	No evidence of collaboration was evident. The information on the 30-day assessment of incoming students is not where the crosswalk indicates.
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must provide specific information or clarification around the entrance and exit criteria for EL students that includes consultation with various LEAs, representing the geographic diversity of the state. The SEA must provide information on the 30-day assessment of incoming students in this section.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response partially complete. The state describes that it will monitor Title III; however, it does not address how it will help EL students meet state standards and EL goals.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The SEA must describe how it will assist eligible entities in helping to ensure that English learners meet challenging state academic standards and long-term goals for EL proficiency.

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?

	Peer Response
Peer Analysis	Response not complete.
Strengths	N/A
Weaknesses	N/A
Did the SEA meet all requirements?	☐ Yes (0 peer reviewers) ☒ No (4 peer reviewers)
If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement	The state must provide specific information or clarification on how progress toward long-term goals in aiding EL students in achieving English proficiency. The state must also include the steps that it will take to modify such strategies if students fail to progress along a determined continuum.